



Norges miljø- og
biovitenskapelige
universitet

Master's Thesis 2020 30 ECTS

Faculty of Landscape and Society

The United States' Climate Alliance : A Communicative Action Perspective

Racquel Narvarte

Master in International Relations

Acknowledgment

This thesis work has brought me to transitions – from confusions to learning, from tears to smiles and from disappointments to hope. I doubted myself many times but I have chosen to fight! Truly, in every challenge in life, we must not give up!

I wholeheartedly want to thank my supervisor Tomohiro Harada, for making time to guide me throughout the process. Your constructive criticisms have helped me a lot to be on track when I am losing direction.

To my husband Henry and to my children PM, AM and Maine, you are all my inspiration and contentment! This thesis work is for you!

Racquel Narvarte

Oslo, Norway

Abstract

On June 1, 2017, US President Trump announced the United States decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. This announcement sprouted a lot of debates and criticisms, locally and internationally. Later that same day, the governors of Washington, New York and California announced the formation of the United States Climate Alliance to act towards the goal of the Paris Agreement despite the decision of the US federal government. It did not take long until they become 23 member US state governments that is made up of half of the US population. The Alliance serves as a forum where the US governors interact towards their action to fight climate change and commit efforts towards the goal of the Paris Agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions up to 26-28% by 2025. This thesis asks how do the Trump administration justify its decision to withdraw from the Paris agreement despite being the second largest emitter in the world. It finds that the Trump administration positions American people (coal manufacturing businesses, taxpayers, working class, families) as victims of the withdrawal narrative. It also finds that it puts itself in the hero narrative, asserting in putting and protecting America first for the welfare of Americans. It demerits the Paris Agreement as a bad deal, big disadvantage to American economy, redistributing wealth of United States to the exclusive benefits of other countries. It also asks how does the US state governors disputed the withdrawal. It finds that the US governors condemned the withdrawal as “shameful” and “irresponsible”, thus forming the United States Alliance to act towards Paris Agreement goals and urging other US state governors to join the important action towards security against the shared understanding of the reality of climate change.

Table Of Contents

Abstract

1. Introduction

1.1. Thesis Outline

2. Great Powers Exit from Global Regimes: When and Why?

2.1. Powerful States Withdrawals from Global Regimes

2.1.1 Withdrawal Cases of the United States

2.1.2 United Kingdom on Brexit

2.2. Cooperation Under International Institutions: The Realists and Liberalists Speak

2.3 This Thesis

3. The Theory of Communicative Action: Habermas' "Linguistic Turn"

3.1 What is Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action?

3.2 Arguing in Communicative Action

3.3 Communicative Action as Methodologically Holistic

3.4 Habermas' ontology as Distinct to Searle's Speech Act Theory

3.5 The Concept of Communicative Rationality

3.6 The Concept of "life-worlds"

3.7 Communicative Action Among Academic Scholars

3.8 Criticisms

4. Methodology

4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

4.2 The Choice of Data Materials

4.3 Challenges

5. The Trump Administration versus the "Others" in the Paris Climate Deal

5.1 The Victim Narrative

5.2 A Hero Narrative: Assertion of “America First” Policy

5.3 Demerits the Paris Climate Deal

6 The United States Governors in Action!

6.1 Condemnation of the White House Decision to Withdraw from the Paris Climate Deal

6.2 Shared Understanding of The Reality of Climate Change

6.3 Coordination to United States Climate Alliance Committed to an Equal Force of Climate Action

6.4 Urge Other States to Join the US Climate Alliance

7. Discussions and Conclusion

8. References

1. Introduction

Globalization brought the establishment of international institutions. But the establishment of these institutions also created debates within international relations when states which are members of the international agreement, worse, have been parts in its formation suddenly withdraws. It becomes a practice of states to give reasons why they withdraw from an international agreement. This reason giving seems to serve a legitimating function.” (Mitzen,2005,p.401) What will happen, however, when the United States, being the second largest emitters of greenhouse gases, withdraws its cooperation from the urgent global climate action against climate change through the Paris Agreement?

US President Trump shocked the world in June 2017, when he announced his intention to withdraw United States from the Paris Agreement. The 2015 Paris Agreement serves as a new global effort to avert the effects of global warming that aims to carbon cuts and limit the temperature rise to 1.5 degree Celsius. The withdrawal will not yet be effective until November 2020, but it drew a lot of attention domestically and internationally. The United States now becomes the sole country member of United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that is not a part of any climate mitigation efforts set by the Paris Agreement.

Following Trump’s announcement of withdrawal from the Paris Agreement that day, the United States Climate Alliance was formed and announced by three US State Governors Jay Inslee of Washington, Andrew Cuomo of New York and Jerry Brown Of California. The Alliance is committed to achieve the U.S. goals of greenhouse gas reduction by 26-28% by 2025. “U.S. Climate Alliance states are committed to taking real, on the ground action that urgently addresses the climate challenge. In becoming an Alliance member, states commit to: (1)implement policies that advance the goals of the Paris Agreement, aiming to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 26-28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025; (2)Track and report progress to the global community in appropriate settings, including when the world convenes to take stock of the Paris Agreement, and (3.) Accelerate new and existing policies to reduce carbon pollution and promote clean energy deployment at the state and federal level.” (United States Climate

Alliance, 2019) The Alliance also acts as a forum to sustain and strengthen existing climate programs, promote the sharing of information and best practices, and implement new programs to reduce carbon emissions from all sectors of the economy. (State of Washington, 2017)

The action the US state governors to form an alliance such as United States Climate Alliance, which have aims in contrast to the climate policy of the US federal government thus becomes the basis of my research questions:

RQ1: How does the Trump administration justifies its decision to leave the Paris Agreement while being the world's second largest emitter in the world?

RQ2: How do the justifications of the Trump administration disputed by the US state governments?

1.1 Thesis Outline

Section 2 presents my literature review about when and why do greatpowers exit from global regimes. Section 3 presents my theoretical framework, exploring Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action; Section 4 presents my methodology; Sections 5 and 6 are both part of my analysis answering my two research questions respectively and Section 7 is discussion and conclusion.

2. Great Powers Exit from Global Regimes: When and Why?

The withdrawal of powerful states from global regimes is causing widespread concern because they appear to signify a backlash or non-cooperation against international regimes and create impacts to other states included in the agreements. This chapter provides existing empirical cases and theoretical studies of powerful states withdrawals from global regimes, upon where this thesis' contribution is founded.

2.1. Powerful States Withdrawals from Global Regimes

2.1.1 Withdrawal Cases of the United States

“The United States has suspended financial support to UNESCO twice. First, in 1977 over political decisions, when Israel’s petition to be considered part of Europe was denied and in 1984, over national interest and cold war conspiracy, costing UNESCO some \$43 million in lost revenues.” (Valderrama 1995,p.294, as cited in Meskell, 2013,p. 490) In 1985, the Reagan Administration withdrew the US from UNESCO citing personal grounds of the agency’s “politicization of every subject it deals with and exhibition of hostility towards the basic institutions of a free society, free press and its efforts to introduce a new world information order”. (Wells, 1987, p.109) And since reforms within UNESCO were not affected that time, UK also withdrew from the UN agency at the end of 1985, followed by Britain in 1986. Von Borzyskowski & Vabulas, (2019) studied “when” do states withdraw from international organizations and documented more than 200 cases of states withdrawal from intergovernmental organizations using an original dataset of more than 493 IGOs since 1945. They found out that “nationalism and other domestic political factors are not a driving force for IGO withdrawals across time and argue that geo-political factors (preference divergence, contagion and IGO’s democratic density) are integral to understanding when and why states withdraw from IGOs: first, when a state’s preferences diverge from average preferences in the institution, that state is more likely to withdraw; second, contagion makes IGO withdrawal more likely: when important countries – including founding members, regional powers, or economic hegemons -- lead the way in withdrawing, other states often follow so that they are not left with an inflated burden and fewer benefits”. (Von Borzyskowski & Vabulas, 2019,p. 39)

