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Abstract

The aim of this thesis was to analyze and discuss how and why the traditional agenda setting process, as it is presented by Kingdon through the concepts of problems, politics and policy, can be seen in a new light of social media (tweets) and the concept of identity, by studying the case of American president Donald Trump and investigate his use of Twitter for agenda setting in the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis. This thesis used a case study method to study the material of 28 tweets made by Trump about North Korea. The analysis revealed that Kingdon’s traditional agenda setting theory was useful for understanding the material, however an addition of looking at the concept of identity creation which is important within social media and International Relations (IR). The concept of identity helped to understand Trump’s agenda setting in a new light, where identity creation helped to discover an ‘us-and-them’ dynamic.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoKo</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTUS</td>
<td>President of the United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

In this chapter, I will introduce the topic and problem that this thesis is examining. Further on, the aim and research questions of the thesis are presented in subchapter 1.2. After the aim, the overall research design of this thesis is introduced in subchapter 1.3, followed by a limitation discussion in 1.4. This chapter ends with a presentation of the thesis outline in 1.5.

1.1 Introduction and problem

What is taken up on the international agenda is a central question for whom holds the power of agenda setting and therefore whom holds the power over politics. Agenda setting is therefore a way of executing power and since power and politics always depend on one another, agenda setting is important to understand. Agenda setting has traditionally been studied and explained by different processes of problems, policy and political streams where each of these specific policy streams come together at a specific time which makes a certain agenda successful (Kingdon 2011:1). These questions of how the agenda setting process looks like is described in Kingdon’s classical theory on agenda setting which was created in the 1980s for American context and legislature.

The basic concepts of Kingdon’s theory is that it explains the agenda setting process having three core processes and the model is often called the multiple stream model (MS). According to Kingdon the three processes are problems, policy and politics. These streams flow through the policy system which is the formulation of a certain policy. In this formulation of policy, the political stream is creating the agenda environment for the agenda to have the possibility to change. The problem stream on the other hand is the stream where concerns come to attention among the policymakers, but it is in the policy stream where the ideas are actually formulated and edited to what actually goes on the agenda (Ackrill & Key 2011:72). Kingdon’s theory also is unique to former theories on agenda setting because it presents the concept of policy entrepreneurs which basically is certain people that seem to know how to get their ideas through the policy streams, exactly when all the streams go together and a policy window, an opportunity to affect the agenda occurs (Rawat & Morris 2016:610).
Agenda setting used to be about how policy traditionally was conducted through traditional mass media and politicians, however due to the fact that the 21st century brought the society phenomenon of social media, like Twitter and Facebook to name a few, the way agenda setting can directly be conducted by powerful people has changed. Therefore, it is important to understand how Kingdon’s classical way of studying agenda setting can be understood in the new context of social media. Agenda setting in contemporary time is not only a new way that needs to be studied, it is also a new way to do politics. Since politics and diplomacy especially in International Relations (IR) are all about communication, the importance of such social media platforms gets a crucial importance for how policy takes form (Bjola & Holmes 2015:28). Twitter for example has had a great importance in the American presidential election of 2008 as former president Barack Obama used it as a tool to win. The way Obama used Twitter throughout his presidential election 2008 was also groundbreaking in the way the agenda of U.S. public diplomacy was set in a new way by the use of social media (Hayden, Waisanen & Osipova 2013:1624). Furthermore, Twitter has been an important platform for diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Iran especially twitter communication was important during the P5+1 nuclear negations during the years of 2013 and 2015. Twitter was important because the use of social media changed the space which diplomacy could operate within, when the traditional diplomatic practice was too tense, twitter was a way to interact (Duncombe 2017:546). How IR politics is conducted has changed due to the development of new media and therefore agenda setting also needs to be studied in a new way, by adding the layer of social media theories to truly gain understanding of contemporary agenda setting.

Agenda setting through new media as Twitter can be studied by investigating a specific case which is illustrating how political actors now use new media to set their agenda. The year of 2017 marked a year full of traditional media monitoring every move of a new political leader that embraced the use of social media for agenda setting. The new American president Donald Trump didn’t seem to be afraid to speak his mind about international politics using his Twitter account as his tool to reach out. The 20th of January 2017 president Donald Trump was sworn in as the 45th president of the United States of America (Smith 2017.01.20). The radical shift in the new president’s use of Twitter from a more careful precursor Obama, shocked the international community.
The shock partly seems to be about how Trump daily through his personal Twitter-account @realDonaldTrump tweeted about his and thereby U.S. relationship to other countries and political leaders, the tweets that was given the most attention to was the one’s about the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis and the relationship with the North Korean leader Kim-Jong-Un.

The year of 2017 illustrates that international crises of nuclear weapons are not a mark in the history book anymore, but it is an ongoing crisis in the present moment that seems to be escalating fast and furious. During the year of 2017 the world has witnessed how the relationship between North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un and U.S. president Donald Trump has reached a critical point where North Korea has tested eight successful nuclear missiles since the year of 2006 (Sanger & Broad 2018.01.06). During the year of 2017 media was constantly reporting what Donald Trump has said in both formal situations like in front of the UN: “US President Donald Trump has told the UN General Assembly that America would destroy North Korea if forced to defend itself or its allies.” (BBC 2017.09.19). But what media seems to pay most attention to is Trump’s use of Twitter. Somehow it seems like the conflict between North Korea and the U.S. has escalated due to Donald Trump’s uniqueness in the way he uses social media to comment on the ongoing nuclear crisis (Michaels & Williams 2017:54).

But why is it interesting to study Trump’s use of Twitter for agenda setting in an international crisis? Well according to Michaels and Williams (2017) “There is a public perception that whoever holds the office of the American President is the sole determinant of national interests, particularly with regard to nuclear weapons policy.” (Michaels & Williams 2017:55). Since the American president is seen to have such a powerful position of agenda setting it is interesting to study how a new way of doing politics through Twitter is used by Donald Trump in the agenda setting process towards North Korea. Since a tweet of 144 characters is communication and politics and diplomacy are conducted through communication, Twitter is important to study since it’s representing a contemporary additional way of conducting international relations (Duncombe 2017:547). Therefore, in this thesis a case study will be conducted on the case of Donald Trump’s agenda setting on Twitter in the North Korean nuclear crisis.
1.2 Aim and Research questions

The aim is to analyze and discuss how and why the traditional agenda setting process, as it is presented by Kingdon through the concepts of problems, politics and policy, can be seen in a new light of social media (tweets) and the concept of identity, by studying the case of American president Donald Trump and investigate his use of Twitter for agenda setting in the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis.

The aim will be addressed through the following research questions:

RQ 1: How can Kingdon’s classical theory be understood in the context of new media (Twitter) in international relations?

RQ 2: How is Twitter used by Donald Trump in the agenda setting process towards North Korea?

RQ 3: How can Trump’s use of Twitter be understood from the traditional look on agenda setting (Kingdon)?

RQ 4: What can be learnt more generally about contemporary agenda setting and the use of social media through this case study?
1.3 Overall research design

This thesis has an ambition to contribute both in terms of theories and analyses of the case of Kingdon’s agenda setting approach. But why is theory so important? According to Bryman (2015):

“Theory is important because it provides a backcloth and justification for the research that is being conducted. It also provides a framework within which social phenomena can be understood and the research findings can be interpreted.” (Bryman 2014:18).

In line with Bryman’s argument stating the importance of theory, I dedicate research question 1 to provide the framework that is necessary to understand the empirical case of Donald Trump’s agenda setting on Twitter in the North Korean nuclear crisis. Since I argue that there is a gap in previous research where traditional agenda setting theory have not been explored in the era of new media (Twitter), I will in line with Bryman’s (2015) opinion that when different findings in different theories might not explain the whole topic independently, one as a researcher can provide an alternative approach by combining several theories (Bryman 2015:19). This is why I will use research question one for in the theory chapter three, to see how Kingdon’s classical theory of agenda setting can be understood in the new context of social media (Twitter) theories of IR in line with the aim of this thesis. Furthermore, research question two will be addressed in the case description in chapter five, while research question three is addressed in chapter six case analyses. Both research question two and three are approached by a case study method which is further described in the method chapter four, which is questions to the empirical material. Finally, the fourth and last research question is addressed in chapter seven, the concluding chapter, which will be a question reflecting on the outcome of the other three research questions and what can be learnt from the case study.
1.4 Limitation of topic

In this subchapter the empirical limitations are discussed, while the theoretical limitations are discussed in chapter four of material and methodological consideration. This thesis is about how Twitter can be used to form the agenda, however it is not about the alternatives used to form such an agenda. Neither is it about how to measure the effects of the agenda, which can be done by studying responses in the form of comments so therefore comments are not included in this thesis. Nevertheless, this thesis mentions in a few occasions how people received the tweets (in the form of likes or retweets). However, this is done to illustrate what kind of ideas were supported rather than to measure the effects of the agenda. Neither is this thesis trying to explain the actors or the ‘policy entrepreneurs’ that Kingdon (2011) identifies and discusses as key actors within the agenda setting process. Instead I will rather focus on how a traditional political actor on a strong institutional position, in this case how the American president Donald Trump, uses Twitter. Here the question is how his use of Twitter can be seen from a traditional agenda setting theory (Kingdon) in a new light of social media in the setting of IR. But, this is done without analyzing Trump and his actions in general, nor by considering him as a political entrepreneur. This thesis does not try to say that tweets are ‘the only way’ Trump is setting the agenda, it is rather trying to shed light on and investigate the use of ‘new media’ such as Twitter as a new tool for setting the agenda and explain how we can understand the traditional agenda setting of a traditional actor in a new context (social media). Further, a limitation is that this thesis does not explain the North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un’s agenda setting towards the U.S. due to the fact that North Korea is a very closed country, with non-transparency, lack of infrastructure and access to internet. Therefore, it cannot be studied from valid sources. The sources that exist about North Korea are mostly of journalistic nature and more speculations than confirmed fact, that will be further discussed in the chapter five of material and methodological consideration.
1.5 Outline
The thesis will be organized in the following manner. First in previous chapter, an introduction, problem formulation, aim, research questions, overall research design and limitations of topic are presented for and discussed. Second, a presentation about former research on the use of Kingdon’s theory of agenda setting as well as previous research on social media and International relations (IR) will be presented in chapter two. Third, the theoretical framework will be introduced in chapter three starting with an overview of Kingdon’s theory as well as theory on social media and IR together, the chapter aims to answer research question one. Fourth, after the theory chapter, the material and methodological consideration is discussed in chapter four, where the focus will be on the case study method and choice of material, tweets. Next, a case description of the tweets and a short background will be given to the case of the North Korean nuclear crisis and what the material looks likes is presented monthly in chapter five in line with research question two, the material (tweets) are presented in this chapter as well as they are summarized in ‘Appendix 1 - The tweets ‘. After the case description, the case analysis will take place in chapter six whereas the material is analyzed through the theoretical framework and research question three. Finally, the fourth research question and a conclusion are given in chapter seven.
2. Literature review

In this chapter of the thesis an overview of the former research about agenda setting will be presented. The type of former research that will be used are about how theories of agenda setting have been studied and used in IR as well as how social media have been studied within IR in political science. In this thesis former research will be embedded in how it is used in chapter three on theory as well as the gap in previous research is discussed in chapter four on material and methodological consideration.

2.1 Agenda setting in IR

Agenda setting is important in IR because when the institutional structures are lacking the agenda setting is the only relevant process to study, especially within IR where politics is conducted through communication. The classical way of looking at agenda setting in political debates is to use the classical theory of political scientist John W. Kingdon from the 1980’s as introduced shortly in the introduction chapter about the multiple-streams models and policy entrepreneurs. The traditional agenda setting theory by Kingdon has been used to analyze issues in the context of the European Union (EU). An example of when Kingdon’s theory have been used in the European context is in Ackrill and Kay’s article ‘Multiple streams in EU policy-making. The case of the 2005 sugar reform’ from 2011. As the title of the article reveals, Ackrill and Kay looked at the European sugar reform of 2005 by adopting Kingdon’s theory of policy entrepreneurs and Kingdon’s idea that a policy ‘has its time to happen’ in a short period of time where a window of opportunity occurs, which Ackrill and Kay argue is true even in the context of the European Union.

Agenda setting has also been used within IR to study public diplomacy. An example on how agenda setting has been used in IR is the chapter by Bjola and Jiang ‘Social Media and Public Diplomacy: a comparative analysis of the digital diplomatic strategies of the EU, US. and Japan in China’ in Bjola and Holmes’ book Digital Diplomacy: theory and Practice (Bjola and Holmes 2015). Where agenda setting is used in part of a three-dimensional framework for examining the effectiveness of social media within public diplomacy (Bjola & Holmes 2015:7). In the context of Bjola and Jiang’s study of digital strategies of three embassies in China, agenda setting is used to explain to which extent social media do enable diplomats to set the agenda of discussion with their audience (Bjola & Holmes 2015:7).
Agenda setting is also used in their study to understand if there is a shared understanding and common interests between what the embassies publish in this case on the Chinese social media forum Sina Weibo, and with what the audiences response is (Bjola & Holmes 2015:7). Agenda setting has therefore been used to understand the foreign public perceptions from a diplomatic standpoint by looking at comments and responses of social media posts by the embassies themselves.

Agenda setting has also been studied in the context of the United Nations (UN) to study the policy process and policy formulations. An example of how agenda setting has been studied in relation to the UN is Sumida’s article Agenda setting in multilateral contexts: the example of the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2017). In the article Sumida (2017) argued that Kingdon’s model of the multiple streams is under-researched in the context of multilateral organizations and therefore the article wanted to contribute to that research gap. Kingdon’s agenda setting theory was used to analyze how the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development’s (DESD) policy went from an idea to being on the UN agenda and later part of the Sustainable development goals (Sumida 2017:382). Sumida’s research showed that the DESD could be understood from Kingdon’s three policy streams of problem, politics and policy in the way that there were three conditions making the policy occur on the agenda: “a funding-backed policy entrepreneur, policy oligopoly, and a highlight predictable window.” (Sumida 2017:392).

Agenda setting in IR has therefore been studied both for specific traditional policy documents through applying Kingdon’s multiple streams model, but it has also been studied in the context of public diplomacy and the multilateral context. Let us now continue looking into how social media have been studied in IR.
2.2 Social media in IR

As social media entered the world in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century as a new tool for conducting policy and politics, the new tool has changed the way agenda setting is conducted as well as how the practice of IR is conducted on a daily basis. How is social media used in the field of IR? And what is social media about? Can we learn something from it? First of all, social media is a technological tool that according to Duncombe 2017: “...\textit{has material power precisely because of how its users employ it, similar to any other technology}” (Duncombe 2017:550). In the field of IR, it has been studied how social media engages with foreign publics (Duncombe 2017:550). For example, Bjola and Holmes (2015) focus on how social media and tweets can be used in IR. According to Bjola and Holmes governments and the international community have realized the last couple of years how the use of social media in general can be a ‘game changer’ for the practice of IR and diplomacy (Bjola & Holmes 2015:28). Moreover, Bjola and Homes (2015) have studied how effective social media is for public diplomacy. Where a comparison between different actors: the European Union delegation and two embassies: Japan and the United States of America in China and their use of the Chinese web-site Sina Weibo are studied. Sina Weibo is the Chinese alternative to social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook since those are blocked in China (Bjola & Holmes 2015:157).

