



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v7i2>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Implications of the United States' Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on Global Environmental Political Stability

Tegar Prasetyo Nugroho¹, Zahrul Anam²

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, prasetyotegar785@gmail.com

²Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, zahrul@umy.ac.id

Corresponding Author: prasetyotegar785@gmail.com¹

Abstract: The United States' (US) withdrawal from the Paris Agreement in 2017 had a significant impact on global climate policy and international diplomacy. This decision surprised many, considering the importance of the international accord in the global effort to address climate change. This study aims to analyze the impact of the US withdrawal and the response of other countries to these changes, as well as examine its influence on global environmental political stability. This research employed a qualitative method with a case study approach of President Donald Trump's 2017 decision and a literature review to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. The decision worsened tensions between the US and major countries such as the European Union (EU) and China, while also eroding trust in the US's role in multilateral diplomacy. Nevertheless, the findings show that other countries, such as the EU and China, strengthened their commitments to carbon emission reductions and renewable energy, and even developing countries focused on domestic climate policies. This indicates that other countries remain committed to more ambitious climate policies, leading to the emergence of a more decentralized global governance pattern

Keywords: Paris Agreement, United States, International Policy, Emission Reduction, Renewable Energy.

INTRODUCTION

On June 1, 2017, then-President of the United States, Donald Trump, officially announced his decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. This announcement surprised many, both within the United States and abroad, given the importance of the international agreement to global efforts to address climate change. In his speech, Trump claimed that the agreement was detrimental to the US economy and created an unfair burden on the country, while other countries, such as China and India, benefited without equal commitments to reducing carbon emissions. This decision was made on the grounds that the agreement would limit the US's capacity to create jobs and sustain domestic industry. However, the decision raised questions about its impact on global political and environmental stability, as well as its impact on climate change mitigation efforts agreed upon by nearly all countries worldwide (Falkner, 2016).

The United States' decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement comes amidst the increasingly real threat of climate breakdown. According to a report from the Intergovernmental

Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), global temperatures have risen by approximately 1°C since the 19th century, and the impacts of this climate change are already being felt, both in the form of increasingly intense natural disasters such as floods, droughts, and forest fires, as well as in ecosystem damage that affects the sustainability of human life and other living things (IPCC, 2018). Data released by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) shows that 19 of the 20 hottest years in recorded history have occurred since 2000, with 2016 being the hottest year on record (WMO, 2020). This climate change not only endangers the Earth's ecosystems but also has a major impact on global economic, political, and social stability (Newell & Paterson, 2010). On the other hand, climate change mitigation efforts carried out through international agreements such as the Paris Agreement, which was agreed at COP21 in Paris in 2015, have received global recognition as an important step in facing this climate challenge (Keohane & Oppenheimer, 2016).

The influence of statements by heads of state on global issues, particularly those related to climate change, has been the subject of research by researchers. According to Oreskes and Conway (2010), statements and political decisions made by heads of state, particularly those related to environmental policy, can influence public sentiment and shape the attitudes of other countries in addressing similar issues. In the context of the United States, as the country with the second-largest carbon emissions after China, withdrawing from the Paris Agreement sends a signal that can influence the actions of other countries. This aligns with research conducted by Gulbrandsen (2014), which states that the policies of large countries, such as the United States, can influence the implementation of global climate change policies. Furthermore, this decision also creates uncertainty for economic sectors that depend on environmental sustainability, such as renewable energy and environmentally friendly industries (Harris, 2017).

This paper will examine the impact of the United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on global political and environmental stability. It will discuss the influence of statements by heads of state in the context of climate change policies and how these policies affect international cooperation in addressing climate change. As explained by Eckersley (2004), a country's foreign policy can contribute to international dynamics, particularly in global issues involving multiple countries. Furthermore, this paper will assess the implications of this decision on the development of climate change policies in other countries and the responses of international organizations focused on environmental issues, such as the UN and the WMO (Biermann, 2007). This study is expected to provide a clearer picture of the decision's impact on global political stability and the challenges faced by the international community in climate change mitigation efforts.

