

---

# AMERICAN POLICY ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF OBAMA AND THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION DURING THE ERA OF 2009 TO 2021

---

**Ghulam Shabbir**

*Research Scholar*

*Department of International Relations*

*Greenwich University Karachi*

[gu9109@greenwich.edu.pk](mailto:gu9109@greenwich.edu.pk)

**Dr. Fatima Agha Shah**

*Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities*

*Greenwich University, Karachi*

[drfatimaagha@greenwich.edu.pk](mailto:drfatimaagha@greenwich.edu.pk)

---

## ABSTRACT

*This article provides a comparative analysis of the U.S policy on climate change and the Paris Agreement during the administrations of Obama and Trump. The Obama administration (2009-2017) focused on climate change and took important legislative initiatives. On the other hand, there were many hurdles in implementing policies on climate change. The Trump administration (2017-2021) didn't focus on climate change policy. After pulling out from the Paris Agreement, it supported the fossil fuel sector, which caused stress on diplomatic interactions and concerns about climate change progress. The Obama administration received extensive attention from the media, which portrayed climate change as an important environmental issue, appreciating his policies. However, Trump's propaganda campaigns declined climate change concerns and prioritized energy dominance, dividing public opinion and suppressing confrontation. The Trump administration's skeptical approach and decision to pull out from the Paris Accord jeopardized international cooperation and progress toward global climate goals. Here, the*

*study has raised the question of what ways the approaches and commitments to climate change under the Obama and Trump administrations were different, and what key factors drove these differences? Reviewing the existing literature, the study has hypothesized that the Obama administration's resolve to address climate change policy enhanced technology transfers, and harmonization of environmental policy with global cooperation, while Trump administration's strategy blocked harmonization of environmental policy and advancements, which escalated climate-related geopolitical conflicts in the real world as this policy was based on the prioritization of national interests. To examine these aspects, the study had adopted a descriptive and analytical approach, as climate change is not merely an ecological issue but a big challenge to the worldwide community that requires necessary collaboration and innovative solutions to a more sustainable future.*

**KEYWORDS**

*Climate Change, US policy, Paris Agreement, Diplomatic, Global Climate Goal.*

**INTRODUCTION**

On December 12, 2015, at the twenty-first Conference (COP21) of the Parties to the UNFCCC in Paris, 197 Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) reached a new worldwide climate agreement after seventeen years of impasse. In the framework that had taken initiatives and positive steps for the elimination of poverty, the Treaty pursues to strengthen the global response to the threat posed by climate change. The goal of the world community work jointly to continue the increase in universal surface temperature below 2°C, with an aim to contain the temperature increase within 1.5 degrees Celsius; direct all investments towards environmental advancement with minimal negative effects; to strong efforts to conflict climate change; and to develop the gap of institutional changes and domestic legal.

Additionally, Barack Obama's presidency mainly paid much attention to climate change policy from 2009 to 2017. Serious depth analysis was taken for the alarming issues of climate change. Obama also patronized global collaboration and agreements like the Paris Accord, aimed to hamper universal temperature rise to well below 2 degrees Celsius (Spash,2016). The areas on which Obama's administration focused more were up upgradation of renewable energy technology, multilateralism, and specially made diplomacy as a tool in the war against climate change policy.

After having come into power, the Trump administration changed the climate policy. The strategies that Trump gave a practical shape were entirely contrasting to the Obama policies for a long time, but the Trump policies were not so effective regarding climate change because he prioritized privatization and self-interest (Farber,2018). Moreover, the Trump administration had dismantled ecological policies and pulled out from the Paris Agreement, and focused on immediate economic benefits instead of long-term climate concerns. Counter-norm of the climate skepticism mechanism against the global accord and Trump's skepticism approach to climate change has not only upset domestic politics but also erected a hurdle at a global level (Raul Pacheco-Vega,2023).

The demands challenge what the USA's efforts to complete the upcoming details of the Paris Climate Agreement and how it would support worldwide development in building the goal of “A more developed, freer and safer global” (Obama,2015). In December 2015, President Obama declared that the global community had not waited for our children but that the Accord had been decided by nearly 200 worldwide states, and initiatives had been through that action against global warming had taken and the necessary steps its. However, the Trump administration declared the US committed to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, enlightenment that the deal was “uncompetitive” for the USA, its low-cost economy, and job creation. Even so, Trump’s withdrawal as president again in 2020 left the agreement’s future in danger.

The global community had expected that the pull-out from the Paris Agreement would not be problematic for the USA, as China and the European Union would combine their authorities with the optimism that the Trump government could be influenced to change its decision. However, Trump’s pullout from worldwide climate coalitions has concerned high-level criticism from worldwide leaders. Obama, for illustration, criticized Trump because he won’t understand the future, although Antonio Guterres expressed dissatisfaction over the viewpoint of the US leader (Dong,2017). The partnership of the EU and China aimed to express how deep the obligation to the accord is and what the point of the US is. However, the U.S pull out from the Paris Accord could decline protection policy frameworks and global initiatives to achieve the main emission reductions. The US’s image is at stake and could decline as freeloading is predicted to become an even greater issue. Trump’s political games facilitated the intensification of economic and political threats that had a dire influence on the unit’s national interest. If the U.S. continues to implement a contracted view of pursuing self-interests without global

cooperation, the long-term influence would be aggressive.

The rejection of global cooperation in the discovery of narrow-minded state interests will burn the U.S. in the long run. Prof. Dr. Miranda Schreurs (Technical University of Munich), Prof. Michele Betsill (Colorado State University), Prof. Peter Haas (University of Massachusetts) and Prof. Robert Keohane (Princeton University) express their view about President Trump's unpopular decision (Dong,2017).