In recent years Twitter has become an important tool in contemporary diplomacy (Duncombe 2017:546). According to Duncombe (2017) “\textit{If diplomacy is the ‘art of communication’, then Twitter is another platform for dialogue between states.}” (Duncombe 2017:547). Since the contemporary diplomacy of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, diplomatic relations are built upon greater frequency of communication than it has been historically, when it comes to communication exchanges between states and peoples. Therefore, social media such as Twitter are important to acknowledge when studying diplomacy (Duncombe 2017:549). According to Duncombe (2017) Twitter can be used as a diplomatic tool both to communicate freely and to build a relationship due to the possibility of personal interaction (Duncombe 2017:546). Duncombe exemplifies how Twitter was used in the case of the relationship and nuclear negotiations between the U.S. and Iran and had a positive outcome as an addition to traditional diplomacy (Duncombe 2017:546).
Within diplomatic studies other researchers have studied the use of social media as a tool of Public Diplomacy. Zhong & Lu (2011) have studied the U.S. embassy’s blogs and micro blogs in China with a focus on understanding what the core messages were, whom the major content contributors were, and what the key features of the U.S. social media strategies were (Zhong & Lu 2011:544). To gain that understanding Zhong & Lu did a content analysis of the tweets and categorized them after different themes/topics. Social media, mainly Twitter can be studied this way, by quantifying the amounts of tweets into different themes and then analyze the results through applying theory.

Public diplomacy seems to be one of the most researched topics within IR and social media. Presidential elections through social media have also been well researched, especially since former American president Barack Obama’s first election in 2008, where he is seen as a pioneer in his use of Twitter for political communication (Hayden, Waisanen & Osipova 2013:1624). For example, the two research areas of public diplomacy and political campaigns on social media have been studied together by Hayden, Waisanen & Osipova (2013), where it was examined how the communication on social media between public diplomacy practitioners and publics were occurring during the U.S. presidential election 2012, through embassies social media accounts (Hayden, Waisanen & Osipova 2013:1623). The research showed that there was not a debate in the communication but rather messages acknowledging Obama’s political campaign (Hayden, Waisanen & Osipova 2013:1623).

In the research field of diplomacy and social media there is a focus on the top-down approaches when studying social media, where the focus is on how states communicate or exercise power on foreign publics (Duncombe 2017:551). Therefore, it is according to Duncombe (2017) interesting to study the horizontal approach of diplomacy on social media instead, which takes place between state policy-makers and other states (Duncombe 2017:551). There are also studies focusing on social media as a possibility for change and how it can be used to define policy-identity for a state. According to Duncombe (2017) in the article ‘Twitter and transformative diplomacy: social media and Iran-US relations’ social media, namely Twitter can be defined as diplomacy, “if diplomacy is the ‘art of communication, then Twitter is another platform for dialogue between states.” (Duncombe 2017:545). If Twitter can be used as a tool of diplomacy to communicate with other states, then I will argue in line with Duncombe that we can learn about relationships between states
or even presidents by studying Twitter. According to Duncombe (2017) by studying Twitter as a part of a negotiation strategy we can learn how social media can shape and legitimate political possibilities for change (Duncombe 2017:548). Twitter and other social media platforms like Facebook in the context of IR is also described as it can be understood as tool for states to create policy-identity or as a way of forming state identity by representing or communicating how the state wants to be perceived by others (Duncombe 2017:548).

In the field of media and communication studies, politics is addressed similar to the reasoning within IR about creating policy identity. In media and communications studies there is a specific field of political communication, which focuses on the public relations and strategic communication that is needed for a political actor like a president or a prime minister to succeed. These political actors can get support for their ideas through public communication, which is needed to get their ideas through (Strömbäck 2014:187). This idea is similar to how agenda setting is studied in the way that the importance for an actor to get consensus is a part of both political communication and agenda setting research.

Strategic political communication can be seen as a tool to reach political goals by using communication in a strategic way (Strömbäck 2014:187). There are also studies that focus more on the communication itself as politics rather than politics as communication. In the field of media and communication studies, politics is addressed as its entire own sub-field of political communication, which is addressed as communication being the primary pillar for politics to even exists and as politics and communication being always dependent on each other (Strömbäck 2014:9). Some researchers within the media and communications field argue that there is a gap in the field of Political Science concerning the communications process in relation to politics (Strömbäck 2014:9). According to Strömbäck (2014), communication is needed for political leaders to get validation in forms of support for their political ideas (Strömbäck 2014:187). There are also studies that have focused on how social media and diplomacy interact with each other where two levels of interaction have been presented; top-down interaction which is the communication from state-policy makers to the foreign publics. Second, there is horizontal interaction that take place between state policy-makers and other state policy makers (Duncombe 2017:551).
In this chapter, I have presented that agenda setting has been used in IR to study traditional policy such as the European sugar reform of 2005 and the Decade of Education for Sustainable development. When it comes to former research within the field of IR and social media, there have been studied a lot of Public diplomacy, embassies and presidential election. What this literature review has shown is that there is little research or almost non-existing on agenda setting within IR and social media, this research gap I argue this thesis try to fill is further discussed in chapter four as previously mentioned in the introduction of this chapter. Now let us continue to the chapter of the theory this thesis will use.
3. Theory

In this chapter of the thesis the research question one will be addressed: How can Kingdon’s classical theory be understood in the context of new media (Twitter) in international relations? To answer this research question, first the theories that will be used throughout this thesis are presented. To be able to answer research question one, I will first give an introduction to Kingdon’s theory on agenda setting. Second, I will present how others have interpreted Kingdon’s theory. Third, I will give an introduction to theory within the field of IR on social media and agenda setting. Fourth, I will present how the Kingdon’s theory on agenda setting can be understood in the context of theories of social media and IR and used together.

3.1 Kingdon’s theory on agenda setting

A classic work in Political Science when understanding policy is the work of John W. Kingdon originally in 1984 in his work *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. It is argued that Kingdon’s model on agenda Setting has its origins from the garbage can model which was introduced by Cohen, March & Olsen in 1972 (Rawat & Morris 2016:609). The two scholars Rawat and Morris argue in their article *Kingdon’s “Streams” Model at Thirty: Still Relevant in the 21st Century* from 2016 that one of the differences between the ‘garbage can model’ and Kingdon’s model is the number of streams in the agenda Setting process. Kingdon explains the agenda setting process as three streams of *Problems, Policy* and *Politics*, while Cohen, March and Olsen in their garbage can model describe it as the four streams of *Problems, Solutions, Participants* and *Choice opportunity* (Rawat & Morris 2016:610). Another thing that is different with Kingdon’s model from the garbage can model is that he also introduces the concept of *Policy entrepreneurs* (Rawat & Morris 2016:610).

The theory of Kingdon explains why some ideas make it to the political agenda while other ideas do not. According to Kingdon it can be explained as: “an idea whose time has come” (Kingdon 2011:1). In Kingdon’s work *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* originally from 1984 he wanted to understand why attention is given to certain topics rather than others and why some of those topics come on the agenda while others don’t (Kingdon 2011:2). In this thesis citations to Kingdon’s work will be to his latest updated second edition from 2011. Important to notice is that
Kingdon’s model is made in the context of American legislature and procedures which should be taken into consideration if the model was to be adopted in another context (Ackrill & Kay 2011:73)

**3.1.1 The policy streams**

According to Kingdon there are three kinds of processes ‘streams’ that are important in policy formulation: 1) *Problems*, 2) *Policies* and 3) *Politics*. These streams flow through the policy system:

“The politics stream contains factors creating an environment conducive to agenda-change, the problems stream contains concerns that come to the attention of policy-makers. Whilst the policy stream is where ideas and proposals are formulated and revised.”

(Ackrill & Key 2011: 72).

*The problem stream* is referred to as in policy formulation, government officials always have a long list of ‘problems’ they could work on, however the daily work of a government would not work if they dealt with all of those problems, therefore obviously some problems are paid attention to while other problems are ignored (Kingdon 2011:90). Problems can get more attention by certain indicators such as non-governmental organizations pushing for a problem right after an event has happened or a research by academia that just have been realized showing a specific problem etc., the indicators vary (Kingdon 2011:90-91). However, sometimes the problems need a push to rise on the list of problems for people in and around the government. Such a push can be a crisis or a personal experience of a policy maker (Kingdon 2011:94-95).

*The policy stream* is a lot about consensus building and have to be governed by arguments and compromises (Kingdon 2011:159). According to Kingdon the policy streams is called ‘the policy primeval soup’ and consists of some policy communities consisting of researchers, specialists, congressional staffers, academics, interest groups etc. that are specialized in a given policy area (Kingdon 2011:116-117). These experts within a specific field generate alternatives and proposals by compromising and arguing which is a selection process where only some ideas survive (Kingdon 2011:117). The ideas that survive this selection process by ticking off certain criteria is narrowed down to a short list that are serious alternatives (Kingdon 2011:143). Some people are better than
others at getting their ideas through such a process, so called policy entrepreneurs. These people invest a lot of their resources to get their ideas through (Kingdon 2011:143). These policy entrepreneurs will be further described later in this theory description.

Let us continue with the political stream. The political stream is consisting in processes which become a bandwagon in motions for policy and problem to push policy through (Kingdon 2011:159). However, actors in the political stream need to have consensus from other members and support for their ideas to push for an agenda (Kingdon 2011:159). However, the political stream is the only one of the three streams that according to Kingdon flows independently, due to the fact that politics consists of other factors that influence it, such as national moods, elections, new administrations, ideology, congress and other interest groups pressing the political stream (Kingdon 2011:162). The developments of factors pushing the political stream that was just mentioned in the previous paragraph have a powerful effect on agendas both when it comes to pushing for a new agenda or putting other ideas on the shelf (Kingdon 2011:145). The political stream is an important promoter for high agenda status, all actors pushing for an agenda need to have the political stream to favor the idea for it to be tolerated (Kingdon 2011:163). As a new administration takes place in the American government, they can in the political stream bring with them ideas and changes to policy agendas (Kingdon 2011:153). Agendas can be changed due to the fact that the major governmental participant, as a new administrations changes (Kingdon 2011:153). However, for a new administration to build consensus for their policy they do need bargaining (Kingdon 2011:159).

3.1.2 The policy entrepreneurs and window of opportunity

Within the three policy streams there are certain people that operate that are better than others to get their ideas through, always willing to invest their reputation and all resources on their ‘pet projects’ – the policy entrepreneurs (Ackrill & Kay 2011:72). These policy entrepreneurs have a talent for coupling the different policy streams and when the time has come, and an opportunity occurs for getting something on the decisions agenda, in a so-called policy window they are waiting with their idea (Rawat & Morris 2016:610). The policy windows are the metaphor for the opportunity for actors or policy entrepreneurs to push through their problems when either the
opportunity opens on routine in renewal of a program or unpredictably (Kingdon 2011:165). Kingdon describes the action of the policy entrepreneurs as:

“Policy entrepreneurs play a major part in the coupling at the open policy window, attaching solution to problems, overcoming the constraints by redrafting proposals, and taking advantage of politically propitious events”
(Kingdon 2011:166).

As described in the quote, the policy entrepreneur is talented in attaching their ideas to the opportunity of an open window and therefore get their agenda through. But what does it mean for a policy entrepreneur to get something on the agenda? Let us continue exploring Kingdon’s concept of ‘the agenda’.

3.1.3 The agenda and its alternatives
An open window as described in the previous paragraph affects the type of agenda called the decision agenda. First, we have the governmental agenda which is described as: “The list of subjects or problems to which governmental officials, and people outside of government closely associated with those officials, are paying some serious attention to at any given time” (Kingdon 2011:3). Since the agenda is seen as the list of alternatives the agenda setting process then take it one step further to the narrow subjects or alternatives that become the serious options of policy (Kingdon 2011:3). There are different types of agenda, the agenda that have the ‘biggest’ items on its list is the governmental agenda where governmental officials – the president and his closest handles, this can be items like international crises (Kingdon 2011:3). There is also a difference between the governmental agenda and the decision agenda whereas the governmental agenda is the subjects that get attention while the decision agenda is the list of subjects within the governmental agenda that actually are up for a decision (Kingdon 2011:4).

There is also a difference between the agenda and its alternatives which is a bit hard to distinguish. Kingdon describes it as experts within government are making the alternatives which they are in great importance for, while the President is the more important one for actually setting the chosen agenda (Kingdon 2011:4). With this being said in the forming of the governmental agenda more
precisely the agenda for the president and his closest such as international crisis, the president is still an important actor and the most powerful force in the agenda setting process especially in relations to other actors (Kingdon 2011:23). Therefore, the policy entrepreneurs are powerful but in contrast to the president not as powerful since according to Kingdon: “The president can single-handedly set the agendas not only of people in the executive branch, but also of people in congress and outside of government” (Kingdon 2011:23). Even if Kingdon identifies the president as an important and powerful actor he also highlights that the president cannot control the policy agenda, but he has most power in contrast to others (Kingdon 2011:23).

3.1.4 Kingdon’s model have been used by other researchers

Ackrill and Key also adapted Kingdons theory a bit since Kingdon argues that there is a separation of policy entrepreneurs and decision makers while the authors argue that policy entrepreneurs may even be involved directly in the decision-making progress. Which they use to look at a key individual in the sugar reform which otherwise would not have been included according to Kingdons theory. Ackrill and Kay also adapted the multiple stream (MS) model to analyze the sugar reform. However, for being able to use the multiple streams model they argue that since Kingdon’s theory was made for the American policy and legislature context it needed to be adapted for the EU context of their study (Ackrill & Key 2011:73). This illustrates how it is necessary to adapt Kingdon’s theory when it is studied in an international context which do not have the American context as a core of studying. Since in this thesis the focus is to study a political actor in the American context, such an adaption will not be necessary in this thesis, however it is important to highlight that such interpretations have been made by others within the field of IR.
3.2 Agenda setting in the field of IR and social media

To be able to answer the research question one which is addressed in this chapter: How can Kingdon’s classical theory be understood in the context of new media (Twitter) in international relations? As we now have discussed, how Kingdon’s classical theory of agenda setting is understood through the three streams: problems, policy and politics, we now also need to learn about theories saying something about the context of new media (Twitter) in IR.