The Bush administration signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 but abandoned it in March 2001, prompting the 180 country delegates of the COP in Bonn to gather in July 2001 to save the collapse of the Protocol. “Bush explicitly declined to ratify the Protocol, reasoning that the costs of the economy would be too high and exemption of developing countries from binding emission targets would not be acceptable.” (Böhringer, 2003,p.457)

Dabbous et.al, (2019) studied Trump’s shift from multilateralism to bilateralism citing that Trump’s decision to withdraw US from several multilateral agreements like Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), UNESCO and Paris Agreement all in the year 2017 was due to one major reason – that these agreements are not beneficial to American citizens. In 2018, Trump also made his intention to withdraw from NAFTA. He leveraged bilateral negotiations, luring Mexico over a new trade deal and warning Canada of being left out of the new deal if it will not negotiate. This resulted in replacing NAFTA with USA-Mexico-Canada Agreement or USMCA. “President Trump will continue to seek success to US demands by leveraging bilateral negotiation settings and applying economic and political pressure on its trade partners.” (Dabbous et.al, 2019, p.7)

In their study, Clarke & Ricketts (2017,p.373), examined Trump’s foreign policy programs and cited that “Trump’s unwillingness to endorse Article V of the NATO Treaty that binds member nations to defend one another if one comes under attack, is only looking after the physical and economic security of the Americans; and Trump’s withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, is labeled by the administration as encroaching upon America’s ability to conduct its own domestic affairs”. The authors argue that the notions of national honor and reputation that suggests strategy of unilateralism are the driving factors that underpin Trump’s foreign policy agenda, which disconnects the United States from the post World War international order.

With U.S. leading international treaties from 60’s to 70’s to shifting leadership to EU in the 90’s, Kelemen & Vogel (2010) argue that US relationship with multilateral efforts to address climate change has oscillated between engagement and disengagement and that regulatory politics provide explanation to why EU and US traded places as leaders to international environmental issues. Kelemen & Vogel

(2010, p.451) concluded that “a regulatory politics model that links the effects of domestic politics and international regulatory competition provides the most powerful explanation for shifting U.S. and EU positions in international environmental politics.” US opposition to the 2000 Cartagena Protocol, for example was due to its disadvantages to US farmers, while Europe championed the protocol to internationalize regulatory restrictions of GM imports and stood to gain in raised cost to American competitors. (Kelemen & Vogel, 2010)

2.1.2 United Kingdom on Brexit

The result of the referendum in United Kingdom in 2016 leading to its exit from the European Union shocked the world. The momentous event of June 23, 2016 was described as David Cameron’s referendum gamble turned into great miscalculation. (Glencross, 2016) The Brexit or the exit of UK from EU cause a lot of studies why the leave vote succeeded to the 2016 referendum in UK. Swales (2016,p.11) says “the leave victory was not about demographics alone, but also feelings of national identity and sense of change in Britain over time. Others like Hobolt (2016) argue fears of immigration and multiculturalism as reasons behind the Leave vote. Goodwin & Milazzo (2017,n.p.) states that “most of those who voted for Brexit were aware of the local changes and felt negatively about how historically unprecedented levels of immigration were impacting on the national economy, culture and the welfare state.” “Rising economic insecurity and social deprivation among the left-behinds has fueled popular resentment and populist forces have proven decisive for the outcome of the British referendum on membership in the European Union in 2016.” (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, p.30) “Economic arguments for Brexit have focused on the ideas that leaving the EU’s Customs Union would allow the United Kingdom to strike new trade agreements with non-EU countries and that leaving the Single Market would allow the United Kingdom to deregulate its economy (Booth, Howarth, Persson, Ruparel, and Swidlicki (2015), as cited in Sampson, 2017,p.173)

2.1.3 Russia’s Withdrawal from the International Criminal Court

President Putin of Russia withdrew from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court on November 16,2017. “Russia denounced the ICC’s work as one-sided and inefficient, holding them accountable only through the UN Security Council

where they also have a strong influence and veto powers.” (Ndubuisi, & Onoriode, 2018, p.154)

2.2. Cooperation Under International Institutions: The Realists and Liberalists Speak

Widely associated with neoliberal institutionalism, Robert Keohane refutes the view that the decline of hegemony makes cooperation impossible and argues that international institutions or international regimes facilitate cooperation among states. Keohane’s “After Hegemony” stresses that cooperation can still happen based on state interests. “He focuses on the economic relations among advanced market economies where he believes common interests are greatest and the benefits of international cooperation the easiest to realize.” (Herbert,1996. p.225) In short, cooperation can be a potential goal for states. This cooperation, however, depends on the existence of an international institution or recognized patterns of practice. Self-interested, egoistic actors in world politics can seek to form international regimes and may follow their rules and principles on the basis of shared interests, sacrificing self-interest. Absolute gains (total gains regardless of greater gains of others) can also be motivations cooperate, according to neoliberalism.

It is not safe to say, however, that cooperation is very easy in neoliberalism. States may fail to cooperate because of lack of information about the other party’s true preference, cheating and free-riders who are gaining without doing something. Also, states may be discouraged to cooperate because of fear. “Because states fear that their cooperative partners may fail to live up to mutual agreements, states may be discouraged from engaging in cooperative projects.” (Dunne et.al. (2007, p. 122) According to Ikenberry (1999,p.45), says “the United States had to engage in strategic restraint of hegemonic power after postwar order, through the potential binding effects of international institutions. “International institutions do not simply serve the functional purposes of states, reducing transaction costs and solving collective action problems, but they can also be “sticky” – locking states into ongoing and predictable courses of action”. “It is this lock-in effect of institutions that allows them to play a role in restraining the exercise of state power and in effect, institutions create constraints on state action that serve to reduce the returns to power – that is, they reduce the long-term implications of asymmetries of power.” (Ikenberry, 1999, p.45)

For realists, on the other hand, cooperation is difficult because of the concern of relative gains (if the other party state gains more, then the other party may not want to enter cooperation) and cheating. In “The False Promise of International Institutions”, John Mearsheimer held a pessimistic assessment of the liberal institutionalism’s claim that “institutions are important cause of peace”. He argues that though states in a realist world are fundamentally competitive, cooperation is possible, yet difficult to achieve. He cited that considerations of relative-gains hold back cooperation. “Cooperation is more difficult to achieve when states are attuned to relative-gains logic rather than absolute-gains logic.” (Mearsheimer, 1994,p.12) Cooperative efforts become complicated when states worry about how the pie is divided; each side not only considers its individual gain, but also how well it does compare to the other side. (Mearsheimer, 1994) Another hindrance to cooperation is the concerns of cheating. “States are often reluctant to enter into cooperative agreements for fear that the other side will cheat on the agreement and gain a relative advantage.” (Mearsheimer, 1994,p.13)

2.3 This Thesis

As presented, most of the researches above focus on the question of when withdraw and why these powerful states withdraw from international institutions. There has been less attention on the question of “how”, from which this thesis aims to contribute. “How does the Trump administration justify its decision to leave the Paris Agreement while being the world’s second largest emitter in the world?” “How do the justifications of the Trump administration disputed by the US state governments?”