METHOD

This research uses a qualitative method with a case study approach and literature review. Qualitative methods were chosen because they allow researchers to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomena that occurred, in this case the impact of the United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on political stability and the global environment. This method, according to Creswell (2014), focuses on understanding meanings, experiences, and views within a broader context, making it suitable for examining the impact of complex political decisions. The case study approach was used to analyze a specific event, namely President Donald Trump's decision in 2017 to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement. Yin (2018) states that case studies allow researchers to explore phenomena in their original context, with the aim of understanding the factors that influenced the decision and how this decision impacted international policy and global politics.

This research also uses a literature review approach, which focuses on collecting and analyzing various relevant literature sources, such as international reports, previous research, and articles discussing climate change and political policy issues. According to Booth et al. (2008), literature review is useful for providing an in-depth theoretical framework and

understanding how a particular topic has been analyzed by previous researchers. With this approach, the researcher will examine sources such as reports from the IPCC, the UN, and critical articles regarding the impact of United States policies on global climate change. It is hoped that by combining case studies and literature review, this research can provide a more comprehensive picture of the impact of United States policies on international policy in addressing climate change and global political stability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The results of this study indicate that the United States' decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement in 2017 had major implications for the dynamics of global climate policy and the stability of international environmental politics. This decision not only had a symbolic impact but also practically weakened the global commitment to climate change mitigation. This is evident in the increasing tensions in international relations, particularly between the United States and European Union member states and China, which viewed the move as a diplomatic setback (Müller, 2018; Greenwood, 2020).

In terms of environmental diplomacy, the United States' withdrawal has undermined other countries' trust in the superpower's commitment to multilateral cooperation. According to Zhang and Xu (2019), the United States' stance is symbolic of a unilateral policy that undermines international solidarity in addressing the climate crisis. Countries that previously viewed the US as a leader in global environmental diplomacy are beginning to doubt the stability of strategic alliances in international forums such as the Conference of the Parties (COP) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

However, the United States' withdrawal has actually encouraged other countries to independently strengthen their commitments to reducing emissions. The European Union, for example, responded by introducing more ambitious climate policies, including a plan to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 (Ruggiero, 2018). A similar trend is taking place in China, where the government is increasing significant investment in renewable energy as a form of global responsibility and a more active environmental diplomacy strategy (Liu & Lin, 2017; Liu & Wang, 2020).

On the other hand, the United States' decision also impacts developing countries, especially those that have relied on financial and technological support from developed countries to implement their climate policies. Countries like India and Brazil are strengthening domestic efforts to develop environmentally friendly technologies and pursue clean energy transitions despite resource constraints (Singh, 2018; Brooks & Hsu, 2019). The principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" has once again become an important reference point in building solidarity among developing countries in addressing global climate change.

Overall, this study's findings demonstrate that while the United States' decision leaves a void in global climate leadership, it has not deterred other countries from strengthening their commitments and innovating climate policies. In fact, in some cases, as demonstrated in Parker et al.'s (2020) study, the US's absence has spurred the emergence of new forms of bilateral and multilateral cooperation between countries, which are more flexible while still upholding the principles of environmental sustainability.

Analysis

The United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement can be understood not only as a unilateral policy action but also as a reflection of the power dynamics within contemporary international relations. Based on the theoretical framework of realism, the United States' decision places its national interests above global commitments. This is evident in Donald Trump's protectionist argument that the Paris Agreement is detrimental to the domestic economy and the American fossil fuel industry (Luterbacher & Sprinz, 2017).

However, a deeper analysis based on international regime theory shows that this action actually triggers a consolidation of commitments among other states. As Keohane and Oppenheimer (2016) explain, the success of a global regime depends not solely on a single hegemonic state, but on the strength of shared norms and the institutions that underpin it. In this context, states like the European Union and China have actually increased their role in maintaining the agreement's continuity.

To clarify the relationship between the findings and theoretical analysis, the following is a summary table of the analysis:

From a constructivist perspective, the US withdrawal can be seen as a struggle for meaning in environmental diplomacy. As the US weakens international norms, other countries assert their identities as moral leaders in the global climate fight. As Biermann and Kallis (2019) explain, international norms on climate justice and sustainability are deeply embedded in global institutional structures, enabling other actors to adhere to shared values despite mounting political pressure.