Bjola & Holmes (2015) argue that agenda setting on social media such as Twitter and Facebook are used by diplomats to set the agenda of discussion with their target audience which they define as something called digital agenda setting (Bjola & Holmes 2015:163). The concept of digital agenda setting is also about how one through social media can influence the public agenda (Bjola & Holmes 2015:424). But what explains the countries way of using social media in agenda setting? According to Bjola and Holmes (2015) it showed in their book of several studies that the nature of the bilateral relationship between countries influences the way which social media is used in diplomatic purposes (Bjola & Homes 2015:424).

In the book in chapter four Social media and public diplomacy – a comparative analysis of digital diplomacy strategies of the EU, US and Japan in China, a study by Bjola and Jiang, their study of the strategies of digital diplomacy, showed that Japan for example, due to a painful history with China during world war II, did not touch upon political or controversial topics because of that specific bilateral relationships history (Bjola & Holmes 2015:424). Digital agenda setting therefore seems to be about influencing the perception amongst the public. However, there are others who argue that agenda setting on social media not only is used for affecting the public but also for creating an identity which both states and the general public is perceiving.
3.2.1 Identity

Why do we use social media? Well a common perception is that social media is used to portray a certain identity, a representation of one self or an organization, state etc. But what is an identity? According to the English Oxford Dictionary identity is “the fact of being who or what a person or thing is” (English Oxford Dictionary 2018). Within the field of IR, there are theories of digital diplomacy explaining why the president, diplomats and other government officials use social media. The authors Bjola and Holmes (2015) do explain why president and governments use social media in their book Digital Diplomacy: Theory and practice where they explain it as that:

“Governments and international organizations are now realizing that social media is also a potential game changer for how international relations can be pursued. In particular, the adoption of digital diplomacy.” (Bjola & Holmes 2015:28).

Bjola and Holmes also argue that in contemporary times governments and other officials in countries all over the world now use social media as Twitter and Facebook as their day to day diplomatic practice (Bjola and Holmes 2015:33). According to Bjola and Holmes social media affects core diplomatic function such as representation, communication and relationship management (Bjola and Holmes 2015:30). Government officials and foreign ministries also use their social media accounts to gain insights in how other foreign public’s view their country as well as they use social media to portray themselves to other countries (Bjola & Holmes 2015:34).

If social media is a way for governments to portray themselves, then they are trying to create a certain identity (Bjola & Holmes 2015:34). There are others also arguing that social media in IR is about identity creation. Duncombe (2017) argues that identity in IR is formed through how others through our communication recognize us (Duncombe 2017:548). Through social media such as Twitter there is a policy-identity creation process which ends up in some form of state identity. The way a state or political leader makes a statement on social media can reflect who ‘us and them’ are, which is pure foreign policy politics (Duncombe 2017:548).
Twitter and other social media are important in the policy-identity process because states are expressing representation of themselves and how they desire to be recognized by others (Duncombe 2017:554). Duncombe (2017) argues that governmental officials simply use Twitter and other social media channels within IR to present their policy-identity, state-identity or to control the perception of their state (Duncombe 2017:548). Further Duncombe argue that why governments use statements on social media for framing their state-identity is simply because it creates an ‘us and them’ situation where it is used as a tool to rule out others in foreign policy contexts (Duncombe 2017:548). Further Duncombe argues that why diplomats or governmental officials use Twitter and other social media platforms in IR is because how a government or a president portrays himself on Twitter, can be affected by portraying themselves as they want to be recognized. Also, by using Twitter to express their opinions through creating their identity through their words it can provide an element of distance that helps to reduce tensions that in face to face diplomacy would have become a crisis (Duncombe 2017:554).

Duncombe (2017) also says that Twitter has such a critical importance within diplomacy and IR because: “...the capacity of Twitter to frame representations of state identity that are integral to the struggle for recognition, easily accessible and quickly disseminated to diplomatic counterparts...” (Duncombe 2017:551). Since identity can be created on Twitter so easily by a state or political leader, it is also easy to access for the people you want to perceive the identity you try to create. Identity creation through Twitter therefore is easy and fast to use. However, with that being said it does not mean that it is easy to create the identity that is wished for. By using Twitter to express one’s concerns in an identity creation can sometimes be helpful in diplomatic relations because it provides a distance to the other state for example before a crisis breaks out (Duncombe 2017:554).
3.3 How agenda setting can be understood in the context of new media

This final part of the theory chapter addresses the first research question: How can Kingdon’s classical theory be understood in the context of new media (Twitter) in international relations? I will end this theory chapter by discussing such a research question. However, how the theories presented in this chapter will be used in the analyses of the case of this thesis, is further presented in the next coming research design chapter four. The theory of agenda setting by Kingdon and the theories from IR and social media will be merged together, where merging them together to one theory will be the goal, to give a more theoretical answer and then throughout the thesis, I will try to give a more empirical answer.

First of all, Kingdon’s classical theory consists of the three streams of problems, politics and policy which are the focus for this thesis. The political stream needs to be investigated in agenda-setting on social media. For example, Kingdon argues that the political stream is the most independent stream, but the people operating within it still need to have consensus for their ideas. However, Kingdon also argues that there is a new administration, an opportunity to push through new politics concerning a policy occurs, and since that is the case for this thesis studying the traditional actor American president Donald Trump it is useful even for understanding agenda setting on Trump’s Twitter.

When it comes to policy, according to Kingdon one has to have support for one’s idea, this can on social media be investigated by looking at the number of retweets and likes to figure out which political ideas or tweets that are more supported than others. This consensus is something also IR and social media research is pushing for and therefore it is good to look at. Another thing that Kingdon’s theory does not mention exactly but is important in social media and IR is ‘policy identity’ how a state or a president creates an identity throughout his tweets. This policy identity will be the aspect that I in this thesis contribute with to Kingdons theory. While as stated previously in this chapter, consensus for political ideas is something that is important both in Kingdon’s theory as well as in the research on social media and IR. However, looking at how policy identity or how one portrays his or her state is a new aspect in relation to traditional agenda setting theory by Kingdon.
In this chapter, research question one was addressed: How can Kingdon’s classical theory be understood in the context of new media (Twitter) in international relations? And I answered it by saying that Kingdon’s theory mainly can be understood as three political streams of problems, policy and politics. However, new media within IR states that social media both can be explained by identity creation as well as it can be a way to affect the foreign publics. In either of those two directions within new media and IR, they are both talking about that political leaders use of Twitter can be explained as a way of forming identity, perception of themselves or their state. Therefore, I will look at the traditional concept of agenda setting by Kingdon: problems, policy and politics in my case analyses. However, to be able to understand Kingdon’s theory in the era of new media I will also look at the concept of creation of identity, since it is interesting to see how Trump uses identity to portray himself and other countries through his agenda setting on Twitter towards North Korea, and whether an identity dynamic can be found throughout his tweets. The conclusion of research question one has now therefore been answered for, with the conclusion that Kingdon’s theory of agenda setting can be understood in the new context of social media by adding the concept of identity. This analytical framing, I have here formed from the concept of problems, policy, politics and identity will lead the analysis in the case analyses in chapter six.
4. Methodological consideration

This chapter focuses on the material and methodological consideration of this thesis. Since the aim of this thesis is to analyze and discuss how and why the traditional agenda setting process, as it is presented by Kingdon through the concepts of *problems, politics* and *policy*, can be seen in a new light of social media (tweets) and the concept of *identity*, by studying the case of American president Donald Trump and investigate his use of Twitter for agenda setting in the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis, this chapter will focus on discussing choice of method and material. Research question one, as presented in the research design overview in chapter one, has already been answered in chapter four and therefore this chapter only covers the method and material for answering the aim and research question two, three and four.

4.1 Choice of method

According to Bryman (2015) tweets are documents that can be content analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively (Bryman 2015:559). However, since I in this thesis want to understand Trump’s tweets as case of agenda setting on social media, I want to analyze the case qualitatively in detail rather than to generalize a whole perception of the public opinion of something like previous researchers have done. I instead want to analyze the content of Trump’s tweets in the case of North Korea to illustrate agenda setting on social media.

In this thesis it can be argued that the method that is suitable for the aim and research question two, three and four is the qualitative interpretative case study. Della Porta and Keating (2008) argue that: “..the interpretative case study (disciplined configurative) uses theoretical frameworks to provide an explanation of particular cases, which can lead as well to an evaluation and refinement of theories.” (Della Porta & Keating 2008:227). As this thesis aims to look at the traditional actor in the light of new media (Twitter) and the case of Donald Trump and agenda setting concerning the North Korean nuclear crisis, it can be argued that the case study is a suitable approach in relations to Della Porta and Keating’s definition. Since in this thesis Kingdon’s framework together with IR and social media theories is used to explain the particular case of Donald Trump’s use of Twitter to form the agenda in the ongoing nuclear crisis. Doing so, it could lead to an evaluation and refinement of the theories of Kingdon’s agenda setting which haven’t been studied in relation to IR and Twitter before.
To understand what case study method is, a few definitions will be presented. First, it can according to Bryman (2015) be described as: “the basic case study entails the detailed and intensive analysis of a single case” (Bryman 2015:60). Second, a case itself can be described as “...a phenomenon, or an event, chosen, conceptualized and analyzed as a manifestation of a broader class of phenomena or events” (Della Porta & Keating 2008:226). Furthermore, a case study can be a good method to be used for explaining a specific phenomenon by applying theories to the case or to formulate hypothesis (Della Porta & Keating 2008:227). The method is also said to itself aim to generate an intensive examination of a single case in relation to a theoretical analysis (Bryman 2015:64), which is exactly what the aim of this thesis is. By looking at how traditional agenda setting by Kingdon can be seen in a new light of Twitter in the case study of Donald Trump and North Korea. The case study can therefore be seen as suitable method for combining theory with an empirical case to test such a hypothesis which is as described in the aim of this thesis to be about if traditional agenda setting can be seen in a new light of social media. By looking at the case of Trump’s tweets on North Korea, I will then engage in a theoretical analysis based on the classical agenda setting theory by Kingdon as well as theory on social media and international relations.

4.2 How others have studied tweets

In order to analyze Trump’s tweets, we first need to investigate how tweets have been analyzed by others. Tweets have been analyzed as a social media platform that has a growing role within contemporary diplomacy (Duncombe 2017:546). As discussed in the chapter of former research in chapter three, I argue in this thesis that it is well researched how to study political debates through the multiple streams model, it is also well researched the connection between new media and IR. However, there is a gap in the connection between those two fields. I argue that the classical theory of Kingdon is highly relevant looking at the political debate however I use this classical theory in a new context of new media by studying Twitter. Since Kingdon’s theory hasn’t been used in relations to Twitter and IR before, this is where my contribution lay in this thesis. By in this thesis making a conceptual contribution by combining these two research fields when looking at the case of Donald Trump’s tweets in the context of the North Korean nuclear crises.
There is a gap in previous research where Agenda setting has been studied in the international context and EU context. But it hasn’t been studied in the context of new media and social media. There is a gap where I hope to bring more knowledge, by studying Donald Trump’s use of Twitter in the agenda setting process in the case of the North Korean nuclear crisis. My contribution is that Kingdon’s theory hasn’t been used in relation to Twitter before. I used a classical theory looking at the political debate, but in a new context which is how I show creativity in this thesis.

Within the field of IR, tweets have been used to understand the public perception or to measure what effect a specific political outcome has had on the foreign perception. Alkazeim, Fahmy & Wanta (2018) studied the public perception in tweets of attributes of U.S. former president Barack Obama in the Arab world. The authors used tweets to understand the perception of media staff and the public about former U.S. president Obama’s failed promise to improve the relationship between the U.S. government and then Arab world (Alkazeim, Fahmy & Wanta 2018:119). Tweets were studied to understand the agenda setting of the public opinion towards Obama (Alkazeim, Fahmy & Wanta 2018:123). The tweets were used in the study to see which countries that were linked to the tweets about Obama (Alkazeim, Fahmy & Wanta 2018:125). In the example of Alkazeim, Fahmy & Wanta’s study, they used a content analysis method of 4,108 tweets in the period of 30 days in July 2014. A data mining software was used to study the material (Alkazeim, Fahmy & Wanta 2018:126). In this thesis, I instead want to use the tweets for the opposite purpose of the previous studies, I instead want to study in depth the agenda setting made by one person on Twitter, which I argue hasn’t been studied in the same degree before. I want to see what agenda setting the American president Donald Trump is setting towards North Korea in the ongoing nuclear crisis and try to understand this from both traditional agenda setting (Kingdon) as well as through the concept of identity as concluded in the previous theory chapter. Instead of simply studying the public perception of a certain agenda through social media’s such as Twitter which has already been done.
4.3 Limitations of method

As presented in this chapter, others have studied tweets by focusing on public perception. But since the aim of this thesis is to study agenda setting on Twitter throughout the case of Donald Trump and the North Korean nuclear crisis, I argue that a case study is more suitable since I want to illustrate a case to understand agenda setting in the era of social media. This will be conducted by analyzing the tweets in detail and get at deeper understanding of the agenda setting. Rather than through other methods as quantitatively data analysis and data mining see how the tweets have been discussed amongst a bigger number of tweets etc. The qualitative case study method of this thesis cannot give a generalized view of the effects of Trump’s agenda setting for example, neither can it measure how the agenda is perceived by Twitter followers. Rather the method can help to get a deeper understanding on Trump’s agenda setting and the content of such.

4.4 Selection of material

Since the aim of this thesis is as mentioned already in the introduction of this chapter, which is to focus on the case of Donald Trump’s use of Twitter for agenda setting in the North Korean nuclear crisis, it makes it obvious to look at Donald Trump’s tweets as the material of this thesis. But why tweets? Well first of all, to illustrate a case one as a researcher in qualitative research can according to Esaiasson et.al. (2012) collect material in three ways, simply by either 1) interviews, 2) observations or by 3) observing traces of human activity, written material (Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson & Wägnerud 2012:193). Therefore, in this thesis ‘the case’ will consist of the material of tweets collected from American President Donald Trump’s Twitter account, due to the argument that it is traces of human activity, written text research can observe. Since the aim of this thesis is to analyze and discuss how and why the traditional agenda setting process, as it is presented by Kingdon, can be seen in a new light by studying the traditional political actor president Trump and investigate his use of Twitter to form the agenda in the case of the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis. I argue it is to be suitable to study tweets, as a trace of human activity, also due to the fact that Trump’s tweets can be seen as a good source since it is material gathered from his personal Twitter account and possible written by no other than himself and therefore are a primary source. To be transparent in the way this thesis was conducted a process description of how the tweets were collected will be presented as follows. The process description and way of collecting tweets was developed by myself and ended up in four steps:
First, the inventory of Trump’s Twitter accounts was made. During the inventory of Trump’s Twitter accounts, it was found that the American president has two Twitter accounts one called @POTUS, which is the official Twitter account of the President of the United States for the person holding the chair of the presidency, and one called @realDonaldTrump which is Trump’s personal Twitter account. In this stage an inventory of the tweets on both accounts were made to decide which one of them to be interesting for this thesis. A first decision-making crossroad was met, when realizing that the @POTUS account mostly seem to be retweeting @realDonaldTrump and also the @realDonaldTrump account is the one that is most frequently tweeted from. The personal account is also the one that the president has officially admitted that he is using himself and the account traditional media are following and reporting about. Donald Trump has 50 661 036 followers on his personal Twitter-account @realDonaldTrump the 14th of April 2018 compared to his POTUS account @POTUS who ‘only’ in comparison have 22 812 740 followers. The number of followers and the difference in how many more followers Trump’s personal account reaches also makes it more interesting to study than the @POTUS account.