3. The Theory of Communicative Action: Habermas' "Linguistic Turn"

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework of the thesis. In this section, I will explore Habermas' theory of communicative action. The chapter presents first the general information in section 3.1 about the general information about theory of communicative action, Section 3.2 discusses the logic of arguing in communicative action; Section 3.3 points to the TCA as methodologically holistic; Section 3.4 provides distinction of communicative action from the Speech Act Theory which I believe is important in emphasizing that communicative action is not the speech act itself but a type of action; eventually narrowing it down to Section 3.5 with exploring the concept "communicative rationality", to explain Habermas' concept of reason with the role of language; and section 3.6 with the concept of the "life-worlds", to explore the connection of language and of the validity of claims. These concepts are entry points to the conceptualization of the justifications of Trump administration and the interaction of the United States governors, in relation to the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement. Section 3.7 presents academic usage of the theory of communicative action and lastly Section 3.8 presents critiques of the TCA.

3.1 What is Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action?

The theory of communicative action is built by Jurgen Habermas, one of the most renowned philosophers, the most famous of the Frankfurt School and German sociologist in the tradition of critical theory and pragmatism. After critical reception of his book *Knowledge and Human Interests* (1968), Habermas shifts from the theory of knowledge to a theory of language which has become known as Habermas' "linguistic turn" – a paradigm shift away from early modern period's ontological approach on the philosophy of the subjects. Habermas started the theory of communicative action to ground social science in a theory of language which eventually became the foundation of future theories involving law, democracy and morality. It is a two-volume book, exceptionally rich and dense and was listed by the International Sociological Association as the eighth most important sociological book of the 20th century. In the first volume which entitled, "Reason and the Rationalization of Society (*Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung*), Habermas establishes the concept of *communicative rationality*. In the second volume, "Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason (*Zur*

Kritik der funktionalistischen Vernunft), Habermas created the two level concept of society – life-world (symbolic space of collectively shared background, convictions, of culture, values and institutions; and the system (sphere of material production and reproduction; capitalist economy, political bureaucracies, industries).

Habermas defines communicative action as the interaction of at least two subjects capable of speech and action who establish interpersonal relations (whether verbal or by extra-verbal means) and these actors seek to reach an understanding about the situation and their plans of action in order to coordinate their actions by way of agreement. (Habermas, 1984,p.86) It is a form of action where actors attempt to reach agreement through reciprocal argumentation. Participants need to discuss the action for what they should do in acting upon the situation with valid behavior. “Habermas holds that to understand a speech act, the use of a sentence or sentences in a social context, is to know the conditions under which the claim of the utterance will be acceptable.” (Baxter,1987,p.42) It is a shift from individual reason to inter-subjective communication. “Such reasoning formed inter-subjectively is required where living together but differently in shared space and time drives us to search for ways of finding agreement on how to address our collective concerns.” (Healey,1992,p.237) The theory of communicative action shows that the social world forms an integral part of a decentered understanding of the world, which in turn forms the basis of action oriented toward reaching understanding. (Habermas,1990)

3.2 Arguing in Communicative Action

Communicative action has been equated with arguing (Holzinger, 2004;Risse,2000), though arguing and bargaining are ubiquitous in international relations (Crawford, 2002: 98, as cited in Müller, 2004). Holzinger,2004 defines “arguing” as “justifying” or “giving reasons”. Arguing appeals to reason and different kinds of positions can be justified by various means. “Argument may be defined as the exchange of reasons by participants who are oriented to reaching consensus and remain open to changing their minds if faced with better reasons.” (Habermas, 1984,1996, as cited in Mitzen,2005,p.401). It relies on consensus though, that is the assent of all participants. Thus it makes communicative action a reconstruction of the concept of reason that is grounded in communicative act – a human action and understanding that has linguistic structure. “There may be situations where the pure will is legitimate

but justification becomes obligatory when volitions restrict or curb another party's will which then must be measured against other's claims and rights, freedoms, norms or distributional rules." (Holzinger,2004,p.198) "Facts, norms and values have to be used as justification for the simple wish to be turned into a legitimately recognized wish, where there is agreement on the validity of the norm and of the proof of the empirical claim." (Holzinger,2004,p.198)

Arguing is the means and presupposes the existence of a speaker and an addressee who shall be convinced, where the end is to persuade the addressee of the accuracy of a factual statement, the validity of a norm, or the fairness of the claim. (Holzinger, 2004,p.199) This is different with bargaining that is equated to strategic action, though both take place with disagreements or conflicts that are to be solved. Bargaining is only among parties involved in the agreement and does not include the audience. "Bargaining is inducing the addressee to make concession or to compromise. Bargaining describes the mutual adjustment of demands and wishes by virtue of giving way, either by forsaking one's own ideal goal, or by acknowledging the other party's demands." (Holzinger,2004,p.198) In Risse's article entitled "Global Governance and Communicative Action", he reiterates that arguing and communicative action are significant tools for non-hierarchical steering modes in global governance. (Risse, 2004) "Both arguing and persuasion constitute tools of soft steering that might improve both the legitimacy problems of global governance by providing voice opportunities to various stakeholders and the problem-solving capacity of governance institutions through deliberation." (Risse, 2004,p.1) "Actors engage in truth seeking with the aim of reaching a reasoned consensus (*verständigungsorientiertes Handeln*) challenging the validity claims in any communication, thus Habermas' critical theory of communicative action is helpful in conceptualizing the logic of arguing and can actually be brought to bear to tackle empirical questions in world politics." (Risse, 2000,p.2)

3.3 Communicative Action as Methodologically Holistic

Most scholars today understand politics in terms of self-interested behavior. The pursuance of self-interest holds the society together. "Schools like rational choice theory, public choice, social choice and game theory all represent continuations and

slightly different modifications of the postulate that political behavior can and should be studied as individual, strategically calculated, utility maximizing actions.”(Eriksen & Weigård,1997,p.220) The theory of communicative action focuses on social interaction rather than on isolated individuals. “Individuals reach common understandings, form communal bonds and construct collective identities through communicative action.” (Miller,1992) Yet, TCA does not compel consensus. “Habermas is not forcing us to aim for consensus, he simply means a foreswearing of the mechanisms of coercion and influence in the pursuit of one’s goals and a corresponding commitment to provide reasons for one’s claims if they are challenged.” (Markell,1997, as cited in Martin,2005, p. 368)

Habermas differentiates success-oriented action (instrumental action; strategic action in influencing the actions of other rational actors), to an action oriented toward reaching understanding. “In communicative action, the existence and validity of social norms at the inter-subjective level and the ability to reach mutual understanding are the coordinating mechanisms.” (Eriksen & Weigård,1997,p.221) “Reaching understanding is a process by which participants seek agreement concerning the nature of their interaction and such agreement defines the context within which actors pursue their individual plans.” (Johnson, 1991,p.183) Other types of action that are oriented toward reaching understanding are normatively regulated action and dramaturgical action. In normatively regulated action, participants conform to socially expected modes of behavior while in dramaturgical action; agents constitute a public before whom they can present themselves. (Johnson,1991) Habermas views all these types of action as rational that are capable of being defended from criticism and are tied to validity claim. But to be precise about communicative action, Habermas involves interacting participants in the mode of cooperative negotiation of common definitions of the situation that is made explicit through a discourse or an argument, in admitting of consensus.

Rational choice approach focuses on the individual, referred to as a *homo economicus*, who makes individual decisions among choice alternatives and determine the best choice of action according to availability of information, costs and benefits and probabilities of events. The individual actor then, balances costs and benefits and seek the most efficient means to realize a certain end. His preference

ordering or his utility function defines the end. This action aimed at maximizing utility is a version of instrumental rationality, where the individual actor calculates alternatives to reach the subjective goal or to maximize a function. "Choices are then rational when they can reasonably be expected to advance the actor's objectives." (Eriksen & Weigård, 1997,p.222) It follows the determinant of the individual choice as methodological individualism. Methodological individualism explains social life in showing how it results from individual human action and interaction (Elster 1989a, p.13, as cited in Eriksen & Weigård, 1997). Methodological holism claims social science as reflecting the reciprocal relationship between how people shape their social environment and are in turn shaped by it. (Eriksen & Weigård, 1997,p.221) In short, in methodological individualism, social phenomena are the product of individual action while in methodological holism action and individuals are products of society. Communicative action theory holds on to a form of methodological holism, which implies that individual actors reach a mutual understanding or consensus.