### **BACKGROUND OF STUDY**

Ecological phenomena gained important attention in IR during the era of 1970s, with climate change becoming a significant problem (Zen, 2013). On 21 March 1992, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change aimed to decrease greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming. This Accord, which entered into force in the period of 21 March 1992, is a core decision in emphasizing the worldwide climate disaster (Pramudianto,2016).

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change established a structure that delivers a binding protocol to control gas conservation limits (Darajati, 2020). In 1997, the Kyoto Protocol established that objects to preserve greenhouse gas concentrations lower a level that would not destroy the Earth's weather system. The protocol was passed and forced in 2005 after Russia ratified it, and with the U.S. actually the only non-participant (Diogenes, 2020).

The Paris Climate Agreement was joined by 195 UN member states and addressed climate change after the failure of the Kyoto Protocol. It involved developed states, the largest emitters of greenhouse gases (GHG), the U.S. and China. On November 4, 2016, the PA was implemented and aimed to bring all states to get the better of climate change (Hakiem, 2018). However, the U.S. had not ratified the accord, as elected President Trump judged it as dangerous as industrialized states, especially in the U.S state. The US involvement in the PA was based on responsiveness to the prominence of addressing climate change and support from its governance systems. The Accord's enactment had been met with mixed feedback, with some states articulating distress about the U. S's participation, while others believe it could bring all nations organized to tackle ecological climate change.

According to the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) was recorded hottest in 2016, with increased dangerous ecological degradation. The entry into force of the PA on environmental change was understood as an important landmark and a success of multilateralism. The approval of the "Global Warming Network" led to

the disaster of the Copenhagen Conference in 2009, but the Paris climate change was considered the first core of multilateralism of the 21st century (*Victor, 2011*). During the Bush administration, the United States suspended new environmental laws, marking a pause in proactive environmental change policy (*Steinhauer, 2018*). The subsequent Bill Clinton administration struggled to reestablish the US leadership in combating climate change but largely failed. Despite Bill Clinton's actions, he has struggled to gain congressional funding for most of his climate plans, primarily due to partisan differences and the economic impact of climate action (*Schreurs, 2010*). A key moment during this era was the course of the Senate's 1997 Byrd-Hagel resolution, which highlighted the growing partisan reluctance to take climate action. This decision sets out strict conditions that the United States must decide on regarding global environmental agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol.

This made it difficult for President Clinton to negotiate successfully at the upcoming United Nations climate conference in Kyoto, as any treaty would entail crucial Senate approval (*Kahn, 2003*). Congressional skepticism of the KP was not based on climate change rejection but on its rejection of the protocol's principle of common but differentiated responsibility. Policymakers rejected the idea that developing and developed nations had diverse levels of responsibility for addressing climate change. Rather than, they viewed climate change as a global problem that essential equal participation by all nation-states, regardless of their growth status (*Murthy, 2019*). This position reflects wider concerns about the equity and economic impact of the differentiated approach essential by the Protocol.

Opposition by the US Congress to the KP led to a gradual withdrawal from the World Climate Conference and its non-ratification. Since 1992, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change has achieved international contributions but lacks viable targets. The Kyoto Protocol was adopted in 1997, requiring developed nations to decrease their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 5 percent between 2008 and 2012 compared to 1990 levels. Specific targets ranged from an 8 percent decrease in emissions to a 10 percent development limit. China's massive increase in emissions, which doubled in less than a decade, began in 2002 and 2003 before the KP came into force. The Paris Climate Accord, which had not been proposed to the Senate, was signed by 196 nations states at COP21 in Paris on 12 December 2015.

The Paris Climate Accord, unlike previous major global climate accords, had not

been submitted to the Senate and had been the issue of much discussion. The structure of the Paris Climate Treaty, which allowed the US to contribute through a diplomatic agreement, allowed the Obama presidency to bypass the need for congressional approval. This decision process was highly criticized by Christiana Figueres, the Executive Secretary of UNFCCC, who proclaimed that Obama's approach was related to this decision "fundamentally undemocratic" because it allowed the US to join the Paris Treaty without the participation of the US Parliament and as an alternative follow on left-wing executive authority (Frantzen,2021). Furthermore, the use of an executive order raised concerns that it would make it easier for a future Republican administration to pull out of the treaty (Groves, 2016). These concerns were fast apparent, as the Trump government had made it clear from the kickoff that it planned to pull out from the Paris Climate Treaty. Across the border, domestic and universal opposition. In November 2019, the US pulled out from the Paris Agreement (Friedman, 2020).

The Trump administration announced in 2017 that it would pull out of the Paris Climate Treaty, causing a sudden shock. It was the most important attack by the US on a multilateral approach to ecological change after Bush rejected the KP agreement in 2001. The announcement was met with uproar, but instead of jeopardizing the Paris Climate Treaty, the action isolated the US administration on global climate negotiations and organized non-federal actors in the US to take more climate action. As the world's major economic power and second-largest emitter of GHG, a US pullout could undermine global collaboration and efforts to combat climate change. Still, achieving the motivated objectives of the Paris Climate Treaty remains an experiment, mostly in unindustrialized economies facing rapid industrialization and increasing emissions, dangerous consequences of climate change, and requires greater ambition and critical action at the global, countrywide, and native levels. The global community must push for solid commitments, strategies, and collaboration, particularly from emerging economies, to ensure that the commitments of the Paris Treaty are decoded into positive outcomes. The future of the world depends on the collective to challenge climate change and act rapidly. The Trump administration said that PA is against the national interests and is measured unfairly of US. (Alimuiddin & Maksum,2023) This opinion unquestionably poses problems for the sustainability of climate change conferences and affects the efforts of other states to Accord with climate change problems. As one of the U.S.'s major emitters and an important impact on other nation states, the US's active role in climate change issues, however, these arguments are more

critical. There is no Doubt that the US can resolve climate change policy and convince the global community to take reliable steps to address the climate change problem effectively.