Second, a gathering of the tweets made on Trump’s personal Twitter account @realDonaldTrump were done. The tweets were collected between 28th of January to 2nd of April 2018 and this gathering was made of all the available tweets. What here is referred to as ‘all the available tweets’ is that the tweets were collected manually by going back in time on Trump’s Twitter account as far as possible and collected from there. The material consists in all tweets published between 25th October 2017 – 28 March 2018. The tweets that was collected to the material that was published between 25th October until 16th of November 2017. I have noticed that all the tweet no longer is available on Trump’s Twitter account when making a check in on the 2nd of April 2018, they have been deleted. However, they were available the 28th of January when those specific tweets were collected, so therefore they are still included in this collection of material. Therefore, the tweets that no longer are available are referred to by date in the reference list while the tweets that still are accessible are to be referred to with a specific html link as well. However, to check how a website like Trump’s Twitter looked like a specific date there are different webpages where they show the history of a website that is archived, an example of this type of web tools are archive.org. You simply type in a web address to a webpage and the website archive shows you exactly how it used to look on a specific time and date. In this thesis however, this web
tool was only used to go back and confirm the deleted tweets that were already collected from the original web address of Donald Trump’s Twitter.

Third, a limitation of the tweets was made both by choosing a specific time-period but also by sorting out the tweets by forming concepts or words as criteria of what to include. A direct limitation of time is automatically made because of @realDonaldTrump Twitter account only is available from October 2017 to the present. Therefore, in this thesis I have focused on looking into all the tweets available from October 2017 until the collection date of the material which was the 2nd of April 2018. The tweets that will be used for analyzing is the one mentioning some of the following terms: “North Korea”, “NoKo”, “Kim Jong-Un”, “Rocket-Man”, which was 28 tweets. This material is therefore limited by time since all the tweets that fitted into the criteria of mentioning the specific terms was included. In this thesis when presenting the tweets, they are directly quoted which means that Trumps misspellings have not been changed. The sorting of the tweets and collecting has been made by manually collecting / transcribing the tweets containing those words and the chosen material is quoted in the reference list as well as they all are presented and quoted in chapter five, the case description as well as they can be found in Appendix 1.

Lastly, the tweets that were included in the material ended up in 28 tweets. All the tweets are numbered “Tweet 1”. “Tweet 2”, etc., in chronological order when they were published. Tweet 1 to be the oldest and tweet 28 to be the most recently published. In the 28 tweets, it is also included numbers of how many likes one tweet has got and how many times someone have retweeted that specific tweet. The statistics over likes and retweets were collected the 14th of April 2018. However, these numbers are included because it can show how much support certain ideas have got, in relations to the other tweets. On the other hand, this thesis is about how Trump uses Twitter to form the agenda and not to measure the effects of such agenda or the public perception and therefore the comment function was not included in the material. But rather this thesis is about how Trump use Twitter in his agenda setting on Twitter.

Also, it has not been included in the material if Trump retweeted someone else tweets because this thesis is focusing on what Trump tweets and not which the other actors are. Further, in two of the 28 tweets there were also pictures published in relation to the text, which were both pictures of
Trump himself. However, in this thesis the focus is on the text and not the pictures, since I argue in this thesis that the material for studying Trump’s agenda setting is text and not pictures. In the tweets in which a picture was published was in tweet 2 and tweet 3, and these has excluded from my material. That those two tweets had pictures to them is only mentioning to be transparent of which choices were taken, also to be transparent in the collection of the material.

The tweets will be used to see how Donald Trump uses Twitter to form the agenda in the case of the ongoing nuclear crisis which this thesis aims to address. Since the material only consists of the 28 tweets, this thesis does not try to tell the whole story about the North Korean nuclear crisis, but to fully understand the context of the tweets, news articles are used to understand the news through the tweets. However, it is still the 28 tweets which is the material and case of this thesis. Tweets as a material are short but they are a statement for something more, especially when they come from one of the most powerful presidents of the world.
4.5 The use of theory

In this subchapter it is presented how theory is used in the case study of this thesis. Since the aim of this thesis is to analyze and discuss how and why the traditional agenda setting process, as it is presented by Kingdon, can be seen in a new light by studying the traditional political actor American president Donald Trump and investigate his use of Twitter to form the agenda in the case of the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis. The theory of Kingdon and agenda setting which was presented in chapter four, will be used to analyze the tweets (case) from a traditional agenda setting process standpoint, partly due to the fact that Kingdon’s theory was made for the American context and legislature. Furthermore, an additional layer to the traditional agenda setting theory by Kingdon will be added by using theories from new media and IR and how agendas are set on social media. The following two research questions will therefore be treated in the analyses chapter:

RQ 3: How can Trump’s use of Twitter be understood from the traditional look on agenda setting (Kingdon)?

RQ 4: What can be learnt more generally about contemporary agenda setting and the use of social media through this case study?

Research question two is treated in the case description in chapter six. Since the focus in this thesis is on how Trump use Twitter in forming the agenda in the case of the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis, the policy streams of Kingdon’s theory are used as the independent element. The agenda of policy is the main study object of the thesis, while the policy entrepreneurs are not my main focus and can therefore be seen as a dependent element of focus. However, Kingdon’s concept of a policy entrepreneur is used for describing that Donald Trump in this thesis is argued to be ‘the traditional political actor’, a policy entrepreneur, whom also in line with Kingdon’s definition can be the American president. The concept of policy entrepreneurs was used when choosing the case of Donald Trump’s role in the North Korean nuclear crisis in his use of Twitter in setting the agenda. I do acknowledge the importance on the actors or policy entrepreneurs but in this thesis, I focus on how a traditional actor uses Twitter in forming the agenda rather than the whole policy process or who the actors are. Kingdon’s theory on agenda setting is also used to form the meaning of the agenda which can be seen as the priority, highest on the to-do list which this thesis aims to study.
Kingdon argues that the president can single-handedly be the one who sets an agenda (Kingdon 2011:23). Which is why the theory is used to study the American president Donald Trump. The use of the method and the theory and its concepts is presented in figure 1 below in four different steps. By this illustration I summarizes the discussion above.

**Figure 1:** How method and theory will be used in the analysis of the case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 - Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ 2: Presentation of tweets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 – Case analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ 3: Analyze tweets from Kingdon’s concepts of problems, policy, politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3 – Case analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ 3: Analyze tweets through the additional concept of identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4- Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In conclusion discuss RQ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step one in the figure above symbolizes the case description which aims to answer research question two: how is Twitter used by Donald Trump in the agenda setting process towards North Korea? Which is answered by applying the method of a case study to the material. This case description is presented in chapter six. Step two and three, addresses research question three: how can Trump’s use of Twitter be understood from the traditional look on agenda setting (Kingdon)? This question will be answered by looking at Kingdon’s concepts of problems, politics and policy. While in step three, the case is analyzed from the concept of identity from IR and social media, by looking at the material and Trump is portraying his agenda towards North Korea by creating a
certain identity. A key concept both in Kingdons theory as well as in theories on IR and social media is that consensus is needed to push ideas through, therefore the theory idea of consensus will be used to see which ideas Trump through his tweets is setting better than other ideas. Even if the focus of this thesis as previously described is not aiming to measure the effects of Trump’s agenda setting but it aims to see how Trump is using Twitter to set the agenda, and therefore it can be valuable to see which ideas (tweets) he actually sets in form of likes and retweets. In step four, the focus will be on research question four: what can be learnt more generally about contemporary agenda setting and the use of social media through this case study? The case study will be discussed in relation to the last research question in the conclusion chapter seven. In the conclusion it will also be discussed whether step three, helped us to see agenda setting in a new light which Kingdon’s theory didn’t, by adding such a dimension of policy identity theory which was added from the IR and social media field.

4.5.1 Limitation of theory

In this thesis the theory of Kingdon is used to explain the agenda setting, however it is used by applying it on the tweets to analyze the agenda setting processes of problems, policy and politics. However, the theory will not be used to discuss the concept of the policy entrepreneur. Since the theory will not be used on the case (tweets) of this thesis, actors will not be the focus of explanation. Even if the theory of Kingdon is based on ‘pre-Twitter’ agenda setting, and therefore can be limited, I will by adding an additional layer from theories of social media and IR. By adding the concept of identity, I expand on this limitation by trying something new. That limitation might also become less limiting, as Kingdon’s theory is made for the American context and legislation and therefore can help explain how an American president uses Twitter for agenda setting.

A limitation can be that according to Kingdon’s theory the policy entrepreneur is the one bringing the agenda setting process together, I do acknowledge that importance and I will illustrate it in the sense of variables, but I will call it elements instead since this is not a study built upon variables. A dependent variable is “causally influenced by another variable – the independent variable “(Bryman 2015:690). While an independent variable does influence other variables (Bryman 2015:691). Since a dependent variable is influenced by another variable, I will argue that the Policy entrepreneurs according to Kingdon are influenced by the opportunity which the processes bring
and therefore in my thesis I treat the theory as the independent element is the policy process and the policy entrepreneurs is the dependent element. By defining the independent and dependent element, I argue that I show transparency in the fact that I do acknowledge that the different element of theory is important, and I can see that they both exist in the context of the case which this thesis studies. However, I directly draw a limitation to focusing on the policy streams and what they are saying in the tweets while if I would treat policy entrepreneurs as the independent element I would focus on whom are tweeting and what actors are participating in the agenda setting, then I would also have needed to look at other actors then Trump which is not in line with the aim of this thesis. Therefore, as I study Trump I acknowledge that if I instead focused on the concept of Policy entrepreneur I might would have seen his agenda setting in a different way.

4.6 The sources used

In this thesis, I would like to take the opportunity to discuss sources due to the case of Trump and the ongoing nuclear crisis is still going on the academic sources are limited. Also, as discussed in the discussion of limitations in chapter one of this thesis, due to the fact that North Korea is a closed country, the sources are limited to journalistic books or articles. So, when in the upcoming chapter six, where a case description is given of Trump’s tweets and a little bit about the context of those tweets, to be able to describe the context journalistic articles and books is what mostly have been used. Since the tweets is what I am studying, and the journalistic articles of secondary sources only is used to describe the context and background to the material I argue that it is not a problem. Also, as I mentioned in limitations of chapter one of this thesis, the focus in this thesis is on Donald Trump’s agenda setting and not North Korea’s, and therefore I do not through journalistic sources try to tell the North Korean story, but I rather use articles to give a context to what has happened in the international community at the same time as Trump’s agenda setting on Twitter. However, I argue that as a researcher by mentioning this I am trying to be transparent that there is a limitation in finding valid sources on the North Korean nuclear crisis since it still at this day is ongoing.
5. Case description – Trump’s tweets

In this chapter a description is given of the 28 tweets which is the case of this thesis. The case description aims to address research question two of this thesis: How is Twitter used by Donald Trump in the agenda setting process towards North Korea? To be able to present the material, the tweets are quoted however to be able to understand the tweets I will first present a short subchapter of the background. Further I will make a description of the context of the tweets to get a better understanding of them. Therefore, I will give a context description of what was going on at the time in ‘the real world’ at the same time as the tweets were published. The material that consists of 28 tweets as mentioned in material and methodological consideration chapter 4, is the total material of Trump’s tweets on North Korea during a period of six months, October 2017 until March 2018 which is included in this thesis. Since I have the total tweets about North Korea, it is interesting to look at them in the context of the process as a whole. Even if we think Trump tweets a lot since it has been given so much attention it is ‘only’ 28 tweets compared to how much ‘ordinary’ people tweets about a topic it can be seen as little. First, I will give a timeline of what has happened in relation to Trump’s tweets. Second, I will present each tweet and describe the context of each one of them.

5.1 Background to the crisis of the Korean peninsula

“Then, dropping out of a clear sky on 6 August 1945, came the first atomic bomb, changing everything forever” (Nye 2011:32). Nuclear weapons changed the international view on war and have been argued having a deterrent effect on armed-conflict (Nye 2011:33). To make sure something like the Hiroshima bomb never had such an impact on human kind ever again diplomatic relations of nuclear nature became even more important than before. Furthermore, for the last six decades or so there has been an international norm against using nuclear weapons in war (Nye 2011:30). However, the importance of nuclear weapons in world politics have drastically increased as smaller states such as Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (“the DPRK”) more known as North Korea are seeking nuclear weapons to deter powerful states like the U.S. (Nye 2011:29).
The tensions on the Korean peninsula in international politics has its origins back to the Korean war between the years of 1950-1953, where the two of the world powers and winners of the second world war: Soviet Union and the United States dived the Korean peninsula. The Soviet Union and the U.S. didn’t want a united Korea but rather both states had strong interests in the Korean peninsula geographical position in the Pacific Ocean (Napoleoni 2018:40-41). The Soviet Union in the north, in what we today know as North Korea and the American troops in South Korea. This division is still to be one of the core explanations to why there are tensions between the U.S. and North Korea, since U.S. always have been allied with South Korea (Napoleoni 2018:41). The relationship between the U.S. and North Korea can be described as cold and tricky to understand because to this day, we still don’t know much about the isolated country of North Korea, but historically we know it is a country which suffer from starvation. North Korea used to be dependent on Soviet Union mainly in importing cheap energy, so after the fall of Soviet Union, North Korea had to close almost all of its factories. Which meant that the production went down, and the starvation became a fact amongst the North Korean population (Napoleoni 2018:94-95). In contemporary time, the country of North Korea is a communist dictatorship under the leadership of Kim Jong-Un who inherited his leadership after his father Kim Jong-II died 2011 (Svenska Dagbladet 2018.03.18).

The historical relationship between the U.S. and North Korea have changed a bit over time as well, however the U.S. has never had a permanent diplomatic representation in Pyongyang, North Korea. Instead the Swedish embassy is acting on behalf of the U.S. as Charge de affairs, as a protective power. Sweden has had permanent representation by their embassy since 1975 in Pyongyang and is also a consular representation to the Nordic countries, Canada and Australia (Regeringen 2018). The American view towards North Korea has also shifted from Trumps precursor Obama in the sense that in 2009 Obama during a speech in Prague called for “peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons” (Michaels & Williams 2017:56). This differs in the way Trump more freely seem to speak his mind about the ongoing nuclear crisis by using his Twitter disposal of 144 characters at a time without being afraid to tell North Korea what the consequences will be if they do not stop their nuclear testing. The diplomatic relations between North Korea and the United States have reached a critical stage since Donald Trump entered his presidency. Another actor in the North Korean nuclear crisis is China. While China has been seen to be the country most
‘neutral’ of the countries involved in the Korean Peninsula, the relationship between China and the U.S. is tensed in areas of human rights, however the relationship between China and the U.S. has is strong when it comes to trade, however in other areas such as human rights and North Korea they sometimes differ drastically. After the second world war in 1945 the U.S. wanted to build trade relations with both China and Japan (Jezard 2017.12.19).