In contrast to rational choice theory, "communicative action provides a broader concept of rationality that recognizes communicative as well as strategic and instrumental forms of rationality and focuses on social interaction rather than on isolated individuals"(Miller, 1992, p.22) "Collective identity has been directly linked to communicative interaction and the solving of the free rider problem." (Calhoun 1988; Dawes et al.,1990; Kanter 1972; Mansbridge 1990, as cited in Miller, 1992,) When actors take a stand in the debate, it is the rational weight of the arguments that matters. "Rational communication is a precondition for civilized conflict resolution as for the stability and durability of the political order." (Eriksen & Weigård,1997,p.219) "Individuals reach common understandings, form communal bonds and construct collective identities through communicative action." (Miller, 1992, p.22)

If we look at similarities, both rational choice theory and theory of communicative action are action theoretical approaches, where social phenomena is understood as the result of conscious human action. But with the perceptions of this human action also lies the difference. In the study of politics, human action can be rational or irrational, strategic or communicative. Strategic action implies that the individual actor is success oriented. But Habermas' theory of communicative action "clarifies the rationality of the action oriented toward understanding and in light of Habermas'

work, it seems that a realistic theory of collective action would recognize the unselfish as well as the selfish motivations of human beings, communicative as well as strategic rationality, and actors' collective and individual identities." (Miller, 1992, p. 39) In choice theoretical approach, monological actor pursues self-interest (focus on individual actor while others are just external people) and carry out strategic action. In communicative concept of rationality, "dialogical actors coordinate plans through argumentation aimed at reaching consensus and this understanding of rationality thus has its point of departure that people live together in a normatively integrated life-world, which implies that only a collectively responsible actor is considered to be a rational actor." (Eriksen & Weigård,1997,p.221)

3.4 Habermas' ontology as Distinct to Searle's Speech Act Theory

Communicative action is not the same as speech though it uses language to determine set of shared goals. "Communicative and strategic action are not speech acts, but types of action that include the wider orientation of the speakers and comprise many speech acts that aims at producing consensus with the presumption that both speaker and listener enter the communication." (Müller, 2004) Habermas assumes that language must be comprehended in terms of the structures of discourse. (Taylor,1991) Actors are also assumed as competent language users. Society is to be explained from the vantage point of language, the structures of discourse. "When speaking, the agent must set aside the particular set of mundane objectives that he might like to achieve and instead adopt a set of standardized intracommunicative goals to reach mutual understanding." (Heath,2003,p.23) Speech, for Habermas is distinct from instrumental action. "When speech is used to resolve the coordination problem, it generates the form of action that habermas refers to as communicative action, that explicitly draws upon the public commitments underlying linguistic interactions in order to secure coordination and therefore creates commitments for all agents involved." (Heath,2003,p.23)

Dietz & Widdershoven (1991) argues that between speech act theory and the theory of communicative action, the latter is superior. Habermas examination of Searle's speech act theory has also led to the theory of communicative action, where in the former, the communication of a request by a speaker (S) to a hearer (H) is an attempt

by S to get H to do something and the communication is successful if H does perform the requested act. (Dietz & Widdershoven, 1991,p.236) Though Habermas sees the importance of language as a means for coordinating action, he criticizes Searle for overlooking the participants' orientation and the need to distinguish between the situation in which H performs the requested act either because he wants to evade sanctions or the situation in which he does so or because he accepts the validity of S's claims in a rational way. (Dietz & Widdershoven, 1991) Searle overlooks the orientation towards mutual agreement thus he is incapable to distinguish between power claims and validity claims, between empirical and rational coordination of action. (Habermas,1981,p. 430 ff; 1988, p.136 ff, as cited in (Dietz & Widdershoven, 1991) Habermas stresses that communicative action takes place when participants are oriented towards mutual agreement to achieve a common definition of a situation and regulative speech acts has primary role in the coordination of action.

“The concept of communicative action is indispensable in political analysis as it renders understandable how agreements can be reached and a stable social order achieved.” (Eriksen & Weigård,1997,p.238) But the model of action oriented toward reaching understanding must specify the preconditions of an agreement to be reached communicatively that allows alter to link his actions to egos. (Habermas, 1990) Reaching of an agreement that is the goal of efforts to reach understanding is a mechanism for coordinating actions.

“The theory of communicative action argues that speech acts are the elementary units of communication and the propositional content of speech acts establishes a relation between the utterance and the outside world. (Schoop,2001, as cited in Umapathy,1988p. 61) TCA distinguishes worlds as objective, social and subjective.”(Cecez-Keemanovic and Janson, 1999; Habermas 1984, as cited in (Umapathy,1988) Different types of utterances or illocutionary forces relate to these worlds. “If an actor utilizes statement of belief, desire, intentions then the actor is communicating about the objective world; if an actor utilizes statements directing action (directive), or statements intending actions (commissive), or statements making official judgements (verdictive), then the communication would be about the social world; and if an actor utilizes statements expressing attitudes then the communication would be about the subjective world.” (Umapathy,1988,p.62)

3.5 The Concept of Communicative Rationality

Weber defines action as human behavior with intention, thus a solitary acting subject. Habermas argues that this Max Weber's definition of rationality has a limited view of action. From Marx to Weber, from Lukacs to Adorno, the rationalization of society was always thought of as a reification of consciousness and it were George Herbert Mead and Emile Durkheim who both developed basic concepts in which Weber's theory of rationalization may be freed up from the aporias of the philosophy of consciousness – Mead with his communication-theoretic foundation of sociology and Durkheim with a theory of social solidarity connecting social integration to system integration. (Habermas,2015,n.p.) Habermas reformulates the problem of reification through communicative action and subsystems via steering media. Though he does not reject instrumental conception of rationality (specific agent to perform a particular action and actions are means for the agent's preferred outcome), he replaced it with communicative rationality in which the action is governed by standards of choice. "The instrumental model fails to explain how a preponderance of force and fraud can be avoided in social interaction and fails to explain how agents can generate the fund of trust needed to sustain shared cooperative activity, thus positing a set of publicly shared values that could be transmitted directly into action, seems to solve the problem." (Heath,2003,p.17)

Communicative rationality, then, is based on raising validity claims between two or more subjects and speakers implicitly claim that their statements are true, correct and sincere. (Miller,1992) Habermas argues that rationalization cannot be dealt with the conceptual frame of consciousness. Communicative rationality encompasses coordinating actions- an intersubjective rationality. Habermas explicates communicative action as a theory of communicative rationality - rationality as structurally coordinated. This is intended by Habermas as a remedy to the limitation of cognitive-instrumental rationality. Habermas argues that in the utterance of a speech, the speaker unavoidably raises "validity claims". These validity claims can be redeemed only through discourse within the an ideal speech situation – a situation free from domination.

Habermas reiterates that communicatively achieved agreement has rational basis and rests on common convictions which means that it cannot be imposed by either party

through intervention or influencing decisions. (Habermas, 1984) Communicative action can help explain how people reach mutual agreements on factual and normative matters (Eriksen & Weigård,1997) Communicative action does not equate action with communication but designates a type of interaction that is coordinated through speech acts and does not coincide with them. (Bolton, 2005)

3.6 The Concept of “life-worlds”

According to Habermas, life-world is the social world where individuals establish more or less direct relationship with others. Life-world for Habermas is the lived realm of mutual understandings and argues that communicative action and life-world complement one another. (Kruger,1991) The lifeworld includes immediate contacts or that are within the world of the individual. Participants pursue their individual goals under the condition that they can harmonize their plans of action on the basis of the common situation definitions. (Baxter,1987,p.46) Habermas acknowledges that communicative action takes place within a social context for an action situation, the life-worlds, which offers both context for an action situation and resources for interpretive processes in communication of participants in reaching consensus.

