

Altering Balances In Global Climate Goals After Trump's Withdrawal From The Paris Agreement

Hüseyin Ak ¹

¹ Middle East Technical University, Ankara/Türkiye

Abstract

The withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement under the Trump administration marked a significant shift in global climate diplomacy. This study explores how the U.S. exit altered international climate governance, affected global emission targets, and reshaped cooperative efforts toward climate mitigation. Through qualitative analysis of policy documents, international responses, and emission data, the article highlights the challenges and adaptations within global climate frameworks following the withdrawal. The findings reveal that although the U.S. departure weakened immediate commitments, it also galvanized other nations and sub-national actors to reinforce climate goals. This article contributes to understanding the dynamic balance of power in climate governance and the resilience of international agreements under geopolitical stress.

Keywords: Paris Agreement, climate change, U.S. withdrawal, global climate goals, international cooperation, emission targets, climate governance

Literature Review

The Paris Agreement represents a landmark in global climate policy, setting forth ambitious goals to limit global temperature rise to well below 2°C, with efforts to restrict it to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels (UNFCCC, 2015). Its design emphasizes nationally determined contributions (NDCs), transparency, and global stocktaking to encourage progressive ambition (Bodansky, 2016). The United States, as the world's second-largest emitter, was a central actor in negotiating the Agreement, committing to substantial emission reductions. However, the Trump administration's announcement in June 2017 to withdraw by November 2020, citing economic and sovereignty concerns, shocked the international community (BBC News, 2017).

Scholars have debated the implications of this move on the global climate regime. Falkner (2016) warned that the U.S. departure could undermine collective ambition and trust, given its historical emissions and technological leadership. Conversely, Hale (2018) and Rajamani (2017) argue that the Paris Agreement's flexible and decentralized architecture permits resilience, allowing other actors to compensate for U.S. disengagement. Sonnenfeld and Mol (2018) document a surge in sub-national climate activism within the U.S., such as states, cities, and businesses reaffirming their commitment through coalitions like "We Are Still In." Meanwhile, Schreurs (2019) notes that the EU and China intensified climate diplomacy and policy innovation, striving to maintain momentum. These insights illustrate a complex interplay between national decisions and broader governance mechanisms.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative content analysis approach to evaluate the impacts of the U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. Data sources include official policy statements from the U.S. government, international reaction documents, emission reports from the Global Carbon Project, and scholarly articles published between 2017 and 2023. Thematic coding was used to identify key trends regarding shifts in climate governance, emission trajectories, and cooperative frameworks. The research also includes comparative analysis of emission data before and after the withdrawal announcement to contextualize environmental impacts.

Results

The analysis highlights several critical effects of the U.S. withdrawal on global climate efforts:

1. **Reconfiguration of Global Leadership:** The U.S. exit created a leadership vacuum that the European Union and China actively sought to fill through increased diplomatic engagement and enhanced NDC commitments (Hale, 2018). The EU announced more ambitious emission reduction targets, while China emphasized its role in climate finance and technological innovation, signaling a multipolar leadership dynamic.
2. **Empowerment of Sub-national and Non-state Actors:** Within the U.S., numerous states, cities, and private sector actors resisted federal withdrawal by forming networks such as the “We Are Still In” coalition, committing to uphold Paris Agreement standards despite federal policy rollbacks (Sonnenfeld & Mol, 2018). This sub-national activism contributed to sustaining domestic climate efforts and underscored the fragmented nature of climate governance.
3. **Emission Trends and Policy Implications:** Although U.S. federal policy stalled, national emissions showed a modest decline due to market forces and state-level initiatives. However, global emissions continued to rise overall, with the U.S. decline slowing compared to previous trajectories (Global Carbon Project, 2022). This highlighted the gap between international commitments and real-world emissions.
4. **Evolution of International Cooperation:** The Paris Agreement’s multilateral mechanisms adapted by strengthening transparency measures and encouraging financial contributions from other developed nations to support developing countries’ climate actions (Rajamani, 2017). These adjustments helped mitigate the impact of the U.S. absence, preserving the agreement’s integrity.

Discussion

The Trump administration's withdrawal from the Paris Agreement exposed vulnerabilities in global climate governance but also revealed remarkable resilience. The flexible structure of the Paris Agreement allowed for adaptation in the face of geopolitical setbacks. The reorientation of leadership roles, with the EU and China stepping up, reflected a shifting geopolitical landscape where climate policy became intertwined with broader strategic interests. The rise of sub-national actors within the U.S. demonstrated that climate governance is increasingly polycentric, involving multiple levels of government and society beyond the nation-state (Schreurs, 2019).

Nevertheless, the withdrawal slowed global progress and introduced uncertainty for investors and policymakers, underscoring how dependent the global climate regime remains on major emitters' political will. The U.S. federal government's exit also weakened potential U.S. influence in shaping future international climate negotiations and technological pathways. However, the experience catalyzed civil society and market actors to advocate for stronger climate action, demonstrating that bottom-up pressure can partly compensate for top-down political retrenchment.

This episode illustrates the importance of robust institutional design, with built-in flexibility and mechanisms to engage a diverse array of stakeholders. It also highlights the ongoing challenge of ensuring continuity and ambition in global climate policy amid changing national administrations and political climates.

Conclusion

The withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement under the Trump administration significantly shifted the balances of global climate governance. While the exit introduced immediate challenges to emission reduction targets and international cooperation, it also prompted a redistribution of leadership and an unprecedented mobilization of sub-national actors, both domestically and globally. The Paris Agreement's flexible architecture and multi-level governance framework proved crucial for sustaining momentum during a period of geopolitical uncertainty. Future climate policy must continue to strengthen these adaptive mechanisms and foster broad-based engagement to ensure the durability of global climate goals in the face of political fluctuations. This case underscores the critical interplay between national decisions and global environmental outcomes, emphasizing that climate action is inherently a collective, multi-actor endeavor.

References

- BBC News. (2017). Donald Trump announces US withdrawal from Paris climate deal. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-40127326>
- Bodansky, D. (2016). The Paris Climate Change Agreement: A New Hope? *American Journal of International Law*, 110(2), 288-319. <https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintelaw.110.2.0288>
- Falkner, R. (2016). The Paris Agreement and the new logic of international climate politics. *International Affairs*, 92(5), 1107-1125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12708>
- Global Carbon Project. (2022). Global Carbon Budget 2022. <https://www.globalcarbonproject.org/carbonbudget>
- Hale, T. (2018). All hands on deck: The Paris Agreement and nonstate climate action. *Global Environmental Politics*, 18(4), 12-22. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00444
- Rajamani, L. (2017). Ambition and differentiation in the 2015 Paris Agreement: Interpretative possibilities and underlying politics. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, 65(2), 493_514. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589317000117>
- Schreurs, M. A. (2019). The role of cities and states in US climate policy. *Climate Policy*, 19(8), 953-961. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2019.1636023>
- Sonnenfeld, D. A., & Mol, A. P. J. (2018). The U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement: Economic and political implications. *Environmental Politics*, 27(7), 1146-1162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1501517>
- UNFCCC. (2015). Paris Agreement. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>