5.2 Timeline of the tweets
In this subchapter of the case description I have created a timeline of the tweets and made marks on ‘big’ events in the international community or international politics. However, as I mentioned in the chapter of material and methodological consideration chapter I do not try to tell the whole story of what events that were happening in the international community, the tweets are still the study object. The timeline aims to help us understand the general context in which the tweets were created within. As stated in the chapter of material and methodological consideration in chapter four, the tweet here are analyzed as single statements, however they have to be seen in relation to what is going on in real politics at the time. The timeline is created by me and the sources that are used are discussed in the subchapter of limitation in chapter four Material and methodological consideration which are used to describe the context, together with the quotation of the exact tweets Trump made during each month. The timeline is presented below. The ‘real world’ events that are described are the ones that are mentioned in Trump’s tweets or that were happening the same day as the tweets were written by Trump. The number of tweets that are presented in this chapter, are only the one’s where Trump mentioned North Korea, which was selected in line with the criteria that was presented for in chapter four, in the subchapter selection of material.
Figure 2: Timeline of tweets in relation to IR events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 October</td>
<td>CIA director “Trump is ready to act towards North Korea”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 October</td>
<td>U.S. defense secretary: “Washington will not tolerate a nuclear North Korea”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>Trump visited South Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 November</td>
<td>Trump met with the Chinese president in Beijing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 December</td>
<td>UN resolution. Tightening sanctions towards North Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March</td>
<td>UN Security Council resolution. Sanctions Committee handling North Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 October</td>
<td>Tweet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November</td>
<td>Tweet 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November</td>
<td>Tweet 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November</td>
<td>Tweet 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November</td>
<td>Tweet 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November</td>
<td>Tweet 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 November</td>
<td>Tweet 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the timeline above you can clearly see when Trump was more active. In the month of October 2017 Trump tweeted one time, in November he tweeted eleven times and in December 2 times. While during 2018 Trump in January tweeted four times, February one time and in March 9 times. November and March are the two months when Trump tweeted most about North Korea. As we
can see in the timeline is it also two months where two big things happened in ‘the real world’. With North Korea the 28th of November made its latest nuclear missile test and Kim Jong-Un also announced it could reach the US (Hamedy 2018.03.09). And in March 2018 a UN resolution was made to keep a Sanction Committee handling North Korea for an extended period.

5.3 October 2017

In October 2017 Donald Trump entered his ninth month as the president of the United States of America as he was sworn in the 20th of January earlier the same year (Smith 2017.01.20). Donald Trump had already before he was sworn in as president established himself on social media, mostly on Twitter, where he was already a well-known and followed person with an already strong Twitter identity. Even before he became president and during his political campaign running for president he made nuclear-related tweets both about Iran, China, Russia and North Korea (Michaels & Williams 2017: 61). Tweets about North Korea before October 2017 are no longer available, the fact that Donald Trump has deleted tweets before that, means that we should be aware of that it has been more in the past. As Trump tweets in October, the relationship between the US and North Korea was bad as North Korea made its sixth nuclear missile test on September 3rd (CNN 2018.04.03).

During the month of October there was one tweet about North Korea made by Donald Trump. This is the first tweet available on Trump’s Twitter account and this is where the agenda setting is starting. The following tweet was made the 25th of October 2017:

**Tweet 1:**

“Spoke to President Xi of China to congratulate him on his extraordinary elevation. Also discussed NoKo & trade, two very important subjects”

9,365 retweets, 51,305 likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2017.10.25).

In the tweet above Donald Trump starts with congratulating the Chinese president Xi Jinping to his elevation, the elevation meant that the Chinese president was elevated to the same status as the Chinese founding father Mao Zedong. This elevation meant that Chinese president Xi Jinping
wrote his name and ideas into the communist party constitution (Buckley 2017.10.24). In the tweet Trump is also mentioning US trade with China as an important subject, the context of this is as mentioned in the background that China is US largest goods trading partner since 2016 (United States Trade Representative 2018.05.05). In Tweet 1, it seems like Twitter is used by Trump as agenda setting to portray a partnership with China, which actually could be seen as he is forming a certain identity in his agenda setting.

A few days just before Trump tweeted, US officials from the Trump administration also spoke to international press where North Korea was highlighted as an important subject. An example of this is the CIA Director Mike Pompeo who said that US. had to act if North Korea reached the level of being able to actually strike and that Trump was ready to do so (CNN 2017.10.20).

After US Defense Secretary James Mattis visited South Korea for annual defense talks, he announced during the defense talks to international media that that threat of a nuclear attack was accelerating as a fact about to happen. Further the US defense secretary made it clear that Washington would not accept a ‘nuclear North Korea’ (BBC 2017.10.28).

5.4 November 2017
In November 2017 there were eleven tweets written by Trump, which is the most active month in Trump’s agenda setting towards North Korea. November was a shattering month in the relationship between US and North Korea, as well as North Korea’s relationship to the rest of the world. In the international society concerning the North Korean nuclear crisis during November, the tensions to the country became even worse than before as North Korea announced that they had the capability to strike the US mainland, which they announced just after making a missile test on November 28th, 2017 (Hamedy 2018.03.09). US and its allies including South Korea started to analyze the missile tests. The international community consisting of the UN and the European Union condemned the missile test as a threat to world security (SVT 2018.11.28). But let us start in the beginning of the month of November as Trump made his first tweet of the month:
Tweet 2:

“Together, we dream of a Korea that is free, peninsula that is safe and families that are reunited once again”

12,437 retweets, 50,595 likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.07).

At the same day as Trump made Tweet 2, he visited South Korea to talk about the future of the Korean peninsula. The visit to South Korea was part of a twelve-day trip Trump did to five different Asian states including Japan, South Korea, China, Vietnam and the Philippines (Campbell. 2017.11.03). Trumps trip is said to be the longest official trip in Asia made by an American president since 1992. The two topics that in media was argued to be his expected top priority to discuss during the twelve days was North Korea and trade (Campbell. 2017.11.03). This context could explain Tweet 2 where Trump tweets from South Korea about a future for the Korean peninsula free and safe for families to be reunited again. Since a lot of families have been separated during the years of the division between the North and South Korea. Also, in the tweet Trump makes an emphasis on that ‘together, we dream’. Which as described in the background chapter of this thesis can be explained by the fact that the US and South Korea have been allied since the Korean War, and therefore Trump might use ‘together’ and ‘we’. Relating to dreams, also creates a type of agenda setting of optimistic identity for the future of the Korean peninsula, while still emphasizing on that the ongoing situation is the opposite of the dream.

In the US. dreams have historically been used in politics, the American dream can be illustrated by the Fitzgerald’s in the 1920’s America, they symbolized the core of American dreams: the house, the car, the beauty, youth and talent (Cullen 2004:3). The use of dreams in American politics have a subconscious meaning of such a word, it is relating to the agenda-setting on how to change the American agenda and by Trump using the word dream he tries to create a positive and optimistic view of the future of the Korean peninsula just as the function of the American dream have done for the US. The American dream have been seen as a national motto since the US was constituted (Cullen 2004:12). The concept can be seen as hoping for the better and that the future brings possibilities to become successful and happy (Cullen 2004:14). The same day as Donald Trump
tweeted about the future of a reunited Korea and those dreams, he also tweeted about how North Korea had broken all of its commitments to the US:

Tweet 3:

“The North Korean regime has pursued its nuclear & ballistic missile programs in defiance of every assurance, agreement & commitment it has made to the US and its allies. It’s broken all of those commitments.....”

10,101 retweets, 40,558 likes

(†realDonaldTrump 2017.11.07).

The tweet quoted above, Tweet 3 is also tweeted when president Donald Trump was visiting South Korea. In the tweet, Trump is using words relating to long diplomatic processes by using words as ‘assurance, agreement & commitment’ and that North Korea has broken all of such commitments. By tweeting such words, these words mean so much more than what is actually written out. The commitments that North Korea has broken according to Trump, might be about the fact that the UN Security Council decided on the 11th of September 2017 to make an expansion on economic sanctions in response to North Korea’s nuclear test over Japan in August 2017 (S/RES/2375 (Security Council Report 2018.05.02). And at this time North Korea didn’t show any intention to slow down their will to become a nuclear power. In the tweet Trump is also making an emphasis on that it is a broken commitment by North Korea towards both the US and its allies. As described in the Background chapter the allies to the US in this North Korean nuclear crisis is historically mainly South Korea which Trump probably is referring to as he says that North Korea has broken its commitments. In Tweet 3, one could think about how Trump is setting the agenda in the sense that he says that North Korea has broken all of its commitments, which could be seen as a way of forming the US identity to be something different from the North Korean commitment breaker. Two days after Trump made Tweet 3 he made one more, this time with a focus on his relationship to the Chinese president:
Tweet 4:
“My meetings with President Xi Jinping were very productive on both trade and the subject of North Korea. He is a highly respected and powerful representative of his people! It was great being with him and Madame Peng Liyuan!”
14,655 retweets, 80,069 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.09).

As mentioned previously Donald Trump made his official twelve-day Asia trip during the month of November. President Donald Trump started his official visit to China’s capital Beijing on November 8th 2017, where it was already in advance known to be meetings between Donald Trump and Chinese president Xi Jinping about trade and North Korea (Campbell. 2017.11.03). Concerning Trump mentioning North Korea as a subject that he was discussing with the Chinese president Xi Jinping, it was debated in media before they met that Trump might ask China to turn off their export of oil to North Korea as well as doing sanctions towards Chinese banks doing business in North Korea (Campbell. 2017.11.03). Reasons for Trump to highlight his meeting about just trade and North Korea in Tweet 4, can as presented in the background chapter of this thesis be linked both to China being such a big trading partner for the US but also due to the fact that there are rumors that China have been selling oil to North Korea despite the economic sanctions made by the UN security council (Smith 2017.12.28). Two days after Trump met with the Chinese president he tweets about progress of China action towards North Korea:

Tweet 5:
“President Xi of China has stated that he is upping the sanctions against #NoKo said he wants them to denuclearize. Progress is being made”.
15,825 retweets, 74,310 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.11).

In Tweet 5 it is the first time that Donald Trump in the material of this thesis, uses the hashtag #NoKo, this can be seen as a way of setting the agenda by making a specific thread on Twitter discussing action towards North Korea. That Trump is saying that progress is being made, can be explained by the fact that it is a new statement that China says that it wants North Korea to
denuclearize. Due to the fact that China is North Korea’s allied historically, except of trade as described in the Background of this thesis where the US and China are allied trade partners. The Tweet 5, as presented above could be showing a ‘new’ agenda setting, where Trump portrays China as a partner in solving an international crisis. The same day as the tweet above, Donald Trump made his first tweet mentioning president Putin of Russia in relations to North Korea in Tweet 6 below:

Tweet 6:

“Met with President Putin of Russia who was at #APEC meetings. Good discussion on Syria. Hope for his help to solve, along with China the dangerous North Korean crisis. Progress is being made”

14,929 retweets, 71,465 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.11).

In the tweet above, Trump writes that he met with the Russian president during the APEC meetings. The APEC stands for Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, and the summit was being held during the same day as Trump tweeted above in Vietnam (Merica 2017.11.11). In the tweet Trump says that he hopes for both China and Russia’s help in the North Korean nuclear crisis and that progress is being made. How Trump is setting the agenda here towards North Korea can be seen as interesting from a historical point of view going back to the Korean War which was briefly introduced in the background chapter of this thesis, that Russia or the Soviet Union at the time was allied with North Korea. That Trump is tweeting that he hopes for both China and Russia’s help against North Korea and that progress is being made could be seen as a way Trump sets the agenda that he has allies and that North Korea should be scared being alone against it former allies. Moving on, Trump tweets one more time about Russia the same time where he argues for the importance of a good relationship to Russia:
Tweet 7:
"When will all the haters and fools out there realize that having a good relationship with Russia is a good thing, not a bad thing. There always playing politics – bad for our country. I want to solve North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, terrorism, and Russia can greatly help!"

38,504 retweets, 152,602 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.11).

The way Trump argues for the importance of a relationship to Russia can be explained by the way he has been criticized since he won the presidential election and US intelligence agencies in a report which was released in 2017 stating that Russia ordered a campaign to harm Trump’s opponent Hillary Clinton (Merica 2017.11.11). Trump has been accused for having cooperating with Russia to win the American election. In Tweet 7 Trump therefore in the setting of the agenda states the importance of good relations with Russia, and then he uses the argument that it is for the reason that they can be helpful in solving ongoing international crises, one of them North Korea. This way of the American president through his tweeting setting the agenda, that good relations with Russia are important could be seen as Trump is creating a new US identity, compared to the historic relationship with Russia is usually seen as the ‘enemy’. The last tweet Trump made about North Korea on the 11th of November which was one of his most active days was when he wrote the following tweet about North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un:

Tweet 8:
“Why would Kim Jong-Un insult me by calling me “old”, when I would NEVER call him “short and fat”? Oh well, I try so hard to be his friend – and maybe someday that will happen“

260,943 retweets 581,381 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.11).

This tweet differs from previous tweets Trump has made about North Korea, partly because it is directed to the North Korean leader and a comment to that Kim Jong-Un has called Donald Trump old. Which Trump respond to by saying he would ‘never’ insult Kim Jong-Un back, as he at the same time does in Tweet 8. Also, in a sarcastic way Trump writes that he tries “so hard” to be Kim Jong-Un’s friend and maybe that will happen. This is the first tweet that Trump uses sarcasm
directly towards the North Korean leader. The next tweet a few days later, Trump uses a more serious tone again writing about a Chinese delegation traveling to North Korea to negotiate:

**Tweet 9:**

“China sending an Envoy and Delegation to North Korea – A big move, we’ll see what happens.”

19,196 retweets, 87,421 likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.16).

In the tweet above Trump refers to that China at the time sent a special envoy to North Korea for the first time in over two years. This China delegation was going to North Korea to talk, just a few days after Trump pressed the Chinese president to take action against North Korea (Tang 2017.11.16). In Tweet 9 above, Trump also makes a point that it is a big move that China goes to North Korea, since a Chinese delegation had not done so in years, but then he also adds that ‘we’ll see what happens’ which makes it seem like he is setting expectations on China and then make it seem like he’s not sure they will deliver with North Korea, maybe because China did continue to deliver oil to North Korea although economic sanctions were to be taken as previously discussed in this case description chapter. Twelve days after Trump tweeted about the Chinese delegation going to North Korea. North Korea made its latest successful nuclear missile test (Landler 2017.11.28). As a response to North Korea’s missile launch Trump tweets:

**Tweet 10:**

“After North Korea missile launch, it's more important than ever to fund our gov't & military! Dems shouldn't hold troop funding hostage for amnesty & illegal immigration. I ran on stopping illegal immigration and won big. They can't now threaten a shutdown to get their demands.”