The concept of “life-worlds” helps define Habermas’ theory of communicative action and locate the concept of communicative action within the concept of society. Habermas wants to show that the concept of the social world forms an integral part of a decentered understanding of the world, which forms the basis of action oriented toward reaching understanding. (Habermas, 1990) In the two level concept of society, Habermas placed communicative action in the ‘lifeworld’ and the strategic action in the ‘system’. “The actor stands face to face with that situationally relevant segment of the lifeworld that impinges on him as a problem but the actor is supported from behind by a life-world that forms the context for the process of reaching understanding and furnishes resources for it.” (Habermas, 1990,p.135) The solidarity of groups integrated through values and the competences of socialized individuals also serve as resources for action oriented toward reaching understanding. (Habermas,1990)

The situation is that part of the world relevant at a given time to the goals and interests of the participants where they interpret and seek to master through resource like cultural standards of interpretation, value and expression or stock of knowledge. (Baxter,1987,p.46) A situation is a segment of the life-world where a theme arises with individual action plans.

Achieving consensual understanding must be met with activity of interpretations, which implies that the action situation is also a speech situation. The actors take turns playing the communicative roles of speaker, addressee, and by-stander, simply called the speaker perspectives that are intertwined with the world perspectives. (Habermas, 1990) Yet Habermas argues that “even agreement among individuals to pursue common ends would break down as soon as one party considered it in his or her interest to abrogate the agreement and so as soon as we consider the nature of action not from the perspective of the isolated actor, but from the actor who must live with others, the importance of institutional norms in coordinating, even constituting actors’ pursuit of ends becomes obvious. (Baxter, 1987,p.46)

“Collective action cannot be understood apart from the dynamics of the system and the colonization of the lifeworld and capital’s search for spatial fixes can have adverse consequences for collective action.” (Miller,1992,p.39) “New social movements are defined by attempts to defend or claim new lifeworld spaces.” (Miller,1992,p.39) “Local mobilization to address local issues may be highly desirable but in an increasingly global capitalist system, community life is not a microcosm of the whole but a compartment.” (Calhoun,1988,p.172, as cited in Miller,1992,p.39) Movements or organizations must address issues on an appropriate scale to be effective. “When people find themselves unable to control the world, they simply shrink the world to the size of their community, thus, urban movements do address the real issues of our time, although neither on the scale nor terms that are adequate to the task.” (Castells, 1984, p.331, as cited in Miller,1992,p.39) Communities then need to link themselves to larger communities or organizations that is based on mutual understanding – the inherent telos of communication.

3.7 Communicative Action Among Academic Scholars

Aside from Risse (2000) and Lynch (2002) scholars in International Relations that used Habermas Communicative Action Theory in their studies, Mitzen (2005,p.401) used communicative action in her study of global public spheres and multilateral diplomacy and argues that public talk can mitigate the security dilemma and enable interstate communicative action. The LAP (language-action perspective) is grounded from the theory of communicative action and speech act theory (Umapathy,1988) Bjola (2005) also used communicative action perspective in his examination of the legalistic approach to the concept of legitimacy of the use of force and argues that the approach overlooks situations where legal standards are rendered instruments of deception and political manipulation of powerful actors. Bjola (2005,p.293) argues that “the theory of communicative action with its concept of deliberative legitimacy suits well to address the problem as the non-coerced commitment of an actor to obey a norm adopted on the basis of the criteria and rules reached through a process of communicative action, adding second dimension to the legal component especially when legal standards offer conflicting interpretations on the matter”.

Forester (1992) showed in his study of a critical ethnographic work considering just a fragment of a professional staff meeting, that Habermas’ communicative action can be appropriated for empirical, political and social research and critical ethnographic analysis. Communicative action has been understood as metatheoretical but the study of Forester suggests and illustrates empirical appropriation of communicative action where his analysis “reveals the play of power and action, with multiple voices presenting and contesting facts, norms, selves and representational styles”. (Forester,1992,p.63)

3.8 Criticisms

One of the criticisms against communicative action is the emphasis on language. Langsdorf (2000,as cited in Bolton, 2005) questions the applicability of the theory to real-world communication because communication is much more than language. But according to Habermas, language in the other three action models is one-sided

(teleological action is getting someone to do something; in normative action, language is a medium to transmit values and consensus; in dramaturgical, language is the medium of self-representation to an audience). (Bolton, 2005) Communicative action is a medium of uncurtailed communication that takes all the functions of language equally into consideration. (Bolton, 2005)

Habermas' conception of communicative action has been criticized by holding on to reason and that for believing that consensus can be arrived at, as others would argue that social relations like class, race, gender and culture can only be resolved through power struggle between conflicting forces, (Healey, 1992,p.238) But Habermas justifies his retention of reasoning not apart from the language of morality or aesthetics. He argued that reasoning is a legitimate guiding principle for collective affairs where we need to engage in argumentation and debate in when our concern is collective action. (Healey,1992) "Our intersubjective practical reasoning draws on the store of knowledge and understanding of technique, morality and aesthetics and in this way, our collective reasoning is informed by, and situated within, the various life-worlds from which we come to engage in our collective enterprises." (Healey, 1992,p.238)

4. Methodology

4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

My chosen approach in this thesis is critical discourse analysis, a variant of discourse analysis. Critical discourse analysis incorporates insights from discourse analysis thus should not be treated as being “totally” in opposition or contradiction to discourse analysis. (Bryman, 2016,p.531) “Discourse analysis shares with CDA a preference for locating contextual understanding in terms of the situational specifics of talk”. (Bryman, 2016) This thesis acknowledges the importance of language in social relations. I agree with Fairclough (1992, as cited in Fairclough 2001),that “the increased importance of language in social life has meant more conscious attempts to shape it and control it to meet institutional or organizational objectives. The role of language is important, as it needs to be comprehended in discourses where speeches generate form of action. CDA provides in analyzing texts and interactions. CDA seeks to discern connections of language and other elements of social life in its linguistic and semiotic aspect. (Fairclough, 2001) CDA does not only concern with analysis but is critical in the sense that it has emancipatory knowledge interest. (Habermas, 1971, as cited in (Fairclough, 2001) Though it does not begin with texts and interactions, it starts with “social issues” and “problems”. CDA focuses on what is widely perceived as a crisis in the the space where individuals meet to debate issues of common concern that are under threat. (Fairclough, 2001,p.230) In this thesis, the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement of United States is of great concern as it is the second largest GHG emitter in the world and its inaction with carbon cut emissions cause attention locally and internationally.

In conducting critical discourse analysis, I used Fairclough’s model for CDA (1989,1995, as cited by Janks, 1997) that consists of three dimensions of critical discourse analysis which includes (1)the object of analysis (the verbal or visual texts); (2) processes by means of which the object is produced and received (writing/speaking/designing/listening/viewing) by human subjects; (3)socio-historical conditions(social condition) which govern these processes. The aim of the interactional analysis within the CDA is to show how semiotic, including linguistic properties of the text connect with what is going on socially in the interaction.