However, US President-elect Donald Trump had decided to withdraw, undoubtedly worsening global climate response plans. Withdrawing weakens the foundation of global climate governance and disrupts the process of climate collaboration. It will have multiple impacts, including damaging the image of leadership in solving international ecological problems and setting a bad example for international climate cooperation. In addition, the withdrawal will also reduce the emission space of other countries and increase their emission costs. Worst of all is the decline in air quality, which, of course, worries other countries as they grapple with climate change, which is heating up the planet, both in other countries and in the US itself (Zhang, 2017).

Climate change mitigation will be disrupted as one of the impacts of the US pulling out from the Paris Agreement, among several other impacts, which prompts the Researcher to analyze the issue in their study. Based on the above explanation, a question arises: “What impact will the US policy of withdrawing from the Paris Agreement under Trump’s leadership have on worldwide climate governance?” The US withdrawal from the climate change system has taken governments around the world by surprise and undermined the universality of the Paris Agreement.

### ***STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM***

Climate change is an important global challenge, with controversial policy issues increasing in recent years. The US, a major contributor to GHG, has played a central role in global mitigation efforts. However, the US's climate change policy has seen major shifts during the Obama and Trump administrations in the context of the Paris Agreement. The Obama administration focused on international collaboration and aggressive emission reduction goals, while the Trump administration disregarded global agreements and promoted conventional energy sources. This study influences the US's reputation and impact in the climate change domain.

In this paper, the US’s complex climate change policy is discussed, highlighting various steps taken. However, if critically analyzed, the climate change policies under both the Obama and Trump administrations reveal major controversy and represent a critical juncture, with large impacts on both the domestic and international systems.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVE**

In this paper, the U.S. policy on climate change during the Obama and Trump presidencies focuses on their approaches to global treaties, major Paris climate agreements, domestic policies, new diplomatic policies, and engagement with the global community. It will analyze critical policies implemented by both administrations of Obama and Trump, such as the Clean Power Plan and the rollback of environmental regulations. The research will also analyze the core decision-making processes and factors influencing policy formulation and implementation. It will also investigate the U.S.'s engagement in global warming pacts during Obama and Trump's presidencies, considering the Paris agreement and diplomatic strategy consequences. The study will also evaluate the consequences of the U. S's contribution and pull out from the Paris Accord, as a global collaboration in resolving climate change issues. It will also examine how domestic policies fit into international obligations, ecological sustainability, renewable energy progress, and emission reduction mechanisms. The study also explored the potential long-term consequences for future US administrations.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

- In what ways did the approaches and commitments to climate change under the Obama and Trump administrations differ, and what key factors drove these differences?
- How significantly did the policy of the Obama administration contribute to global efforts in addressing climate change, and what were the cost-benefit mechanisms of climate change?
- How did the global view of the US as a leader in the fight against climate change evolve throughout the terms of the Obama and Trump administrations, and what were the main influences on this perception of climate change?
- What impact did the U.S.'s exit from the Paris Agreement under President Trump have on international climate change diplomacy, and what was the reaction from other nations and international bodies?

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TOPIC**

This paper explores the impact of US policy on climate change during the Obama and Trump administrations, concentrating on the challenges humanity and the planet face. During that period, the Obama Administration focused on global treaties like the Sustainable Energy Investments and Paris Climate Accord;

however, Trump has adopted a more pessimistic policy, leaving the Paris Accord, loosening ecological regulations, and protecting the oil production industry. The study has highlighted the complex climate change policy of both administrations and the need for coordinated actions across borders. Comparing the policies of both administrations can help policymakers, researchers, and political leaders identify successful initiatives and learn from past mistakes. Optimistic Policy choices like investing the climate-friendly advanced technologies, and encouraging renewable energy can lead to major progress in the fight against climate change problems. Understanding how the U.S policy affects climate change can improve perception of the nation's environmental obligation and promote collaboration across borders.

### ***THE RATIONALE OF THE STUDY***

Climate change is a global issue causing ecosystem reduction, dangerous weather conditions, and health issues. The US, as the largest GHG producer, has a responsibility to address it. The Obama administration played an important role in the Paris Climate Agreement negotiations in 2015, promoting a low-carbon economy and renewable energy sources. However, the Trump administration took a differed approach by announcing it pulling out of the treaty in 2017 and promoting the coal and fossil fuel sectors. This shift in policy reflects the US's political will and leadership, affecting its global reputation and impact in the climate change field. Investigating the divergent policy strategies of both administrations exposed major facts about the diplomatic and reputational influences of the U. S's climate change position.