23,018 retweets, 94,019 likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.28).

In the tweet above, Trump highlights that after the North Korean missile launch the same day, it is more important than ever to fund government and military together with a critic of the democrat’s way of conducting such politics. Further, the day after North Korea’s missile launch Trump tweeted
about his relationship with the Chinese president once again and that more sanctions will be taken, and that the North Korean situation will be handled:

Tweet 11:

“Just spoke to President XI JINPING of China concerning the provocative actions of North Korea. Additional major sanctions will be imposed on North Korea today. This situation will be handled!”

20,107 retweets, 99,485 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.29).

The context of Tweet 11 above was both the fact that the day before North Korea made a missile launch but also the US UN ambassador Nikki Hayley made an announcement at the UN security council meeting that the attack on the 28th of November brings us closer to war and that if North Korea acts any further the regime will be destroyed. UN ambassador Hayley also called all countries to cut all their ties with North Korea (Borger 2017.11.29). The UN ambassador Hayley’s announcement can explain what Trump means with “This situation will be handled”; that the US will not tolerate any further action from North Korea without going to war. Two days after the North Korean missile launch and two weeks after Trump in Tweet 9 said that a Chinese delegation was sent to North Korea to talk, he in this Tweet 12 below follows up on the result on the Chinese envoy visit:

Tweet 12:

“The Chinese Envoy, who just returned from North Korea, seems to have had no impact on Little Rocket Man. Hard to believe his people, and the military, put up with living in such horrible conditions. Russia and China condemned the launch.”

16,251 retweets, 74,726 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2017.11.30).

In the tweet above Trump says that the Chinese delegation that visited North Korea earlier in November didn’t have so much impact on ‘Rocket man’ referring to the North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un. This is the first time in the material where he also comments on the living conditions of
the people of North Korea. Here it can also be seen as another example where Trump portrays both Russia and China to be on his side against North Korea, as he mentions specifically those two countries as they have condemned the missile launch on the 28\textsuperscript{th} of November.

5.5 December 2017

In December 2017, Trump’s activity was much lower on North Korea than previous months, when he only tweeted two times. The month of December was a month were the international community were waiting to see how much the North Korea- US crisis would escalate. Starting December with a missile test from North Korea on the 28\textsuperscript{th} of November, the UN decided to add on the economic sanctions already taken towards North Korea. The 22\textsuperscript{nd} of December 2017 the UN Security Council made a resolution (S/RES/2397) towards North Korea which was adopted unanimously with tightening sanctions (Security Council Report 2018.05.02). The first tweet Trump made in December was one reporting about the UN action on sanctions towards North Korea:

**Tweet 13:**

“The United Nations Security Council just voted 15-0 in favor of additional Sanctions on North Korea. The World wants Peace, not Death!”

18,644 retweets, 89,957 likes


This was also the first time, in Tweet 13 that he said what ‘the world’ wants by referring to the unanimously voting result in the Security Council, and that the world wants peace not death. The way Trump sets the agenda in this tweet, by in previous tweets making himself and the US allies towards North Korea in certain questions but here he says, ‘the world’ and not only US and its allies. A few days after the tweet about the United Nations Security council’s decisions on economic sanctions, Trumps way of tweeting about China shifted from previous tweets where he previously described China as taking action and that they would handle North Korea. In Tweet 14 below Trump instead expresses how disappointing he is with China for not keeping the promise of economic sanctions and still selling oil to North Korea:
Tweet 14:
“Caught RED HANDED - very disappointed that China is allowing oil to go into North Korea. There will never be a friendly solution to the North Korea problem if this continues to happen!”
31,261 retweets, 125,380 likes

In Tweet 14 above, Trump also points out that if China continues to withdraw from economic sanctions towards North Korea it will not be a friendly solution to the North Korean problem. By shifting from positive tweets about China to shaming them, one could say that Trump is setting the agenda to be the good person who is friendly towards other states until they don’t act as he wants them to, that they are described previously as a partner, but in this case, it seems like China still only is a US allied in trade but not in the North Korean conflict.

5.6 January 2018
Further, January was a month similar to December where Trump’s tweets on North Korea were drastically lower with four tweets compared to the most active month of eleven tweets in November. The start of 2018 was led by sanctions by the United Nations Security Council which was decided on the 22nd of December. In Donald Trump’s first tweet in 2018 about North Korea, he mentions the sanctions and what effects they might have:

Tweet 15:
“Sanctions and “other” pressures are beginning to have a big impact on North Korea. Soldiers are dangerously fleeing to South Korea. Rocket man now wants to talk to South Korea for first time. Perhaps that is good news, perhaps not - we will see!”
17,037 retweets, 77,044 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.01.02).

The same day as Trump tweeted about the sanctions and its effect he also tweeted about his nuclear button in relation to Kim Jong-Un’s:
Tweet 16:

“North Korean Leader Kim Jong Un just stated that the ‘Nuclear Button is on his desk at all times.’ Will someone from his depleted and food starved regime please inform him that I too have a Nuclear Button, but it is a much bigger & more powerful one than his, and my Button works!”

188,382 retweets, 494,958 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.01.02).

In the tweet above Trump argues that in relations to a statement made by the North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un who said something about that his nuclear button always is available on his desk, Trump in response to Kim Jong Un’s statement, tweet and insult the North Korean regime as well as Trump says that he has a bigger and more powerful button. This is also the first time Trump through a tweet sets the agenda directly what he thinks about the North Korean regime, where he above says it is ‘depleted’ and ‘food starved’. Two days after Trump tweeted about the size of his nuclear button, he gives a response to the critic among diplomats, security experts and lawmakers who says its alarming how Donald Trump is handling the foreign policy on North Korea since it can have world-wrecking consequences (Baker & Tackett 2018.01.02). Trump’s response to the critic of his impulsiveness:

Tweet 17:

“With all of the failed “experts” weighing in, does anybody really believe that talks and dialogue would be going on between North and South Korea right now if I wasn’t firm, strong and willing to commit our total “might” against the North. Fools, but talks are a good thing!”

19,437 retweets, 93,256 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.01.04).

In the tweet above Trump calls the experts of diplomats, national security experts and other key persons in the international community for failed “experts”. Saying such a thing could be seen as the meaning of the traditional diplomacy being ‘failed’ according to Trump, which is the same principle Trump ran for president on, criticizing the existing system to be failed. After Trump previously tweeted about North Korea with non-tolerance to the regimes nuclear program, he now
says that talks and dialogue between North and South Korea would not have existed if Trump had not been that hard. Trump also points out that the failed ‘experts’ and anyone else that thinks dialogue with North Korea would lead to talks between North and South are fools and that the consequences of his firm and strong way of handling North Korea are good since the talks that started to occur between North and South at the time were a good thing.

Later in January, Trump made his first tweet about ‘fake news’ in relations to North Korea. During both Donald Trump’s campaign for becoming president as well as since he entered his presidency, discussing ‘fake news’ have been one of his topics. Fake news according to Trump seems to be about when he thinks media lies or do not do something he agrees with. This time in the tweet below he states that The Wall Street Journal have twisted his words about Kim Jong-Un:

Tweet 18:
“The Wall Street Journal stated falsely that I said to them “I have a good relationship with Kim Jong Un” (of N. Korea). Obviously I didn’t say that. I said “I’d have a good relationship with Kim Jong Un,” a big difference. Fortunately we now record conversations with reporters...”

22,090 retweets, 94,958 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.01.14).

As stated above Trump argues that The Wall street journal misinterpreted his word from him saying that he would have a good relationship with the North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un to that Trump has a good relationship with Kim Jong-Un, and that it is a big difference between those two. Trump also says that he now records all conversations with reporters to prevent such false statements.
5.7 February 2018

In February Donald Trump was almost completely quiet about the circumstances with regards to North Korea on his Twitter as he only tweeted one time. This one time he actually tweeted mentioning North Korea, it was about a meeting with Henry Kissinger who is known as the former US foreign minister during the 1970’s as well as a known for his work within diplomacy, history and political science. Kissinger also got the Nobel Peace Prize for the Vietnam accords (Nobel prize 2014). This tweet is the first one where Trump writes about meeting an established ‘expert’ to discuss countries on the presidential agenda:

Tweet 19:

“I will be meeting with Henry Kissinger at 1:45pm. Will be discussing North Korea, China and the Middle East.”

13,492 retweets, 79,500 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.02.08).

In the tweet above and in relations to the other previous tweets it is a new way that Trump says that the focus on discussion with Kissinger will be North Korea and China (and Middle east), especially due to the fact that he previously mostly has talked positively about China as one state that stand on the same side towards North Korea, with expectations for when he wrote about them not living up to the sanctions towards North Korea.

5.8 March 2018

After three more quiet months, March became the month where Trump started to tweet more again with 9 tweets during the month. This was the month where Donald Trump started to have a more positive approach than before in his agenda towards North Korea. The month of March was containing tweets talking about progress, denuclearization, talks, potential meetings and the fact that no more nuclear testing has been made by North Korea since 28th of November 2017. The first tweet Trump made during March on North Korea, is way more optimistic than previous tweets in this case description, however in tweet 20 below, Trump still is careful with his optimism and says it’s the first serious efforts in many years:
Tweet 20:

“Possible progress being made in talks with North Korea. For the first time in many years, a serious effort is being made by all parties concerned. The World is watching and waiting! May be false hope, but the US is ready to go hard in either direction!”

27,700 retweets, 122,085 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.06).

In the tweet above, Trump is more optimistic than he previously has been, however he points out that the world is watching and waiting, and that it might be false hope to believe that North Korea will put in this serious effort, and that no matter which direction it will lead to, the US is ready to go hard either way. Two days after the tweet above, Trump continues with a more optimistic approach in the agenda on North Korea, however he still adds something harsher as a consequence until North Korea actually goes through with the expectations of the US:

Tweet 21:

“Kim Jong Un talked about denuclearization with the South Korean Representatives, not just a freeze. Also, no missile testing by North Korea during this period of time. Great progress being made but sanctions will remain until an agreement is reached. Meeting being planned!”

45,404 retweets, 173,743 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.08).

In Tweet 21 above, Trump points out that the North Korean leader has talked about denuclearization with people from the South Korean government. Trump also highlights that North Korea have not done any nuclear testing since November which is the first time Trump mentions the fact that North Korea have not acted in an escalating way since the UN Security Council sanctions in December. In the tweet, Trump also says it is a great progress but that the sanction will remain until there is an agreement. In this way, the meaning of Trump’s words can be seen as carrots and sticks, that the American president highlights the progress and optimism but still says what the punishment will be if North Korea do not follow his demands. However, the day after the tweet above, Trump continues with more optimism:
Tweet 22:

“The deal with North Korea is very much in the making and will be, if completed, a very good one for the World. Time and place to be determined.”

27,011 retweets. 126,070 likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.09)

In Tweet 22, Donald Trump is even more optimistic than before, he is even saying that a deal on denuclearization is even ‘very much’ in the making, and if the agreement is completed it will be very good for the world. However, time and place have not been determined yet. The day after saying that a deal with North Korea is in the making, Trump continues saying that he has been discussing the length of the meeting with the North Korean leader, with the Chinese president:

Tweet 23:

“Chinese President XI JINPING and I spoke at length about the meeting with KIM JONG UN of North Korea. President XI told me he appreciates that the US is working to solve the problem diplomatically rather than going with the ominous alternative. China continues to be helpful!”

19,126 retweets, 91,472 Likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.10).

In Tweet 23, Trump also highlights that China appreciates the US way of ‘solving the problem’ and that China continues to be helpful to the US in solving the North Korean nuclear crisis. The same day Trump also highlights once again that North Korea has not conducted any more missile tests:

Tweet 24:

“North Korea has not conducted a Missile Test since November 28, 2017 and has promised not to do so through our meetings. I believe they will honor that commitment!”

17,970 retweets, 90,566 likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.10).
Since Donald Trump is repeating the non-existing missile testing by North Korea after 28\textsuperscript{th} of November 2017, he also says that North Korea has promised to continue not doing so throughout the process of potential meetings. Trump continues with saying that he believes that they honor that commitment with an exclamation mark behind. A third tweet was made by Trump the same day as the two other tweets above. This time Trump talked about that he heard that the North Korean leader wanted to meet with him and talk about denuclearization and that the missile launches would end:

\textbf{Tweet 25:}

\textit{“In the first hours after hearing that North Korea’s leader wanted to meet with me to talk denuclearization and that missile launches will end, the press was startled & amazed. They couldn’t believe it. But by the following morning the news became FAKE. They said so what, who cares!”}

21,593 retweets, 89,560 likes

(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.10).

Trump continues in Tweet 25 above with saying that the press went crazy but that the morning after it became fake news. Once again Trump takes the discussion to that media shouldn’t be trusted because they are delivering fake news etc. Almost two weeks after Trump tweeted about potential talks with North Korea, the UN security council made on the 21\textsuperscript{st} of March 2018, one more resolution on North Korea (S/RES/2407) which was also unanimously adopted and extended the mandate of a ‘Panel of Experts’ assigned to the 1718 DPRK Sanctions Committee which will have that mandate until the 24\textsuperscript{th} of April 2019 (Security Council Report 2018.05.02). The same day Donald Trump made a tweet about the Russian president Putin saying he could help solving several ‘problems’, one of them being North Korea:
Tweet 26:

“.....They can help solve problems with North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, ISIS, Iran and even the coming Arms Race. Bush tried to get along, but didn’t have the “smarts.” Obama and Clinton tried, but didn’t have the energy or chemistry (remember RESET). PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH!”

20,046 retweets, 85,408 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.21).

In the tweet Trump says that previous administrations such as Bush, Obama and Clinton didn’t get along with Russia since they were not smart enough, had the energy or chemistry. Trump continues with stating that peace will happen through strength, where he refers to getting help from Russia is strength. Tweet 26 above is an example where Trump makes himself as a president look like he has made something previous administrations could not, by saying Russia can help. One week later, Trump continues with saying his administration has done what previous administrations could not and that he might do something that the others said was not even possible:

Tweet 27:

“For years and through many administrations, everyone said that peace and the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula was not even a small possibility. Now there is a good chance that Kim Jong Un will do what is right for his people and for humanity. Look forward to our meeting!”

26,505 retweets, 113,821 likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.28).