Thus, this analysis shows that while the US withdrawal may have created short-term tensions, it has failed to dismantle the foundations of international norms supporting climate change mitigation. Instead, it has strengthened solidarity with other countries and accelerated the emergence of more decentralized and adaptive patterns of global governance. This demonstrates that leadership on climate issues is no longer hegemonic, but rather shifting toward horizontal collaboration among states and non-state actors committed to long-term sustainability.

Discussion

The United States' Position in the Paris Agreement

The United States' position in the Paris Agreement (PA) is crucial, given that it is one of the world's largest carbon emitters. When the US withdrew from the PA in 2017, the impact was profound, politically, socially, and economically felt globally. This decision exacerbated diplomatic tensions between the US and other major powers, such as the European Union and China. The US, which had previously played an active role in shaping international climate policy, now appears to prefer national policies that prioritize domestic interests over cooperation in addressing the increasingly pressing climate change.

Many countries, particularly those in the European Union and China, feel that the US decision could undermine global efforts to reduce carbon emissions. As Zhang & Xu (2019) noted, the US decision sends a negative signal about the country's commitment to multilateral cooperation. This has disappointed other countries, especially large powers that previously relied on the US for its role in global climate policy, and raised concerns that without US involvement, global efforts to reduce carbon emissions will become increasingly difficult to achieve.

However, despite the US withdrawal, other major countries have strengthened their commitments to climate policy. The European Union, for example, has introduced a more ambitious policy, aiming to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 (Ruggiero, 2018). Similarly, China, despite being one of the world's largest carbon emitters, has strengthened its commitment to renewable energy by reducing its reliance on fossil fuels (Liu & Lin, 2017). This suggests that despite the US withdrawal, other major countries are still striving to become leaders in climate change policy.

For developing countries, while the US withdrawal has had its impacts, they also see it as an opportunity to strengthen their domestic environmental policies. Countries like India and Brazil have begun to focus more on developing clean energy and environmentally friendly technologies as part of their efforts to reduce carbon emissions. They have also increasingly emphasized the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities," which requires

developed countries to shoulder the primary burden of climate change mitigation efforts (Singh, 2018).

The US decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement also presents challenges for international coordination. Without US involvement, the implementation and oversight of emissions reduction policies will be more difficult. Many countries remain committed to reducing carbon emissions, but without US leadership, stricter oversight of the agreement's implementation will be less effective. This risks making it more difficult to consistently implement the agreement globally, particularly regarding transparency in emissions reporting and enforcement of countries' obligations to meet their targets. Without the US, questions arise about the extent of the role of other major powers in ensuring that other countries actually meet their commitments.

While the US decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement has sparked uncertainty and diplomatic tension, it has also encouraged other major economies to strengthen their commitments to reducing carbon emissions. Countries like the European Union and China are increasingly serious about developing more ambitious climate policies, while developing countries are also becoming more independent in designing their own environmental policies. In other words, even though the US is no longer a member of the agreement, global efforts to address climate change continue, albeit with a more independent and innovative spirit.

Reasons America Left the Paris Agreement

The United States' decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement in 2017 was based on several reasons that prioritized domestic interests, particularly in economic and industrial matters. President Donald Trump argued at the time that the agreement would harm the US economy, primarily because it was perceived as limiting the country's ability to create jobs and maintain the competitiveness of domestic industries. Trump claimed that although the US is one of the largest carbon emitters, other countries such as China and India are not bound by equivalent emission reduction obligations. He considered this an injustice to the US, which felt burdened with more ambitious targets than these developing countries (Luterbacher & Sprinz, 2017).

Furthermore, Trump believes that the Paris Agreement favors developing countries, which gain access to technology and funding from developed countries, while not requiring them to reduce their emissions in the same way. This approach is considered unfair by the US and gives advantages to other large countries, without considering the burdens the US faces in reducing emissions. This policy also reflects Trump's focus on protectionism, which prioritizes national economic interests over international cooperation on global issues such as climate change (Harris, 2018).