(Fairclough,2001p.240) According to Fairclough, “each of these dimensions requires different kind of analysis, namely (1) text analysis (description; looking for patterns, linguistic functions that contradict or confirm one another); (2)processing analysis (interpretation; the production, distribution and consumption of texts) ; (3)social analysis (explanation; power relations, ideologies and hegemonic struggles that discourse reproduce, challenge or restructure).” (Janks, 1997) Texts are instantiations of social discourses and Fairclough’s model of CDA analysis and is useful in providing multiple points of analytic entry and the interconnections of patterns that describe, interpret and explain. (Janks, 1997)

4.2 The Choice of Data Materials

To answer the first research question RQ1, “How does the Trump administration justifies its decision to leave the Paris Agreement while being the world’s second largest emitter in the world?”, I used Trump administration speeches transcripts and interview statements (specifically US president Trump, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, US Vice-President Mike Pence, National Security Adviser HR Mc Master, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo) during and after Trump’s announcement of withdrawal from the Paris Agreement in Rose Garden June 1, 2017. These actors speeches (in transcripts) and statements regarding the decision of the United States to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, have effects to society because there is no external relationship between language and society. In discourses, language is a form of social practice and is part of the society. (Fairclough, 2001) Language becomes a phenomena when these languages have social effects. These actors are said to have contributed part of Trump’s decision of withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. . The speeches and statements are found in news website articles and government websites.

To answer the second research question RQ2, How do the justifications of the Trump administration disputed by the US state governments?” I used speeches (in transcripts) and statements of the US Governors that are members of the United States Climate Alliance. These speeches and statements are found in news articles in news websites, US state websites/United States Climate Alliance website. These particular actors within the US politics/government that have taken an action criticizing the validity claims of the Trump administration becomes relevant in this study for very

reason that, they are important actors in coming up with an action that are contradictory to the US federal government's climate policy. "Michael Billig writes that to understand the meaning of a sentence or whole discourse in an argumentative context, one should not examine merely the words within that discourse or the images in the speaker's mind at the moment of utterance." (Hajer,1993,p.45) Though within the same country of power politics, their power cannot be equated with the US federal government's power to sign and withdraw in accordance with the Paris Agreement rules. As according to Hajer(1993,p.45), "one should also consider the positions which are being criticized, or against which a justification is being mounted because without knowing these counter-positions, the argumentative meaning will be lost."

4.3 Challenges

This is my first time to conduct a critical discourse analysis so I encountered a lot of challenges. Most challenging for me was, I didn't know where to start the analysis. Questions like, "How will I analyzed these materials?" or "What shall I do with these text/transcripts/articles? Or "How can I do it step by step?" popped unto mine. Then, I searched for models that can guide me conduct a CDA. Thankfully, I found Fairclough's model of CDA that guided me to take note of the important aspects to be analyzed in the texts/articles.

5. The Trump Administration versus the “Others” in the Paris Climate Deal

This chapter analyzes speeches and statements of Trump administration, which includes President Trump, Scott Pruitt and Vice President Mike Pence, HR McMaster, Mike Pompeo, who are supporters of Trump’s decision on moving out from the Paris Climate Deal, to answer my first research question, RQ1, “How does the Trump administration justifies its decision to leave the Paris Agreement while being the world’s second largest emitter in the world?”. Section 5.1 covers the victim narrative wherein Trump administration justifies decision by identifying the losing sides in the Paris Climate Deal. Section 5.2 covers the hero narrative wherein Trump administration justifies the decision by asserting its “America’s First Policy”. Section 5.3 presents the demerits of the Paris Climate Deal by the Trump administration.

5.1 The Victim Narrative

PRESIDENT’S TRUMP SPEECH ON PARIS ACCORD WITHDRAWAL

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-agreement/>

Trump said in front of Rose Garden as part of his announcement of decision about Paris Accord, “*But begin negotiations to re-enter, either the Paris Accord or in, really entirely new transaction on terms that are fair to the United States, its businesses, its workers, its people, its taxpayers*” (people losing on the deal, as for his point of view). (Trump is open to re enter negotiations; choices between Paris Accord or a new one of which the one that is fair to US, businesses, workers, people and tax payers is better) “*So we’re getting out.*” (after talking about possibilities of reentering a new one or a better Paris Accord, he abruptly said a statement of leaving the Paris Accord) “*But will we start to negotiate and we will see if we can make a deal that’s fair.*” “*And if we can, that’s great.*” “*And if we can’t, that’s fine.*” (re-negotiation depends on the fairness of the deal)

“As president, I can put no other consideration before the well-being of American citizens.” (America first before others) *“The Paris Climate Accord is simply the latest example of Washington entering into an agreement that disadvantages the United States, (United States is losing) to the exclusive benefit of other countries,(other countries are exclusively gaining) leaving American workers, (losing sector) who I love, (expression of love to American workers) and taxpayers (losing sector) to absorb the cost in terms of lost jobs, lowered wages, shuttered factories and vastly diminished economic production.”* *“Thus as of today, the United States will cease all implementation of the non-binding* (since it is non-binding then we have the right to cease) *Paris Accord and the draconian financial and economic burdens the agreement imposes on our country.”* (emphasizing the Paris agreement puts burden to United States). *“This includes ending the implementation of the nationally determined contribution and, very importantly, the Green Climate Fund, which is costing the United States a vast fortune.”* (giving importance to fund, finances of the US) According to Ludden (2017) ,”Under Obama, the U.S. transferred \$1 billion, but Trump's budget proposal does not include payments for the rest”.

Compliance with the terms of the Paris Accord and the onerous energy restrictions it has placed on the United States could cost America (America will be losing a lot of money for compliance) *as much as \$2.7 million lost jobs by 2025, according to* (having a basis) *the National Economic Research Associates. This includes 440,000 fewer manufacturing jobs – not what we need, (manufacturing workers are losing) believe me* (he is trying to convince with the truth), *this is not what we need* (again trying to convince), *including automobile jobs and the further decimation of vital American industries on which countless communities rely. They rely for so much and we would be giving them so little.*

China will be allowed to build hundreds of additional coal plants. So, we can't build the plants, but they can, according to this agreement. India will be allowed to double its coal production by 2020. Think of it. (emphasis) *India can double its coal production. We're supposed to get rid of ours. Even Europe is allowed to continue construction of coal plants.* (Comparison statements with what others like China, India and Europe can and what the United States can't)

*In short, the agreement doesn't eliminate coal jobs. **It just transfers those jobs out of America and the United States and ships them to foreign countries.** This agreement is **less** about the climate and **more** about other countries gaining a financial advantage over the United States. **The rest of the world applauded** when we signed the Paris Agreement. They went wild. They were so happy. (emphasizing America is losing transferring job opportunities abroad while other countries are gaining financially much more)*

*For the simple reason that it put our country, the United States of America, **which we all love, at a very very big economic disadvantage.** (again reiterating they love America that is at losing position now) A cynic would say the obvious reason for economic competitors and **their wish to see us remain in the agreement is so that we continue to suffer this self-inflicted, major economic wound.** We would find it very hard to compete with other countries from other parts of the world. (Self-inflicted means it was the United States which made itself suffer in joining the agreement during the Obama administration, creating big economic disadvantage and the economic competitors (renewable energy businesses; other countries) obviously want them to stay in the agreement).*

*We have among the most abundant energy reserves in the planet, sufficient to lift millions of America's poorest workers out of poverty. (America's coal reserves) **Yet** under this agreement, we are **effectively putting these reserves under lock and key, taking away the great wealth of our nation.** (The Paris Agreement hinders the economic progress from coal) **It's great wealth. It's phenomenal wealth. Not so long ago, we had no idea we had such wealth. And leaving millions and millions of families trapped in poverty and joblessness.** The agreement is a **massive redistribution of United States' wealth to other countries.** (again reiterating America is transferring its own wealth to other countries)*

*The Paris Agreement **handicaps the United States' economy** in order to win praise from the **very foreign capitals and global activists** that have long sought to gain wealth at our country's expense. (again, the United States being put in expense) **They don't put America first. I do. And I always will.** (putting emphasis that he always puts America first)*