In Tweet 27 above, Trump indirectly says that because of that he did something previous administrations failed to, now there is a ‘good change’ that Kim Jong-Un, the North Korean leader will do what is ‘right’. Lastly Trump says that he looks forward to his meeting with the North Korean leader. The last tweet of the month which is presented below, Trump continues with carrots and sticks:
Tweet 28:
“Received message last night from XI JINPING of China that his meeting with KIM JONG UN went very well and that KIM looks forward to his meeting with me. In the meantime, and unfortunately, maximum sanctions and pressure must be maintained at all cost!”
24,241 Retweets, 103,488 Likes
(@realDonaldTrump 2018.03.28).

In relation to the previous tweet (Tweet 27) the same day, Trump here says that the North Korean leader told the Chinese president that he looks forward meeting with Trump. However, Trump finishes with saying that until such a meeting, there must be maximum sanctions and pressures taken towards North Korea at all costs.

In this chapter of the case presentation, I aimed to address research question two: How is Twitter used by Donald Trump in the agenda setting process towards North Korea? And the conclusion of this chapter is to summarize, that even if Trump’s way of forming the agenda towards North Korea seems to become more optimistic during March 2018 than previous months, it still is with a determination in Trump’s agenda setting that keeps the argument that it should be non-tolerance towards North Korea until North Korea signs an agreement and denuclearizes. It also in the presentation above is found that Trump highlights his relations with China, sometimes with criticizing them for not following through the US demands on economic sanctions towards North Korea, but also by complementing the Chinese president for his work. In the presentation of the material in this chapter it is obvious that Trump uses Twitter to express that the US will not tolerate any other outcome than denuclearization of North Korea. To take this presentation further, it is now time to continue to the next chapter six, Analyses where the tweets will be analyzed and understood from both the traditional agenda setting by Kingdon as well as by contemporary agenda setting on social media.
6. Case Analyses

In this chapter of the thesis, research question three will be addressed: How can Trump’s use of Twitter be understood from the traditional look on agenda setting (Kingdon)? This chapter aims to answer the research question above by analyzing the tweets presented in the previous chapter with the case description. Based on the conclusion of theory chapter three and research question one, which was to be able to understand Kingdon’s theory on agenda setting in the context of media, it is needed to analyze the tweets from the theoretical concepts of *problems, politics, policy* and *identity*. Therefore, this case analyses chapter is organized according to those four concepts.

6.1 Problems

To answer RQ 1: How can Trump’s use of Twitter be understood from the traditional look on agenda setting (Kingdon)? The start of this analysis will be on the problem stream that Kingdon identifies in his multiple stream model. As this theory was further presented in chapter three on Theory, we know that some problems get more attention than others and that problems sometimes need a push to be acknowledged in agenda setting (Kingdon 2011:94-95). First Kingdon stated that for something to be considered a problem for people in and around government it can depend on a crisis (Kingdon 2011:94-95). Since the North Korean nuclear crisis is seen as an international crisis as the United Security Council even has taken economic sanctions against the country of North Korea. In Trump’s agenda setting through his tweets, the president does already in Tweet 1 of the material (see appendix 1 or case description in previous chapter), say that North Korea is an important subject as he directly acknowledges that North Korea is a problem that needs to be discussed and solved. Furthermore, Trump does in Tweet 2 continue saying that the way the situation of the Korean peninsula is not safe, and since a state that is not safe usually is seen as a problem for the other states of the world, Trump also here is using the highlighting of North Korea as a problem in his agenda setting. By looking at how we can understand Trump’s agenda setting in his tweets in the North Korean nuclear crisis from Kingdon’s problem stream, Kingdon’s theory can explain that Trump of course sets the agenda of North Korea as a problem, in line with Kingdon’s argument that an international crisis is what usually is seen as the governmental agenda (Kingdon 2011:3).
From the view of Kingdon’s problem stream we can understand Trump’s way of tweeting by the fact that an international crisis is something that usually is on the American president’s agenda and therefore he does agenda setting to handle such a crisis and that a nuclear crisis is a ‘natural’ problem pressing the agenda setting system according to Kingdon. Analyzing the tweets from looking at the ‘problem’, it can also be seen in the way Trump uses something such as North Korea’s missile test in November 2017, to also by support of the international community in Tweet 13, highlight that the UN Security Council voted for even more sanctions against North Korea, which says that the world want peace and not death. This could maybe be seen as Trump using the decision of the Security Council to set the agenda that the ‘world’ which in this case does not include North Korea wants peace while North Korea wants death. One could interpret this as Trump making North Korea the problem and the US and ‘the world’ the peaceful ones.

6.2 Politics
To understand Trump’s use of Twitter further from Kingdon’s theory, let us now take a look at the political stream of agenda setting. According to Kingdon the political stream is as described in the Theory chapter three, a bandwagon for the other two streams of policy and problem (Kingdon 2011:159). If a new administration takes place they have the possibility to push through a new agenda (Kingdon 2011:153), which can explain why the US agenda setting on the North Korea nuclear crisis has changed from Obama to Trump. Due to the fact that Trump had a new opening to push his political agenda setting ideas through Twitter as he entered his presidency as a new administration in January 2017, there was an opening for creating new policy towards North Korea in the ongoing nuclear crisis. The politics that can be seen in Trump’s agenda setting in his tweets, could be seen as that he is pushing for a US non-tolerance approach for North Korean behavior with its nuclear missile testings, this is shown for example in Tweet 11 where Trump says that he spoke to the Chinese president and that the situation of North Korea’s latest missile test the 28th of November will be handled. Trump also expresses in his tweets that every time another state like China or Russia has said that North Korea needs to be solved, he expresses it to be as progress in the North Korean nuclear crisis, which he expresses in example Tweet 6 and Tweet 7. This could maybe be seen as Trump is highlighting what politically can help him with his agenda setting of non-tolerance towards North Korea’s nuclear escalation.
In the tweets which was presented in the previous chapter ‘Case description’ it was clear that Trump seemed to want a certain outcome in the North Korean nuclear crisis. First of all, Donald Trump in Tweet 1 said that he had been speaking to the Chinese president and that he discussed trade and North Korea with him and that it is two very important subjects. By saying North Korea is an important topic, he does directly in line with Kingdon’s theory, he as the president of the United States set the most important ‘list of agenda’, so by saying North Korea is important he start setting the agenda with putting it on his presidential list showing that he politically prioritize taking action in the North Korean nuclear crisis. However, for Trump’s agenda setting to work he needs consensus or bargaining to get his political ideas and policy through (Kingdon 2011:159).

The political part of Trump’s agenda setting towards North Korea is also shown in Tweet 10, where Trump uses the event of the North Korean missile test to say that it is more important than ever to fund government and military and then he criticizes the democrats’ way of conducting politics. This way of setting the agenda, by using North Korea as a ‘problem’ and by making it to politics, Trump also tries to push other policy ideas of his if we understand it from Kingdon’s way of explaining. Using the ‘window’ that occurs of the ‘problem’ of North Korea to push other ideas through. If I would have looked at Kingdon’s concept of ‘policy entrepreneur’ I could have analyzed this further here. However, since my focus is the content and the different streams of agenda setting and not how a certain ‘policy entrepreneur’ join the different streams and because this is not what the material of this thesis is collected for, the material of this thesis would not have high validity for analyzing such a concept, and therefore I will now go on to another example.

Another way Trump is using politics in his agenda setting is when he uses the American concept of the American dream in Tweet 2, where he says that together we dream of a free Korea peninsula. By saying this is play on a world known political idea of the ‘dreams’ that is traditionally important in the US, by doing this it could be seen as Trump through a political optimistic idea, get validation for his way of handling North Korean nuclear crisis. In this way of doing agenda setting throughout using dreams in his tweet, where he also expresses that together through that dream a free Korea is possible and that families can be safe and together again. In the way Trump does this it makes it seem like he is the ‘good guy’ and North Korean leader Kim Jung-Un has created the opposite
‘nightmare’, which might be true but by portraying it like this in his tweet Trump creates a certain view of his agenda setting.

Another interesting aspect from the perspective of politics and history in Trump’s agenda setting in his tweets, is the way he portrays his own and US relationship to other countries. The countries he portrays to be his partners, are in most other international crisis not seen as US allies. Example of tweets where Trump does exactly this are about two countries: China and Russia. Trump is positive about the relationship with Russia in Tweet 6, 7, 12 and 26. While Trump tweets about his positive relationship with china in Tweet 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 23 and 28. That Trump tweets this way about specifically China and Russia are quite surprising when thinking about the historical aspect to this conflict as mentioned in the background of the chapter of case description previously in this thesis. Whereas former Soviet Union in the Korean war was on North Korea’s side against South Korea and the US. And China who sure is the US. biggest trading partner but it is not known historically for being more loyal to the US. than North Korea.

So far Kingdon’s theory has helped us to see that the problem stream can help us understand that through the fact that the North Korean nuclear crisis is being seen as an international crisis from the view of the United Nations Security council for example who have taken action in the form of sanctions. It makes it easier for Donald Trump to through his agenda setting on Twitter highlighting that North Korea is a problem that needs to be solved. The problem stream of Kingdon’s theory also highlights that the president of the United States has the possibility to partly decide what a problem on the governmental agenda actually is. The political stream on the other hand, has so far helped us understand that Trump though his new position as president of the United States of America had the opportunity to push for his agenda, and due to the fact that he already in his presidential election was well established on Twitter it can explain his agenda setting towards North Korea in the form of an opportunity. Let us now continue to the last aspect of Kingdon’s theory that is used to understand Trump’s agenda setting on Twitter in the North Korean nuclear crisis – the policy stream.
6.3 Policy

Which agendas are actually being set? According to Kingdon, consensus building is something crucial for a policy to be set by a certain agenda. Therefore, the way Trump gets consensus in the setting of the agenda is to be discussed here. Let us start with looking into which of the tweets that got the most likes. The most liked post was Tweet 8, where Trump wrote that Kim Jong-Un had called him old, and as a response he said that he was short and fat. The record of amount of likes in Tweet 8 was 581,381 likes. It seems like when Trump does an agenda setting towards North Korea that is humiliating the North Korean leader in a sarcastic way, he gets most consensus in form of likes. The second most liked post was Tweet 16 with 494,958 likes, which has a similar way of making fun of the North Korean leader. In Tweet 16, Trump tweeted that his nuclear button was much bigger and more powerful than North Korean leader’s Kim Jong-Un’s nuclear button. In Tweet 16 Trump also said that North Korea was a depleted and food starved regime, and by saying his nuclear button was bigger and more powerful, it could indirectly be seen as he is saying that the US is stronger and bigger, and no one should mess with them.

The tweet that got the least consensus in form of likes was tweet was a bit surprisingly enough Tweet 3, where Trump wrote that the North Korean regime had broken all of its commitments. This might show that in line with Kingdon’s theory concept of policy as presented in chapter four of theory, for an agenda to be set the policy needs consensus. Since the tweet given the least consensus in forms of likes is one that Trump expresses that North Korea has broken all of the long diplomatic processes, it shows that this type of agenda setting does not seem to be set.

When it comes to which of Trump’s tweets that got most retweets these are the same two tweets that got the most likes, Tweet 8 and Tweet 16. Tweet 8 is the most retweeted one with 260,943 retweets, which is more than ten times more retweets than his tweets in general. In tweet 8, Trump does as previously presented in the case description, talk about that the North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un supposed to have said that Trump was old and then Trump responded that he would never insult the North Korean leader back. The fact that Trump gets consensus on such a tweet, maybe shows that Trump gets support for his way of sarcastically, are handling North Korea in a rational pretty untraditional way. The second most retweeted post was Tweet 16 with 188,382 retweets which was the tweet about that Trump said that his nuclear button is bigger and better than Kim
Jong-Un’s. The least retweeted post was Tweet 1, where Trump congratulated the Chinese president to his elevation saying that trade and North Korea are important subject that they discussed. Tweet 1 had 9,365 retweets. As Tweet 1 had the least number of retweets can from the theory of Kingdon and his concept of consensus for building policy be seen as it is not supported the way he portrays his relationship with the Chinese president.

Except getting consensus for the people liking and retweeting his tweets one could also analyze whether Trump ‘creates’ consensus throughout saying that other states support his ideas. An example of this is Tweet 23, where Trump writes that the Chinese president XI Jinping is appreciating that the US is working on solving the problem of North Korea. By tweeting that the Chinese president is appreciating the way US are solving the ‘problem’ North Korea, one could interpret it as Trump is portraying it as China is giving consensus to US policy. If Trump is portraying China as a state accepting his agenda setting Towards North Korea through Twitter, and this is not the reality, then it would be interesting to look into this further in future research as how a president can portray other states’ consensus through Twitter, even if it does not match the reality. The way Trump is ‘creating’ consensus from other states like in this example the support of China in Tweet 23, is also interesting since as mentioned in the case description of this thesis, China and the US. are huge trading partners however in other areas as human rights, they are not known to be allied. Kingdon’s argument that for policy to be successful, consensus needed can probably explain this as for Trump to get through his way of handling North Korea, he needs to portray others consensus when the opportunity occurs.
6.4 Identity

In addition to understanding Trump’s tweets and agenda setting from the view of Kingdon’s classical agenda setting theory, let us now continue to go further with analyzing the tweets from the perspective of creating identity throughout the use of social media. Since as presented previously in the theory chapter of this thesis policy identity is a creation process that takes place throughout the way a political leader makes a statement on social media which for example can reflect an ‘us and them’ identity (Duncombe 2017:548). The concept of this creation of ‘us and them’ in creating identity through Twitter can be found in Trump’s way of conducting agenda setting through tweets concerning the North Korea nuclear crisis, for example in Tweet 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 12, 23 and 28 where Trump talks about his relationship to both China and more specifically the Chinese president. This way of creating a certain identity could be seen as Trump is creating this policy identity throughout his agenda setting in the North Korean nuclear crisis by portraying the relationship with China as an allied against North Korea. However, this is only true when Trump is talking positive about China, in another example among the tweets, Trump also creates the opposite ‘us and them’ identity where he instead put an ‘us and them’ between the US and China in for example Tweet 14, where he expresses his disappointment with China selling oil to North Korea despite the economic sanctions that were to be taken.

This creation of an ‘us and them’ identity can also be seen in Trump's agenda setting in the way he portrays the way North Korea is the ‘them’, different from the rest of the population of the world, or more specifically that the North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un is not like the others. An example of this is in Tweet 3 where Trump says that North Korea has broken all of its commitments to US and its allies. This is also something that could be seen through Kingdon’s concept of politics, that Trump is using the ‘problem’ North Korea to get what he wants, which seem to be China doing as he wants as well as getting a North Korea without nuclear weapons. But also, the ‘us and them’ is shown by the way Trump tweets in Tweet 2 about that together ‘we’ dream of a Korea that is free and where people are reunited. This shows how there is an ‘us and them’ with South Korea still in Trump’s agenda setting through tweets is one of the US. allies. All of this ‘us and them’ examples can be seen as Trump is creating a certain state identity on whom is in team US and whom is an enemy.
In this chapter of case analyses the aim was to answer research question three: How can Trump’s use of Twitter be understood from the traditional look on agenda setting (Kingdon)? The main conclusion drawn from this chapter of case analyses shows that when it comes to Kingdon’s concept of Problem, Trump is portraying North Korea to be a problem for the world, and that the rest of the world wants peace while North Korea wants death. Kingdon’s concept of Politics on the other hand helped us understand that Trump is using concepts such as ‘dream’ as a way of portraying that he is the good guy that is fixing the ‘problem’ of North Korea. The concept of politics by Kingdon also helped us understand that Trump is playing a new type of politics from the usual American way of doing it, by portraying both China and Russia to be on ‘his’ side against North Korea. China even more so than Russia. However, Kingdon’s concept of policy helped to understand that Trump’s agenda setting is based on him portraying countries such as China and Russia as accepting his way of doing agenda setting towards North Korea, by saying that they are supporting him or are helpful in handling the ‘problem’.