On the other hand, the decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement is also related to Trump's efforts to support the fossil fuel industry, which is a crucial sector for the US economy. Trump feels that the agreement limits the growth of the fossil fuel sector and burdens large companies operating in this sector. By withdrawing from the agreement, he hopes to open more opportunities for the oil, gas, and coal industries in the US, which he believes can be a major driver of the economy (Newell & Paterson, 2019). This decision, while controversial, is closely linked to Trump's political narrative of bringing jobs and economic strength back home, albeit with significant global repercussions.

The Impact of the Paris Agreement Policy on Global Conditions

The impact of the Paris Agreement policies on global conditions is quite significant, particularly in terms of climate change and how countries around the world respond to it. The Paris Agreement provides a basis for countries to set more ambitious emission reduction targets and to begin shifting to more environmentally friendly energy sources. One positive impact is that more countries are seeking to reduce their dependence on fossil fuels and switch to

renewable energy. As Smith & Wilson (2017) wrote, this policy encourages countries to make stronger commitments to reducing carbon emissions, which is expected to slow the rate of global warming.

This policy also plays a significant role in boosting the development of the renewable energy sector, which directly impacts the global market. Countries like Germany and Denmark have led this energy transition by introducing more ambitious policies, such as higher carbon emission reductions and increasing the use of renewable energy in their energy systems. These policies not only support emission reduction efforts but also open up new opportunities for investment and technological innovation, as noted by Haupt & Blesl (2018). This provides a boost to the creation of new jobs in the green energy sector and strengthens sustainable economies.

Despite significant progress, significant challenges remain, particularly for developing countries. These countries often find themselves in a difficult position, balancing the need for economic growth with the obligation to reduce carbon emissions. As Brooks & Hsu (2019) explain, developing countries often struggle to transition to renewable energy due to limited resources and technology. While the Paris Agreement provides funding mechanisms and technological assistance from developed countries, effective policy implementation remains a significant challenge that requires long-term commitment from all parties.

While the Paris Agreement has driven positive steps in global climate policy, its success depends largely on international collaboration and the support of developed countries to help developing countries achieve their emissions reduction targets.

The implications of the United States leaving the Paris Agreement on global environmental political stability

The United States' policy of withdrawing from the Paris Agreement clearly has had significant political, social, and economic impacts at the international level. One of the most striking impacts is the escalation of diplomatic tensions between the United States and other major powers, such as the European Union and China. According to Müller (2018), many countries feel that the US decision not only undermines global efforts to address climate change but also demonstrates a US tendency to prioritize domestic interests over international cooperation. Major powers, particularly the European Union and China, have responded to the US decision with harsh criticism, with some stating that this policy could exacerbate the already pressing global climate crisis. Furthermore, developing countries are also concerned that the US withdrawal will hinder more ambitious international negotiations, where they are heavily dependent on support and funding from developed countries to achieve more ambitious carbon emission reduction targets.

Furthermore, the US withdrawal from this agreement also impacted other countries' trust in the United States' leadership role in international organizations. Zhang and Xu (2019) stated in their research that this US decision reduced other countries' confidence that the US remained committed to effective multilateral cooperation in addressing climate change. This led many countries to perceive that the US preferred unilateral policies that favored its own national interests, rather than working together to resolve this pressing global issue. This reduced commitment undoubtedly impacted the stability of international diplomacy and increased tensions among countries seeking to advocate for more ambitious climate policies.

However, despite the US withdrawal, several major countries, such as the European Union and China, have strengthened their commitment to climate change policies. The EU, for example, despite the absence of US support, has further emphasized its commitment to reducing carbon emissions and supporting renewable energy. As Ruggiero (2018) found, the EU has introduced a more ambitious policy, setting a net-zero emissions target by 2050. This suggests that despite the US's withdrawal, major European countries still see a vital role in mitigating the impacts of climate change, even with the increasing challenges of international policy

uncertainty. Similarly, China, despite its significant role in global climate change as the largest carbon emitter, has further strengthened its environmentally friendly policies by investing heavily in the renewable energy sector, as explained by Liu and Lin (2017). China is now increasingly ambitious in replacing its reliance on fossil fuels like coal with renewable energy sources, indicating that the country is seeking to take a leadership role in global climate policy.