### ***HYPOTHESIS***

The paper "US Policy on Climate Change and Paris Agreement: A Comparative Analysis of Obama and Trump Administrations" investigated the costs and benefits of both administrations related to climate change policies on global efforts. On the other hand, the Trump administration's policy on climate change is based on the prioritization of national self-interests, withdrawal from international agreements, including the Paris Agreement, and a negative impact on international efforts to combat climate change. The US leader in addressing climate change was greatly impacted by contrasting approaches taken by both administrations, which resulted in an overall decrease in cooperation during the Donald Trump era. During the Trump administration's undermining of global climate change diplomacy, which prioritized US economic interests, withdrew from the Paris Agreement and

impeded national collaboration to achieve climate change objectives. They reduced regulatory burdens to address the challenges that the administration of Obama's policies on climate change faced with domestic opposition and limited cooperation from other major emitters. As a result, the Obama administration's resolve to address climate change policy enhanced technology transfers, harmonization of environmental policy, and global cooperation; in contrast, the Trump administration's strategy blocked harmonization of environmental policy, and advancements and escalated climate-related geopolitical conflicts in the real world.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Rationalist institutionalists argued that, even with the adoption of the Paris Accord (2015), the current structure of environmental policy is not beneficial to broad cooperation (Milkoreit, 2019). They deal with previous patterns of interests, power, and incentives that make non-cooperation inevitable. Drawing on a structural analysis of the KP, scholars such as Barrett (1998), Sunstein (2007), and Rosen (2015) suggest that it wasn't in the interests of key emitters comparable to the U.S. to support a costly climate treaty. While rationalist institutionalists didn't terminate the diplomatic progress in 2015, they continue to argue that structural challenges persist in the post-Paris climate agreement period, even though changes in the inducements for ecological protection. Some continue to discover the likelihood of climate clubs or dualism, while others question the efficiency of the Paris Treaty itself (Keohane & Oppenheimer, 2016).

Social constructivists have analyzed different but complementary explanations for why the international community has failed to address climate change. They debate the way problems are framed, the norms and discourses used, and how actors' observations of their interests affect support for international treaties (Keohane, 2016). The approach understands environmental change and divergent concepts of justice, mainly b/w the Global South and North, also helps describe past failures (Milkoreit, 2019).

However, similar concerns from the Global South that led them to reject the Copenhagen Accord in 2009 are still present in the Paris Climate Accord of 2015. Both agreements are established on a voluntary system where countries initiate actions, with no obligatory commitments to reducing emissions or environmental finance. The Global South rejected the Copenhagen Accord because it was seen as unfair and inadequate.

The U.S. has a key actor but erratic role in environmental debates (Depledge, 2005).

There had been times of unenthusiastic participation (under George W. Bush), disengagement (under George W. Bush and Trump), and more active administration (under Clinton & Obama). Researchers had presented divergent details for this shifting involvement, as well as opinions concentrated on broader global factors (Sunstein, 2007), European or regional sides (Bang, 2005), and additional nationalistic factors (Lisowski, 2002).

Enlightening Putnam's 2-level of game framework, it's clear that in 2009, President Obama had struggled to achieve support from both international and domestic actors. But by 2015, he effectively aligned US national interests with global ones. This allowed him to create an Environmental Accord that had wide-ranging international funding and could be approved in the US through executive Accords, bypassing the need for congressional approval, including the failed Waxman-Markey bill in 2008 (Goode, 2015).

Alex Bowen and Bob Ward analyzed the National Economic Research Association (NERA) report, which explains the costs and benefits of certain Climate policies and was quoted by Donald Trump's administration in his explanation for pulling out the US of the Paris Accord. They argue that the statement was based on dangerous expectations that overstated the fiscal costs of decreasing emissions, although they pay no attention to the benefits. These defective assumptions, they oppose, vary the field as an erratic guide for policymakers measuring the fiscal influences of the U.S. conference on its 2050 emissions decrease target. Several specialists, including Yohe, Kaufman, Bowen, and Ward themselves, had pointed out the thoughtful inaccuracies in the (NERA) report, but the Trump administration disregarded these critiques.

US climate policy had been formed by a divide b/w Republicans, who advocate fiscal interests, and Democrats, who emphasize for stronger belief in climate protection. The Republicans had historically been resistant to the global climate Accords, reflecting a wider development of prioritizing financial advance over ecological concerns. Historical analysis shows that the Republican party had supported some ecological measures in the era of the 1970s, but skepticism grew in later periods, peaking under the government of George Bush, and Donald Trump, who all resisted multilateral environmental frameworks (Mehling, Vihma 2017).

The Paris Accord concentrated on "loss and damage" from ecological change but didn't contain an advantage. In 2017, the Trump administration announced to setback that led to U.S. isolation and better ecological action by non-federal main actors. His decision also encouraged Nicaragua and Syria to join the Accord. Trump

pushed back the Obama-era ecological policies, including the 3 billion aid Green Climate Fund, which he criticized as wealth redistribution (Delbeke,2019).

Previous to his proclamation, the Trump administration urged to withdraw the U.S commitment to the Paris Climate Accords, in a letter signed by twenty Members of the European Parliament (EP), and ten from the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), because of this statement that:

"We believe that the Paris climate agreement is potentially damaging, especially to developed Western economies. We also believe that an early decision by your Administration to withdraw from the Paris Treaty will effectively neuter it, to the benefit of us all.

At the same time, we would urge you to take action to pull out the carbon dioxide endangerment finding, which has no sound basis in science but provides a pretext for harmful and extreme ecological policies. "(Rhodes,2017).

Luke Kemp (2017) critically analyzed that the U.S. remaining in the Paris Climate Accord would have little influence on emissions and could challenge the accord's effectiveness. He advocates that the US pull-out might be less effective, potentially agreeing to the Republic of China and the European Union to centralize the international climate agenda. Frank Jotzo had noted that the US pullout is unlikely to spark extensive results and that an upcoming Leader could simply rejoin the Paris Climate Agreement.