*The **same nations asking us to stay in the agreement are the countries that have collectively cost America trillions of dollars through tough trade practices and, in many cases, lax contributions to our critical military alliance.** (United States as victim of other countries who wants to take advantage of America's financial contributions) You see what's happening. **It's pretty obvious** to those that want to keep an open mind. (very clear to them)*

*At what point does America get demeaned? At what point do they start laughing at us, as a country? **We want fair treatment for its citizens and we want fair treatment for our taxpayers.** We don't want other leaders and **other countries laughing at us** anymore. And they won't be. They won't be. I was elected to **represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris.** (reiterating he is for Americans and is calling for fairness)*

SCOTT PRUITT'S INTERVIEW STATEMENTS

<https://insideclimatenews.org/news/13042017/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-paris-climate-agreement-trump-tillerson-global-warming>

Showing in agreement to Trump, Pruitt said that “the United States *“frontloaded all of our costs”* under the Paris accord, *while* (in comparison) “China or India had no obligations under the agreement until 2030.” (Lavelle, 2017) Pruitt said that “his main objection to the treaty was *“that America was put last.”* (Lavelle, 2017) This is *in contrast* to April 3, 2017 interview with Fox's Chris Wallace, where Pruitt appeared to endorse maintaining a role in the Paris talks. (Lavelle, 2017) Pruitt said in that interview that, *“engagement internationally is very important and to demonstrate the leadership that we have shown on this issue with China and India and other nations is very important. Those discussions should ensue.”*

Pruitt continued. “People say that *it's not enforceable* (pessimistic about Paris goals enforcement),” *“Every meeting I've had with my counterparts from Germany, Canada and others, the first question they ask me is, 'What are you going to do to comply with Paris?’* (showing other counterparts in disagreement to Paris as a defense) *“So What that means is contracting our economy to serve and really satisfy Europe and China and India.”* (implying that US to Paris deal is not for its economy but for the good of others instead). *“They are polluting far more than we are.”* (again reiterating

unfairness) “ *We're at pre-1994 levels with respect to our CO2 emissions.*” This was statement from Pruitt's come at a time “when he has been under fire from some conservatives for not taking on the Obama administration's finding that carbon emissions are an endangerment to human health and ecosystems”. (Lavelle, 2017) “That finding is the legal foundation for the Obama administration's efforts on climate change, including the Clean Power Plan. Pruitt said during his confirmation hearing that he did not anticipate a review of the endangerment finding.” (Lavelle, 2017)

5.2 A Hero Narrative: Assertion of “America First” Policy

VICE-PRESIDENT MIKE PENCE SPEECH IN PRESENTING TRUMP TO ANNOUNCE THE PARIS CLIMATE DEAL DECISION

Good afternoon. Secretary Mnuchin , Secretary Ross, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, members of Congress, distinguished guests, on behalf of the First Family, welcome to the White House.

You know, it’s the greatest privilege of my life to serve as Vice President **to a president who is fighting** every day **to make America great again**. Since the first day of this administration, President Donald Trump **has been working tirelessly to keep the promises** that he made **to the American people**. President Trump has been reforming health care, enforcing our laws, ending illegal immigration, rebuilding our military, and this president has been rolling back excessive regulations and unfair trade practices that were stifling American jobs. Thanks to **President Trump’s leadership**, American business are growing **again**, investing in America **again**, and they’re creating jobs in this country **instead of** shipping jobs overseas. Thanks to President Donald Trump, **America is back**. (Praising Trump leadership in keeping promises during the campaign in making America great again, as if the greatness of America was gone).

And just last week we all witnessed the bold leadership of an American president on the world stage, **putting America first**. From the Middle East to Europe, as leader of the free world, President Trump reaffirmed historic alliances, forged new relationships, and called on the wider world to confront the threat of terrorism in new

and renewed ways. And **by the action the president will announce today**, the American people and the wider world will see **once again**, our president is choosing **to put American jobs and American consumers first**. Our president is choosing **to put American energy and American industry first**. And by his action today, President Donald Trump is choosing **to put the forgotten men and women of America first**. (The decision regarding the Paris Agreement will put America first)

So with **gratitude for his leadership** and **admiration** for his unwavering commitment to the American people, it is now my **high honor** and distinct privilege to introduce to all of you the President of the United States of America – President Donald Trump. (showing great honor and respect to Trump’s leadership and commitment to American people)

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S SPEECH ON PARIS ACCORD WITHDRAWAL

Retrieved From <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-agreement/>

In a ceremony at the White House Rose Garden (audience are those in the White House but also the world through media), Trump announced the decision of the United States about Paris Accord. He stated, *“Before we discuss the Paris Accord, I’d like to begin with an update on our tremendous — absolutely tremendous — economic progress since Election Day on November 8th.”* (Trump presented first the economic progress since the day he was elected, describing it as absolutely tremendous, before discussing Paris Accord) *“The economy is “starting to come back”* (as if it was gone; the economic progress was gone and is starting to come back since he was elected), *and “very, very rapidly”.* *“We’ve added \$3.3 trillion in stock market value to our economy, and more than a million private sector jobs.”* (Trump boasting his economic achievement) But according to Kurtzleben (2017), *“Commerce Department reported that the economy grew at an annual rate of 1.2 % in the first quarter of 2017”.* Trump continued, *We’ve added \$3.3 trillion in stock market value to our economy and more than a million private sector jobs. I’ve just returned from a trip overseas where we concluded nearly \$350 billion of military and*

economic development for the United States, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs. It was a very, very successful trip, believe me. (still boasting/emphasizing economic achievements) But as per Labor Department record, the actual number of 805,000 jobs is actually lower and most of these jobs were during Obama's term. (Kurtzleben, 2017)

Trump then continued that he is keeping his promises during his campaign for president. *“On these issues, (referring to Israeli-Palestinian conflict, immigration, labor factories back in the United States) and so many more, we're following through (a linear direction) on our commitments and I don't want anything to get in our way (nobody can stop them). I am fighting every day for the great people of this country (referring to American people). Therefore, in order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris Climate Accord.”* (withdrawing from the Paris Agreement is due to his duty to protect Americans)

Further, while the current agreement effectively blocks the development of clean coal in America, which it does and the mines are starting to open up, we're having a big opening in two weeks, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, so many places. A big opening of a big new mine, it's unheard of. For many many years, that hasn't happened. They asked me if I'd go. I'm going to try. (boasting new opening of mines on his term)

As the Wall Street Journal wrote this morning, the reality is that withdrawing is in America's economic interest and won't matter much to the climate. (devaluing the effect of the agreement to climate and the withdrawal has better effect to American economy) The United States, under the Trump administration, will continue to be the cleanest and most environmentally-friendly country on earth. We'll be the cleanest. We're going to have the cleanest air. We're going to have the cleanest water. We will be environmentally-friendly but we're not going to put our business out of work. We're not going to lose our jobs. We're going to grow. We're going to grow rapidly. And I think you just read, it just came out minutes ago, the Small Business Report, small businesses as of just now are booming...hiring people, one of the best reports they've seen in many years. I'm willing to immediately work with Democratic

leaders to either negotiate our way back into Paris under the terms that are fair to the United States and its workers or to negotiate a new deal that protects our country and its taxpayers. (Implying to the future of better America, even in cooperation with the Democrats, renegotiate to Paris Agreement when terms are fair to America)

So if the obstructionists want to get together with me, let's make them non-obstructionists. We will all sit down and we will get back into the deal and we will make it good and we won't be closing up our factories and we won't be losing our jobs and we'll sit down with the Democrats and all of the people who represent either the Paris Accord or something we can do that's much better than the Paris Accord and I think the people of our country will be thrilled. And I think the people of the world will be thrilled. But until we do that, we're out of the agreement. (will cooperate if presented with a better agreement than the Paris Accord)