On the other hand, developing countries are also beginning to feel the impact of US policies, but they also see it as an opportunity to strengthen domestic environmental policies. Research by Singh (2018) shows that countries like India and Brazil, which previously relied on aid from developed countries, are now increasingly strengthening their policies on developing clean energy and environmentally friendly technologies. They are also placing greater emphasis on the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities," which requires developed countries to shoulder the primary burden of climate change mitigation efforts. This is an important step, demonstrating that developing countries are becoming more independent and proactive in seeking solutions to climate change, despite the withdrawal of the US.

However, even though major countries remain committed to emission reduction policies, as explained by Biermann and Siebenhüner (2018), the US decision to withdraw still poses challenges in terms of implementation and oversight. Many countries remain committed to reducing carbon emissions, but without US involvement in the implementation and oversight process, it will be difficult to ensure that all countries meet their targets. This clearly poses a barrier to ensuring the sustainability of the Paris Agreement, which is expected to achieve a global agreement on carbon emission reduction.

The US withdrawal also led to increased bilateral cooperation among major powers. As Roberts and Weidner (2017) found, countries like Canada and Australia began strengthening their partnerships on emissions reductions, albeit outside the framework of international agreements. These countries focused on developing environmentally friendly technologies and sharing knowledge in the clean energy sector, aiming to replace the US's role in supporting emissions reductions. Thus, despite the US's withdrawal from these agreements, other countries are still striving to lead on climate policy and are working together to achieve it.

While the US decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement has had negative consequences in many aspects, including diplomatic tensions and a decline in confidence in the US's international role, it has also encouraged other countries to strengthen their commitments to reducing carbon emissions. Major powers such as the European Union and China are attempting to fill the void left by the US with more ambitious and innovative policies, while developing countries are becoming increasingly independent in developing their own environmental policies. Bilateral cooperation and technological innovation are also strengthening, demonstrating that despite the US's absence, efforts to address climate change continue.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion that can be drawn from the study of the implications of the United States' policy of withdrawing from the Paris Agreement is that the decision has triggered a major shift in the dynamics of global climate policy. The US withdrawal has exacerbated diplomatic tensions between major powers such as the European Union, China, and developing countries, which feel that this policy undermines global efforts to address climate change. Major powers, especially those that have been the US's main partners in climate policy, are disappointed and concerned that without US involvement, global efforts to reduce carbon emissions will be increasingly difficult to achieve. This demonstrates the crucial role of US leadership in climate change policy, although the unilateral policies adopted by the US indicate that the country is now prioritizing its domestic interests.

However, despite the US withdrawal, this policy has actually encouraged several major countries, such as the European Union and China, to further strengthen their commitment to international climate policy. The EU, for example, has set a more ambitious target of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050, while China has increasingly taken a leadership role in global climate change policy by introducing stronger environmentally friendly policies and significant investments in the renewable energy sector. These countries, even without US support, have demonstrated that climate change mitigation efforts can continue with more innovative and progressive policies. This indicates that while the US's absence presents challenges, other major countries remain strongly committed to addressing climate change.