Trump often defined global warming as a "hoax" produced by the Republic of China to damage the US industrial sector. His views related to climate change were similar to George Bush's, predominantly his opposition to the KP. Trump wants to eradicate what he sees as an unnecessary hurdle in energy sources like gas and oil, arguing that decreasing carbon dioxide emissions wouldn't harm U.S. industry. His climate opposed the UN emissions decrease agenda and instead preferred self-regulation by US enterprises, under administration control (Zhang, 2017). If analysts examine the Trump policy on climate change as a "hoax" and oppose global emissions reduction efforts, preferring native industry. His decision to pull out of the Paris Climate Agreement in 2017 broke from traditional global actions and decreased the moral values of international law. Though his actions opposed rational choice theory, they had seemed driven by national political interests, reflecting his "America First" Foreign Policy (Pavone,2018).

According to the United Nations Secretary-General, Trump's decision is "a major disappointment for international efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and boost global security". President Macron identified the U.S. decision related to

climate change as a "mistake both for America and for our planet"; however, German Chancellor Merkel "deplored" the U.S. pullout of the Paris Climate Accord (PBS News 2017).

Similarly, various corporations like Google, Apple, and Microsoft in recent times started an active policy of investment in renewable energies, with announcements in some press (The Wall Street Journal, New York Times, and New York Post) urged the Trump administration had to keep the U.S in the Paris Climate Accord. According to Kruger (2018), the Trump administration's core policy was based on an "America First" ideology, which was centered on skepticism of international systems. In addition, Trump had a negative attitude towards President Obama during the 2016 presidential election, and the two presidents openly criticized each other. After taking office, Trump took a path of opposition to Obama's policies and became interested in dismantling several key policies of his administration, most notably the Paris climate agreement, which is considered one of Obama's most important political achievements.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Methodology is the main core of the research. This research will conduct a qualitative methods approach and an in-depth analysis. The analysis will review different journal articles, policy documents to gain an understanding of US policy regarding climate change under both administrations.

To achieve this, the study will pursue a theoretical framework and assess some key concepts, variables, and aspects that are related to climate change. Primary and secondary sources such as speeches, news announcements, executive orders, and government documents or pronouncements made by Obama's or even Trump's administration will be used in collecting data. Additionally, analyze the results and efficacy of the Obama and Trump administrations' climate change policies. This article used the [Descriptive analysis method](#) and summarizes the implementation of renewable energy, global partnerships, CO2 reduction targets, and the application of ecological rules using qualitative parameters.

To demonstrate how U.S. policy has affected climate change during each presidency, choose particular case studies. These case studies might center on important decisions regarding climate policy taken by Obama and Trump, respectively, like the Clean Power Plan and the decision to pull out from the Paris climate agreement. Examine the causes, effects and responses related to these situations.

Consider the study's ethical issues, such as data privacy, protecting human subjects, and possible conflicts of interest. Evaluate whether the research complies with ethical norms and rules. Place the analysis in the larger historical framework of US climate change policy. This research discusses how both administrations have impacted climate change through their policies and actions. The methodology will present limitations such as data availability and bias while seeking to provide an in-depth analysis of US policy towards global warming during each administration. The results will be useful for US climate change policymakers in terms of global relations aimed at climate change policy in practice for future generations.

### ***RESEARCH APPROACH***

The paper used the comparative analysis of environmental policy under the Obama and Trump presidencies in existing literature. This study will examine key policy shifts, their goal, and the wide range of policy implications. Data will be collected from different sources, including policy statements, executive body orders, research articles, and official speeches. This study will analyze data from secondary sources such as comparative cases of each administration's climate policies. Furthermore, there is a need for a deeper examination of the Paris Agreement and its influence on U.S. policy decisions related to climate change during these periods, as well as the ethical considerations and limitations of the methodology used in existing research.

### ***DATA COLLECTION***

It is estimated that the methods used for the research and analysis will produce reliable and meaningful data. This research will use a secondary source of data and involve a previous literature review, which includes official speeches, legal documents of climate policy, policymakers' opinions, and research journals. The US Policy on Climate Change under the Obama and Trump administrations is assumed to be the basis for the study's thorough analysis. Limitations of the research include access to secondary data, subjectivity in policy interpretation, and the evolving nature of climate policy. Ultimately, the study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the evolution of U.S. climate policy, assess the ethical dimensions of both administrations' approaches, and contribute to the academic discourse on future U.S. leadership in global climate action.

### ***THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK***

The diagram illustrates the interconnectedness of climate change and economic policy. Key nodes and their relationships include:

- Obama Administration** (green) leads to **Invest in Renewable Energy** (green) and **Paris Agreement** (green).
- Trump Administration** (red) leads to **Deregulate Environmental Policies** (red), **Invest in Renewable Energy** (green), and **Short-Term Economic Boost** (red).
- Climate Change Policy** (green) leads to **Clean Power Plan** (green), **Invest in Renewable Energy** (green), and **Paris Agreement** (green).
- Paris Agreement** (green) leads to **Stricter Carbon Regulations** (green).
- Stricter Carbon Regulations** (green) leads to **Economic Growth via Green Jobs** (green).
- Stricter Carbon Regulations** (green) leads to **Expected Results** (blue).
- Short-Term Economic Boost** (red) leads to **Industry Growth & Cost Reduction** (red).
- Short-Term Economic Boost** (red) leads to **Expected Results** (blue).
- Support Fossil Fuels** (red) leads to **Expected Results** (blue).
- Expected Results** (blue) leads to **Long-Term Global Leadership** (green).
- Long-Term Global Leadership** (green) leads to **Withdrawal from Paris Agreement** (red).
- Withdrawal from Paris Agreement** (red) leads to **Economic Growth via Green Jobs** (green).
- Withdrawal from Paris Agreement** (red) leads to **Industry Growth & Cost Reduction** (red).
- Deregulate Environmental Policies** (red) leads to **Industry Growth & Cost Reduction** (red).