Additional to Kingdon’s concepts of traditional agenda setting, the concept of identity helped us understand that Trump might be portraying himself in the way he does to try to rule out others. As I described in theory chapter three, Duncombe (2017) argued that why governments on social media are framing their identity a certain why is because through the ‘us and them’ dynamic, which is an efficient tool to rule out other actors in the context where they want to set the agenda (Duncombe 2017:548). This can be seen in the way Trump sets the agenda, from Duncombe’s definition one could interpret Trump’s agenda setting as he wants for example North Korea to perceive it as it is North Korea against the US and the rest of the world in this ‘us-and them’ identity. The concept of identity and the ‘us-and them’ dynamic also helped to uncovered that when Trump did not think China acted in the way he personally or the US wanted, so therefore he created an ‘us and them’ dynamic between US and China.
7. Final discussion and conclusions

We have arrived at the last section of this thesis. During the process of this thesis work a lot has happened in the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis and at the time this thesis is being published talks might even have happened between the core actors of the conflict which will be interesting for future studies. As stated in the problem formulation of this thesis, whom sets the agenda holds the power over politics (Kingdon 2011:1). Therefore, it is interesting to think of the power of Trump’s agenda setting that has taken place throughout his Twitter when reading the conclusions.

The aim of this thesis was to analyze and discuss how and why the traditional agenda setting process, as it is presented by Kingdon through the concepts of problems, politics and policy, can be seen in a new light of social media (tweets) and the concept of identity, by studying the case of American president Donald Trump and investigate his use of Twitter for agenda setting in the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis.

I would like to start with stating that I think I have answered the aim, by highlighting that the analysis of this thesis reveled that Kingdon’s traditional agenda setting theory was useful for understanding the material, however an addition of looking at the concept of identity creation, helped to understand Trump’s agenda setting through a new light, where identity creation helped to discover an ‘us-and-them’ dynamic. As presented in former research in chapter two and theory chapter three of this thesis, by creating this ‘us-and-them’ dynamic which is a way of creating power and mark the differences between two countries and communicate how the state wants to be perceived, it could be seen as Trump do agenda setting as he does to rule out the other state such as both China and North Korea. Furthermore, I will continue to present more detailed conclusions. Since the aim was addressed by four research questions which I will give more detailed conclusions to each one as follows.

The first research question was How can Kingdon’s classical theory be understood in the context of new media (Twitter) in international relations? The conclusion of this question is that Kingdon’s classical theory can theoretically be understood as consensus still being important for getting policy through or getting your agenda accepted. However, in the context of new media, Kingdon’s theory needs to be understood in relation to identity creation on social media which political actors are working on. So therefore, the conclusion of research question one of this thesis is that to use
Kingdon’s classical theory in the context of Twitter an addition to the three classical theoretical concepts of his theory problems, politics, policy needs to be added to a fourth one – identity.

The second research question was: *How is Twitter used by Donald Trump in the agenda setting process towards North Korea?* The conclusion is that Twitter seems to be used in the way that Trump is informing and doing agenda setting towards North Korea with the message that US do not tolerate North Korea as a nuclear power and what the consequences will be if North Korea does not stop their nuclear testing. Agenda setting through Twitter also seems to be conducted by Trump to describe who US allies are, where the most common state mentioned was China.

The third research question was: *How can Trump’s use of Twitter be understood from the traditional look on agenda setting (Kingdon)?* To conclude, we can understand Trump’s tweets from Kingdon’s theory through the concepts of problem, politics and policy. The conclusion of the case analyses was that we can understand Trump’s tweets through problems in the way Trump portrays North Korea as the problem that needs to be solved and that North Korea wants death while the rest of the world wants peace. Trump’s agenda setting on Twitter can also be understood from Kingdon’s concept of politics in the way that Trump uses ‘dreams’ as a way of portraying the US as the good one who will create a good future while North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un is the creator of the opposite. The concept of politics also helped to understand that Trump portray a different politics than previous administrations by portraying China and Russia to be on his side against North Korea. This is a way of setting the agenda that North Korea should do as the US (Trump) wants. The concept of policy helped us understand Trump’s agenda setting on Twitter through the idea of consensus and that Trump might portray China and Russia as his ‘allies’ to accept his agenda to make North Korea feel even more that it is US and its allies against North Korea. This is something that the additional concept of identity that was added to Kingdon’s model to understand agenda setting on Twitter, that Trump might portray himself as having China and Russia on his side to create a ‘us-and them identity’. Identity also helped us see that this ‘us-and them’ identity is something Trump plays against China when it didn’t do as he wanted as well.

The fourth research question was *What can be learnt more generally about contemporary agenda setting and the use of social media through this case study?* As I argued in the material and
methodological consideration chapter this is the conclusions drawn throughout the knowledge of the other research questions of this thesis. In a general sense, throughout this case study I argue that the conclusion is that contemporary agenda setting still has the important theoretical concepts of Kingdon’s theory of problem, politics and policy, however through using the additional concept of identity, we learn that for gaining a general understanding of contemporary agenda setting of social media we must study what identity the ‘actor’ is trying to create, and that relationship building or portraying certain relationship seems to be what it is about. Since this case study shows that a huge focus was on identity in relation to other states, maybe in future studies from this knowledge, one could focus on relationship building through social media with other states. Since in this thesis I did not use Kingdon’s concept of policy entrepreneur it might be interesting to in further studies look at how the policy entrepreneur is creating identity and relationships with other policy entrepreneurs. If I would have focused on policy entrepreneurs and identity instead I could have got a deeper analysis and understanding of Trump’s way of portraying other state leaders and how it can be interpreted.

In this thesis, my main contribution was a promotion of a new concept in addition to Kingdon’s classical theory on agenda setting, by adding the concept of identity to understand Trump’s agenda setting through Twitter in the case of North Korean nuclear crisis. A personal reflection drawn from the study conducted in this thesis, is that agenda setting may still have its core function as presented by Kingdon, but it seems like how someone portrays themselves or what they are representing to create a certain identity on Twitter, becomes more important due to that social media enables individuals to reach a bigger audience through their own words. As stated in the problem formulation of this thesis, the people who sets the agenda has the power in shaping politics, and therefore this might in the future lead to that agenda setting no longer only is the privilege of the people with power in society but also now social media such as Twitter can enable people to gain power in society through social media. In future studies, one could study the perception of Trump’s agenda setting on Twitter towards North Korea by studying a specific tweet and trace what others wrote about it in retweets etc. This can be done with data mining and other methodology, such more of a quantitative content analysis. In that case one could also apply Kingdon’s theoretical concept of Policy entrepreneurs to analyze what type of actors that are behind such a discussion.
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### Appendix 1 – The tweets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tweet</th>
<th>Retweets</th>
<th>Likes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 1</td>
<td>2017.10.25</td>
<td>“Spoke to President Xi of China to congratulate him on his extraordinary elevation. Also discussed NoKo &amp; trade, two very important subjects”</td>
<td>9,365</td>
<td>51,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 2</td>
<td>2017.11.07</td>
<td>“Together, we dream of a Korea that is free, peninsula that is safe and families that are reunited once again”</td>
<td>12,437</td>
<td>50,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 3</td>
<td>2017.11.07</td>
<td>“The North Korean regime has pursued its nuclear &amp; ballistic missile programs in defiance of every assurance, agreement &amp; commitment it has made to the US and its allies. It’s broken all of those commitments.....”</td>
<td>10,101</td>
<td>40,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 4</td>
<td>2017.11.09</td>
<td>“My meetings with President Xi Jinping were very productive on both trade and the subject of North Korea. He is a highly respected and powerful representative of his people! It was great being with him and Madame Peng Liyuan!”</td>
<td>14,655</td>
<td>80,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 5</td>
<td>2017.11.11</td>
<td>“President Xi of China has stated that he is upping the sanctions against #NoKo said he wants them to denuclearize. Progress is being made”.</td>
<td>15,825</td>
<td>74,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 6</td>
<td>2017.11.11</td>
<td>“Met with President Putin of Russia who was at #APEC meetings. Good discussion on Syria. Hope for his help to solve, along with China the dangerous North Korean crisis. Progess is being made”</td>
<td>14,929</td>
<td>71,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 7</td>
<td>2017.11.11</td>
<td>” When will all the haters and fools out there realize that having a good relationship with Russia is a good thing, not a bad thing. There always playing politics – bad for our country. I want to solve North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, terrorism, and Russia can greatly help!”</td>
<td>38,504</td>
<td>152,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 8</td>
<td>2017.11.11</td>
<td>“Why would Kim Jong-Un insult me by calling me “old”, when I would NEVER call him “short and fat”? Oh well, I try so hard to be his friend – and maybe someday that will happen “</td>
<td>260,943</td>
<td>581,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Retweets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 9</td>
<td>2017.11.16</td>
<td>“China sending an Envoy and Delegation to North Korea – A big move, we’ll see what happens.”</td>
<td>19,196</td>
<td>87,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 10</td>
<td>2017.11.28</td>
<td>“After North Korea missile launch, it's more important than ever to fund our gov't &amp; military! Dems shouldn't hold troop funding hostage for amnesty &amp; illegal immigration. I ran on stopping illegal immigration and won big. They can't now threaten a shutdown to get their demands.”</td>
<td>23,018</td>
<td>94,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 11</td>
<td>2017.11.29</td>
<td>“Just spoke to President XI JINPING of China concerning the provocative actions of North Korea. Additional major sanctions will be imposed on North Korea today. This situation will be handled!”</td>
<td>20,107</td>
<td>99,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 12</td>
<td>2017.11.30</td>
<td>“The Chinese Envoy, who just returned from North Korea, seems to have had no impact on Little Rocket Man. Hard to believe his people, and the military, put up with living in such horrible conditions. Russia and China condemned the launch.”</td>
<td>16,251</td>
<td>74,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 14</td>
<td>2017.12.28</td>
<td>“Caught RED HANDED - very disappointed that China is allowing oil to go into North Korea. There will never be a friendly solution to the North Korea problem if this continues to happen!”</td>
<td>31,261</td>
<td>125,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 15</td>
<td>2018.01.02</td>
<td>“Sanctions and “other” pressures are beginning to have a big impact on North Korea. Soldiers are dangerously fleeing to South Korea. Rocket man now wants to talk to South Korea for first time. Perhaps that is good news, perhaps not - we will see!”</td>
<td>17,037</td>
<td>77,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 16</td>
<td>2018.01.02</td>
<td>“North Korean Leader Kim Jong Un just stated that the “Nuclear Button is on his desk at all times.” Will someone from his depleted and food starved regime please inform him that I too have a Nuclear Button, but it is a much bigger &amp; more powerful one than his, and my Button works!”</td>
<td>188,382</td>
<td>493,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Retweets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 17</td>
<td>2018.01.04</td>
<td>“With all of the failed “experts” weighing in, does anybody really believe that talks and dialogue would be going on between North and South Korea right now if I wasn’t firm, strong and willing to commit our total “might” against the North. Fools, but talks are a good thing!”</td>
<td>19,437</td>
<td>93,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 18</td>
<td>2018.01.14</td>
<td>“The Wall Street Journal stated falsely that I said to them “I have a good relationship with Kim Jong Un” (of N. Korea). Obviously I didn’t say that. I said “I’d have a good relationship with Kim Jong Un,” a big difference. Fortunately we now record conversations with reporters...”</td>
<td>22,090</td>
<td>94,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 19</td>
<td>2018.02.08</td>
<td>“I will be meeting with Henry Kissinger at 1:45pm. Will be discussing North Korea, China and the Middle East.”</td>
<td>13,492</td>
<td>79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 20</td>
<td>2018.03.06</td>
<td>“Possible progress being made in talks with North Korea. For the first time in many years, a serious effort is being made by all parties concerned. The World is watching and waiting! May be false hope, but the US. is ready to go hard in either direction!”</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>122,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 21</td>
<td>2018.03.08</td>
<td>“Kim Jong Un talked about denuclearization with the South Korean Representatives, not just a freeze. Also, no missile testing by North Korea during this period of time. Great progress being made but sanctions will remain until an agreement is reached. Meeting being planned!”</td>
<td>45,404</td>
<td>173,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 22</td>
<td>2018.03.09</td>
<td>“The deal with North Korea is very much in the making and will be, if completed, a very good one for the World. Time and place to be determined.”</td>
<td>27,011</td>
<td>126,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 23</td>
<td>2018.03.10</td>
<td>“Chinese President XI JINPING and I spoke at length about the meeting with KIM JONG UN of North Korea. President XI told me he appreciates that the US. is working to solve the problem diplomatically rather than going with the ominous alternative. China continues to be helpful!”</td>
<td>19,126</td>
<td>91,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet 24</td>
<td>2018.03.10</td>
<td>“North Korea has not conducted a Missile Test since November 28, 2017 and has promised not to do so through our meetings. I believe they will honor that commitment!”</td>
<td>17,970</td>
<td>90,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Retweets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2018.03.10</td>
<td>“In the first hours after hearing that North Korea’s leader wanted to meet with me to talk denuclearization and that missile launches will end, the press was startled &amp; amazed. They couldn’t believe it. But by the following morning the news became FAKE. They said so what, who cares!”</td>
<td>21,593</td>
<td>89,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2018.03.21</td>
<td>“.....They can help solve problems with North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, ISIS, Iran and even the coming Arms Race. Bush tried to get along, but didn’t have the “smarts.” Obama and Clinton tried, but didn’t have the energy or chemistry (remember RESET). PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH!”</td>
<td>20,046</td>
<td>85,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2018.03.28</td>
<td>“For years and through many administrations, everyone said that peace and the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula was not even a small possibility. Now there is a good chance that Kim Jong Un will do what is right for his people and for humanity. Look forward to our meeting!”</td>
<td>26,505</td>
<td>113,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2018.03.28</td>
<td>“Received message last night from XI JINPING of China that his meeting with KIM JONG UN went very well and that KIM looks forward to his meeting with me. In the meantime, and unfortunately, maximum sanctions and pressure must be maintained at all cost!”</td>
<td>24,241</td>
<td>103,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>