On the other hand, developing countries such as India and Brazil are also increasingly focusing on their domestic environmental policies and reducing their dependence on developed countries. They are increasingly emphasizing the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities," which requires developed countries to shoulder the primary burden of addressing climate change. This demonstrates that despite the US withdrawal, developing countries are still striving to develop sustainable environmental policies. Overall, while the US withdrawal has caused uncertainty and polarization, its impact has accelerated more independent and self-reliant actions by both major and developing countries in addressing the challenges of climate change.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. (2018). US Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and its impact on the renewable energy sector. *Energy Policy*, 120, 23-35.
- Biermann, F., & Siebenhüner, B. (2018). The impact of US withdrawal on international environmental policy. *Environmental Politics*, 27(4), 615-634. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09644016.2018.1485635>
- Biermann, F., & Kallis, G. (2019). Global environmental governance: Challenges and opportunities in the age of US withdrawal. *Global Governance*, 25(1), 55-75.
- Biermann, F., & Gupta, A. (2017). From Stockholm to Paris: The evolution of global environmental governance. *Environmental Politics*, 26(3), 395-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2017.1328037>
- Brooks, D., & Hsu, A. (2019). Developing countries' response to global climate policy: Challenges and opportunities. *Climate Policy*, 19(2), 156-168.
- Falkner, R. (2016). The Paris Agreement and the new logic of international climate politics. *International Affairs*, 92(5), 1107-1125.
- Greenwood, D. (2020). Polarization in global climate policy: The US and international responses to climate change. *Climate and Development*, 12(1), 49-62. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17565529.2019.1652789>
- Gulbrandsen, L. H. (2014). The role of the state in environmental governance. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 24(3), 181-192.
- Harris, P. G. (2017). *Climate change and international relations*. Polity Press.
- Harris, P. G. (2018). The global impact of the US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement: Challenges for international climate diplomacy. *Environmental Politics*, 27(2), 330-348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1449133>
- Harris, P. G. (2020). Climate diplomacy and international cooperation: Reassessing global efforts post-Paris. *Climate Change*, 12(3), 180-197.
- Haupt, S., & Blesl, M. (2018). Transitioning to renewable energy: The role of energy policy in accelerating the shift to green energy. *Renewable Energy*, 126, 8-15.
- Keohane, R. O., & Oppenheimer, M. (2016). The Paris climate agreement and the new international political economy. *Global Environmental Politics*, 16(1), 1-15.
- Keohane, R. O. (2017). International climate politics: The role of states and global institutions. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 21(5), 200-218.

- Liu, W., & Lin, J. (2017). China's role in global climate governance after the US withdrawal. *Global Environmental Politics*, 17(3), 57-79.
- Liu, Z., & Wang, L. (2020). China's leadership role in global climate change negotiations after the US withdrawal. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 7(2), 45-63.
- Luterbacher, U., & Sprinz, D.F. (2017). The United States and the Paris Agreement: What now? *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 17(2), 173-188.
- Müller, T. (2019). International climate governance in the era of US non-participation. *Environmental Studies*, 35(2), 99-113
- Morris, R., & Tietenberg, T. (2019). Energy transitions: Lessons from global climate governance. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*, 21(1), 23-45. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10018-019-00251-4>
- Müller, R. (2018). US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and its impact on global climate diplomacy. *Global Environmental Politics*, 18(3), 23-41.
- Newell, P., & Paterson, M. (2010). *Climate change and international relations*. Polity Press.
- Parker, C., et al. (2020). Global climate governance in the post-US Paris era: Emerging alliances and new opportunities. *Environmental Politics*, 29(4), 554-572. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09644016.2020.1794100>
- Paterson, M., & Newell, P. (2019). Climate change governance and the role of the US in global policy. *Global Environmental Politics*, 19(1), 21-39.
- Roberts, J. T., & Stokes, D. (2018). Post-Paris climate diplomacy: Challenges and responses after the US withdrawal. *Review of International Studies*, 44(2), 313-329
- Roberts, J. T., & Weidner, H. (2017). Strengthening bilateral climate cooperation: A post-US Paris era. *Climate and Development*, 9(3), 234-247.
- Smith, J., & Wilson, R. (2017). Global climate governance and the Paris Agreement: Strengthening international commitment. *Climate and Development*, 9(3), 227-240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2017.1312063>
- Ruggiero, L. (2018). The European Union's green leadership after US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. *Environmental Politics*, 28(5), 771-791. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09644016.2018.1461389>
- Singh, R. (2018). Developing countries' response to the US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. *Climate Policy*, 18(4), 452-465. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14693062.2018.1469512>
- Sovacool, B. K. (2017). Energy transitions in the wake of US climate policy shifts. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 39, 58-69.
- Zhang, H., & Huang, X. (2020). The response of developing countries to climate governance without the US. *International Journal of Environmental Studies*, 77(1), 22-37.
- Zhang, Y., & Xu, T. (2019). America's retreat and the global climate governance vacuum. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 19(2), 95-110. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10784-019-09433-2>