- Represents the Obama Administration's Policies
- Represents the Trump Administration's Policies



## RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Rationalist institutionalists argued that the Paris Accord (2016) lacks broad cooperation in climate policy. Social constructivists have analyzed different but complementary explanations for why the international community has failed to address climate change. Global South's concerns from the 2009 Copenhagen Accord, persist in the 2016 Paris Accord, despite voluntary actions and no obligatory commitments. The Paris Accord addresses climate change loss and damage, but Trump's administration pushed back on Obama-era policies, including the Green Climate Fund, criticized as wealth redistribution (Delbeke, 2019).

In his first 100 days, President Trump's actions on climate change had been swift and harsh, aiming to undo principles that protect the environment. These changes could cause serious damage in the short term, including increased pollution, more coal production, and damaged protections for oceans, waterways, and the earth. Budget cuts may also slow down the core of advanced research and technology that benefits decrease CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and improve energy efficiency.

President Trump believed that pulling out of global climate treaties would protect the US industries and jobs, but this vision wasn't supported by scientific data. On the other hand, President Obama believed that the Paris Climate Treaty would create more opportunities and financial development by spending on clean energy. The report was released by the US Global Change Research Program (2018). As the 4th National Climate Assessment elaborated that the effects of weather conditions on the U.S. will continue to rise until international twelve-monthly emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) have reduced to zero percent (Ward & Bowen 2020).

The pulling out of the US from the Paris climate treaty was expected. In the early stages of the US election, Trump had claimed many times that climate change is a "hoax". As an open show, he assured to pull out the US from the Paris Climate Treaty.

Trump had also proposed the US First Energy Plan, dismantled Obama's climate change policies, and cancelled the Clean Power Plan. He cut off the main central budgets for climate change policies and appointed anti-climate change administrators. Trump argued that the Paris Climate Treaty was harmful to the U.S.,

would negligibly mitigate climate change, and that developing nations made an unfair treaty against the U.S. He promised to renegotiate the terms of the treaty to be nondiscriminatory for the U.S.

In the period of 4 August 2017, the US State Department sent a formal letter to the UNO confirming that the US would be pulled out of the Paris Agreement. The Trump presidency has had close ties to the fossil fuel industry, which has political influence in the Republican Party. Trump was confident that his voters would not react negatively to this decision, which gave him the political courage to make it public in order to garner support for the upcoming election. Recently, Trump has dismissed scientific evidence of climate change. On the other hand, those countries whose economies depend on oil production, such as King Salman and Vladimir Putin, acknowledge the fact that the world's climate is truly warming (Kruger, 2018).

Trump criticized the PA's importance as well as Obama's foreign policy, and believes that the US did not undermine competitive economic interests and hinder traditional energy industries. On the other hand, Obama believed that the Paris Climate Agreement boosted US leadership in international affairs.

Trump's "America First approach has become stronger as he grows more confident on the global platform. Since taking an oath, the U.S has left the Asian Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), started to renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and pulled the US out of the Paris Climate Agreement. In short, Trump's decision to pull out of the Paris Climate Agreement marks a shift away from US worldwide sovereignty (Peake,2018). The research analyzed that President Jokowi's communication was hopeful for the adoption of ecologically friendly policy, while President Trump's rejection of climate change and reduction of regulations damaged America's reputation. In contrast, Jokowi took comprehensive measures to protect forests and promote renewable energy, although he faced difficulties in implementing the policy. The US withdrawal from the PA was disappointing for countries, such as Indonesia, where Jokowi had strongly supported the agreement and joined environmental initiatives.

Trump has publicly announced the legitimacy of ecological change science, from time to time elaborating on it as a "hoax". During the Trump administration had rolled back climate change policy and actively expanded the fossil fuel industries, such as oil, gas, and Coal (Popovich,2020).

In the present study, Alimuddin (2023) elaborated that Trump clearly and indirectly stressed the U.S. national interest through his speech. Trump decided to withdraw

from the treaty because he was confident it would impact on the US economy. That is why these policies stressed the economic cost that the US would suffer to fulfill the PA. Furthermore, Trump openly criticized Barack Obama, his political rival, by publicly condemning him for prior decisions to abide by the Paris Accord, claiming that it is only the most recent instance of the US towards the inside into a treaty that drawbacks the US to the special advantage of non-industrialized countries. However, Trump's statement repeatedly downplays or ignores real research-based facts related to climate change and its factual effects. During his administration reversed climate-friendly policies or regulations aimed at mitigating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, opposing scientific mechanisms.

Both administrations have diverse climate change policies, with Obama prioritizing renewable energy and global collaboration through the Paris Climate Agreement, while Trump's climate policies moved towards deregulation and promoted the fossil fuels industry. The Trump administration's pullout of the Paris Accord stressed diplomatic relations, degraded global governance, and raised doubts about the US's commitment to climate policy, affecting global collaboration and its ecological image. The finding shows that the policies of both administrations were basically diverse because the researcher proclaimed and applied policies of the Obama administration adopted on multilateral approach, while the Trump presidency has emphasized a unilateral approach, with raised the slogan "America First" and an emphasis on national economic interests in the foreign policy agenda.

In 2008, President Barack Obama was elected and raised the slogan of "change". Obama promised to solve the climate policy issues with a new, rational approach. He spoke of the future tenets of his administration, including rebuilding alliances, countering common threats to cooperation with allies, reviving US leadership, and strengthening soft government (*Khosravi & Emami, 2022*). Critical analysis and policymakers elaborated that during the Trump era, Trump publicly criticized Obama's policies. "Trump has skeptical views about the value of multilateral institutions, and unlike previous presidents, he has seen a limited range of U.S national interests" (Jervis, 2017).

The U.S. security policy has focused on control of energy, power, and financial policies. The Trump administration has announced the US pull from the Paris Climate Agreement, quoting dangers to U.S. sovereignty and harm to domestic economic interests and the working class. Trump's policy highlights financial nationalism, unilateral action to gain profit, and objects to save the U.S. (*Khosravi 2022*).

Finally, the U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement doesn't pass the cost-benefit analysis test. It shows that the US should continue in the Accord and endure to be a leading force in reducing CO2 emissions and mitigating the impact of climate change (Arlota,2019).

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Paris Accord is key for raising global collaboration on climate change and encouraging sustainable growth, aiming for a "win-win" consequence through cooperative action (Zhang, 2017). The U.S. withdrawal from the Climate Agreement under the Trump presidency may have disrupted international collaboration and increased the fossil fuel industry, like coal, gas, and oil (Kemp, 2017). The Trump administration's position on the Paris climate treaty, which suggests that the US could rejoin if it is "fair," highlights equity and fairness, particularly for developing nations. Withdrawal will weaken the role of the US governance system and undermine global alliances, including the EU. The US position also risks encouraging developing nations to reevaluate their commitment to immediate climate action, even as big population states, including India and China, endure participation in decreasing GHG emissions (Gupta,2016).

The impact of the US pulling out Paris Agreement on long-term financial development and global systematic research is mixed. Although withdrawal from the Paris Agreement may yield short-term benefits, the reality is that renewable energy is cheaper and more profitable than the fossil fuel industry. Furthermore, explain that fossil fuel industries like coal, gas, and oil create long-term problems for the global as well as the US natural system.

The US withdrawal from the PA was a major setback for the global environmental governance system. The decision affected the structure of international environmental cooperation, as the Paris Agreement had become a global standard under which the international community began to take serious action on the issue of climate change. The participation of various nations, like the US, sent a message to the world that it takes this global threat seriously. However, the decision to pull out damaged the US's reputation and raised questions about its credibility in the international community. Partner countries got the impression that the US was not serious about fulfilling its global commitments, which not only weakened trust but also affected future cooperation. Trump's worldview is marked by skepticism towards international regimes that he observes as harmful to U.S. domestic interests or such as burdens on US taxpayers (Trump, P. D. 2018). This pullback had a risk

of a negative effect on the US's credibility and trust with its allies. However, the Trump administration cut aid for climate research and pushed back environmental regulations, but the Obama administration pushed for global cooperation and a clean energy economy. Rational Choice theory (RCT) has investigated both administrations' calculation of cost-benefits of divergent policy approaches and specifically calculated that the Obama administration's proactive approach led to greater US policy contributions, while the effectiveness of US climate change initiatives is influenced by international cooperation (Pavone, 2018). Obama has seen the long-term climate change policies, and a cooperative approach to reduce CO2 emissions, while Trump has prioritized short-term climate policy, gained national profits, and created more challenges for the next generations.

## REFERENCES

- Alimuddin, S. Z., & Maksum, A. (2023). Analyzing Presidential Discourse on the Paris Agreement: Trump's Skepticism vs. Jokowi's Support. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 10(3), 317-331.
- Arlota, C. (2019). Does the United States' Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on Climate Change Pass the Cost-Benefit Analysis Test?. *U. Pa. J. Int'l L.*, 41, 881.
- Bang, G., Tjernshaugen, A., & Andresen, S. (2005). Future US climate policy: International re-engagement?. *International Studies Perspectives*, 6(2), 285-303.
- Barrett, S. (1998). Political economy of the Kyoto Protocol. *Oxford review of economic policy*, 14(4), 20-39. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/14.4.20>
- Darajati, M. R. (2020). Efektivitas Protokol Kyoto Dalam Masyarakat Internasional Sebagai Suatu Rezim. *Shar-E: Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi Hukum Syariah*, 6(1), 17-24.
- Delbeke, J., Runge-Metzger, A., Slingenberg, Y., & Werksman, J. (2019). The paris agreement. In *Towards a climate-neutral Europe* (pp. 24-45). Routledge.
- Depledge, J. (2013). *The organization of global negotiations: Constructing the climate change regime*. Routledge.
- Diogenes, D. (2020). Prinsip-Prinsip yang Terdapat di Dalam Konvensi dan Protokol Perubahan Iklim dan Tanggung Jawab Negara-negara Khususnya Negara Maju. *Justitia Jurnal Hukum*, 4(1).
- Dong, L. (2017). The Trump administration's decision to withdraw the

United States from the Paris Climate Agreement. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 15(3), 183-183.

Farber, D. A. (2018). US climate policy: Obama, Trump, and Beyond. *Revista de Estudos Constitucionais, Hermenêutica e Teoria do Direito (RECHTD)*, 10(2), 10.

Friedman, L. (2020). US Quits Paris climate agreement: questions and answers. *New York Times*, 4. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/04/climate/paris-climateagreement-trump.html>.

Goode, Darren and Andrew Restuccia. 2015. "US Republicans Seek to Strangle Paris Climate Pact." *POLITICO*. November 23. <https://www.politico.eu/article/republicans-seek-to-strangle-paris-climate-pact/>.

Groves, S. (2016). The Paris Agreement is a treaty and should be submitted to the senate. *Backgrounder*, 3103, 1-11.

Gupta, J. (2016). The Paris climate change agreement: China and India. *Climate Law*, 6(1-2), 171-181.

Hakim, F. N. (2018). Kemampuan Produktif Amerika Serikat Dan Konvensi Perubahan Iklim Pasca Paris Agreement. *Dauliyah: Journal of Islam and International Affairs*, 3(2), 147-170.

<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/watch-macron-calls-u-s-exit-paris-climate-accord-mistake-u-s-planet/>.

Jervis, Robert (2017). "ISSF Policy Series: President Trump and IR Theory". Available at: <https://networks.hnet.org/node/.../issf-policy-series-president-trump-and-ir-theory>

Kahn, G. (2003). The fate of the Kyoto Protocol under the Bush Administration. *Berkeley J. Int'l L.*, 21, 548-571.

Kemp, L. (2017). US-proofing the Paris climate agreement. *Climate Policy*, 17(1), 86-101.

Kemp, L. (2017) *Nat. Clim. Change*, 7, 458–560

Keohane, Robert O. and Oppenheimer, Michael 2016. "Paris: Beyond the Climate Dead End through Pledge and Review?" *Politics and Governance* 4(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.17645/pag.v4i3.634>

Khosravi, S., & Emami, Z. (2022). A Comparative Study on the Obama and Trump Administrations' Foreign Policy Approaches. *International Journal of Political Science*, 12(2), 51-65.

Krüger, S. (2018). Why did Trump announce his intent to withdraw from

the Paris Climate Agreement?. *Вісник Донецького національного університету імені Василя Стуса. Серія політичні науки*, (3), 25-33.

Lisowski, M. (2002). Playing the two-level game: US President Bush's decision to repudiate the Kyoto Protocol. *Environmental Politics*, 11(4), 101-119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714000641>

Mehling, M. A., & Vihma, A. (2017). 'Mourning for America': Donald Trump's Climate Change Policy. *FIIA Analysis-8, October*.

Milkoreit, M. (2019). The Paris agreement on climate change—made in USA?. *Perspectives on Politics*, 17(4), 1019-1037.

Murthy, S. L. (2019). States and Cities as Norm Sustainers: A Role for Subnational Actors in the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. *Va. Env'tl. LJ*, 37, 1.

Obama, B. (2015, November 30). Remarks by President Obama at the First Session of COP21. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. [https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/paris\\_nov\\_2015/application/pdf/cop21cmp11\\_leaders\\_event\\_usa.pdf](https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/paris_nov_2015/application/pdf/cop21cmp11_leaders_event_usa.pdf)

Pavone, I. R. (2018). The Paris Agreement and the Trump administration: Road to nowhere?. *Journal of International Studies*, 11(1), 34-49.

Peake, J. S. (2018). The decline of treaties? Obama, Trump, and the Politics of International Agreements. *Obama, Trump, and the Politics of International Agreements (April 6, 2018)*.

Popovich, N., Ripka, Livia, A., & Louis, Kendra, P. (2020, October 15). The Trump Administration Is Reversing Nearly 100 Environmental Rules. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/climate/trump-environment-rollbacks.html>

Pramudianto, A. (2016). Dari Kyoto Protocol 1997 Ke Paris Agreement 2015: Dinamika Diplomasi Perubahan Iklim Global Dan Asean Menuju 2020. *Global: Jurnal Politik Internasional*, 18(1), 76-94.

Pacheco-Vega, R. (2023). *Donald Trump and climate denial. International Relations*. [www.e-ir.info/2023/12/04/donald-trump-and-climate-denial/](http://www.e-ir.info/2023/12/04/donald-trump-and-climate-denial/)

Rhodes, C. J. (2017). US withdrawal from the COP21 Paris climate change agreement, and its possible implications. *Science progress*, 100(4), 411-419.

Schreurs, M. (2010). Climate change politics in the United States: melting of the ice. *Analyse & Kritik*, 32(1), 177-189.

Spash, C. L. (2016). This changes nothing: The Paris Agreement to ignore

reality. *Globalizations*, 13(6), 928-933.

Steinhauer, V. (2018). Leaving the Paris Agreement: The United States' Disengagement from the Global Climate Regime and its Impact on EU Climate Diplomacy. EU Diplomacy Paper 04/2018.

Sunstein, C. R. (2007). Of Montreal and Kyoto: A tale of two protocols. *Harvard Environmental Law Review*, 31(1), 1–65.

Trump, D. J. (2018). *Statement on the United States' withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord*. The White House. <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov>

Trump, P. D. (2018). WHY DID TRUMP ANNOUNCE HIS INTENT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE PARIS CLIMATE AGREEMENT? *Серія Політичні науки*, 25.

Victor, D. G. (2011). *Global warming gridlock: creating more effective strategies for protecting the planet*. Cambridge University Press.

Ward, B., & Bowen, A. (2020). An analysis of the Trump Administration's economic and policy arguments for the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement on climate change. *The Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment*.

Zen, R. W. (2013). Kebijakan Politik Republik Rakyat China Sebagai Negara Penghasil Emisi Gas Terbesar di Dunia tahun 2011-2016. *Jurnal Kajian Politik*, 53(9).

Zhang, H. B., Dai, H. C., Lai, H. X., & Wang, W. T. (2017). US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement: Reasons, impacts, and China's response. *Advances in Climate Change Research*, 8(4), 220-225.

Zhang, Y. X., Chao, Q. C., Zheng, Q. H., & Huang, L. (2017). The withdrawal of the US from the Paris Agreement and its impact on global climate change governance. *Advances in Climate Change Research*, 8(4), 213-219.