I will work to ensure that America remains the world's leader on environmental issues but under a framework that is fair and where the burdens and responsibilities are equally shared among the many nations all around the world. (claiming for equality) No responsible leader can put the workers and the people of their country at this debilitating and tremendous disadvantage. (emphasizing his responsibility to American people) The fact that the Paris deal hamstrings the United States while empowering some of the world's top-polluting countries should dispel any doubt as to the real reason why foreign lobbyists wish to keep our magnificent country tied up and bound down by this agreement. (putting the United States on the losing side compared to top polluting countries like China and India) It's to give their country an economic edge over the United States. (as if other countries are taking advantage) That's not going to happen while I'm president. I'm sorry. (Trump will protect America from being abuse by Paris Agreement and other countries)

My job as president is to do everything within my power to give America a level playing field and to create the economic, regulatory and tax structures that make America the most prosperous and productive country on earth. And with the highest standard of living and the highest standard of environmental protection. (Trump's duty as president to make America to be the best, at highest among countries on earth)

*Our tax bill is moving along in Congress, and I believe it's doing very well. I think a lot of people will be very pleasantly surprised. The Republicans are **working very hard.** (complement) We'd love to have support from the Democrats but we may have to go it alone. But it's going very well. I promised I would exit and renegotiate any deal which **fails** to serve America's interest. (The Paris Agreement fails to serve America's interest) Many trade deals will soon be under renegotiation. Very rarely do we have a deal that works rot his country. But they'll soon be under renegotiation. The process has begun from day one.*

*But now we're down to business. Beyond the **severe energy restrictions inflicted by the Paris accord,** it includes **yet another scheme** to redistribute wealth out of the United States through the so-called **Green Climate Fund,** nice name, which calls for developed countries to send \$100 billion to developing countries, all on top of America's existing and massive foreign aid payments. So we're going to be paying billions and billions and billions of dollars and we're already way ahead of anyone else. Many other countries haven't spent anything. And many of them will never pay one dime. (Through the Paris Agreement, other countries is using the Green Climate Fund as a scheme to redistribute America's wealth to other countries)*

*The Green Fund would likely obligate the United States to commit potentially tens of billions of dollars, of which **the United States has already handed over \$1 billion.** (America's financial contribution so far) **Nobody else is even close.** (emphasizing America gave a lot) **Most of them haven't even paid anything.** (in comparison again with other countries, as if America is the only country contributing) Including funds raided out of America's budget for the war against terrorism. That's where they came. **Believe me, they didn't come from me.** (persuasion) They came just before I came into office. Not good. **And not good the way they took the money.** (condemning the financial scheme) In 2015, the United Nations' departing top climate officials reportedly described the 100 billion dollars per year as "peanuts." And stated that the 100 billion dollars is the tail that wags the dog. (informal terms specifying less powerful controlling the more powerful) In 2015, the Green Climate Fund's executive director reportedly stated that estimated funding needed would increase to \$450 billion per year after 2020 and nobody even knows where they money is going to. **Nobody's been able to say, where is it going to?** (doubt where is the money)*

*Of course, **the world's top polluters have no affirmative obligations** under the Green Fund, which we terminated. (top polluters aren't contributing financially compared to America) America is twenty trillion dollars in debt, cash-strapped cities cannot hire enough police officers or fix vile infrastructure, millions of our citizens are out of work and yet, under the Paris Accord, billions of dollars that ought to be invested right there in America, will be sent to the very countries that have taken our factories and our jobs away from us. So think of that. (Presenting problems of America while giving away billions to other countries that should benefit America first) There are serious legal and constitutional issues as well.*

*Foreign leaders in Europe, Asia and across the world should not have more to say with respect to the U.S. economy **than** our own citizens and their elected representatives. (American people should know better) Thus our withdrawal from the agreement **represents a reassertion of America's sovereignty.** (asserting independence from manipulation of other countries) Our Constitution is unique among all nations of the world and it is my highest obligation and greatest honor to protect it. And I will. **Staying in the agreement could also pose serious obstacles for the United States as we begin** the process of unlocking the restrictions on America's abundant energy reserves, **which we have started, very strongly.** (America already started going against the restrictions imposed by the Paris Agreement)*

It would once have been unthinkable that an international agreement could prevent the United States from conducting its own domestic economic affairs. But this is the new reality we face if we do not leave the agreement or if we do not negotiate a far better deal. (a choice to leave or renegotiate a better deal)

*The risks grow as historically, these agreements only tend to become more and more ambitious over time. In other words, the Paris framework is just a starting point, as bad as it is. Not an end point. And **exiting the agreement protects the United States** from future intrusions on the United States' sovereignty and massive future legal liability. Believe me, we have massive legal liability if we stay in. (the exit is for protecting America's sovereignty and against liability)*

*As president, I have **one obligation** and that obligation is **to the American people**. The Paris Accord would **undermine** our economy, **hamstring our workers**, **weaken our sovereignty**, **impose unacceptable legal risk** and put us at a **permanent disadvantage** to the other countries of the world. (demerits the Paris Climate Deal as against American people, economy, sovereignty)*

*It is time to exit the Paris Accord. And **time to pursue a new deal** that protects the environment, our companies, our citizens and our country. It is time to put Youngstown, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; and Pittsburgh, Pa.; along with many many other locations in our country, before Paris, France. **It is time** to make America great again. (Presenting his reasons of leaving , then now is the time to leave or renegotiate a better deal).*

SCOTT PRUITT'S SPEECH AFTER TRUMP'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF WITHDRAWAL

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-accord/>

*Thank you, Mr. President. Your decision today to exit the Paris Accord reflects your **unflinching commitment to put America first** and by exiting, you're fulfilling yet one more **campaign promise to the American people**. Please know that I'm thankful for your fortitude, your courage, and your steadfastness as you serve and lead our country. (an emphasis that the exit is for the American people)*

*America finally has a leader who answers only to the people, not to the special interests who've had their way for way too long. In everything you do, Mr. President, **you're fighting for the forgotten men and women across this country**. You're a champion for the hardworking citizens all across this land who just want a government that **listens to them and represents their interest**. (**protecting American people's interest and other's interests, other countries**)*

*You have promised to put America first in all that you do and you've done that in any number of ways, **from trade to national security, to protecting our border, to rightsizing Washington D.C.** And today, **you've put America first**, with regard to international agreements and the environment. (elaborating what Trump did to protect America first)*

*This is an **historic restoration of American economic independence**, one that will **benefit the working class, the working poor, and working people of all stripes**. With **this action**, you have declared that the people are rulers of this country **once again**. . (the exit is a restoration of independence for the good of American people; once again means as if it was gone) And it should be noted, that we as a nation do it better than anyone in the world, in **striking the balance** between growing our economy, growing jobs, while also being a good steward of our environment. **We owe no apologies to other nations** for our environmental stewardship. (they have no liability to others regarding the exit) **After all**, before the Paris Accord was ever signed, **America had reduced its CO2 footprint to levels from the early 1990s**. (in connection to the previous sentence, they already acted upon carbon emissions from before)*

***In fact**, between the year 2000 and 2014, the United States reduced its carbon emissions by 18 plus percent. (stating proofs) And this was accomplished, not through government mandate, but accomplished through innovation and technology of the American private sector. For that reason, Mr. President, you have corrected a view that was paramount in Paris, that somehow the United States should penalize its own economy, be apologetic, lead with our chin, while the rest of the world does little. Other nations talk a good game. **We lead with action, not words**. (they don't need to stay in the Agreement, since they are acting anyway)*

*Our efforts, Mr. President, as you know, **should be** on exporting our technology, our innovation, to nations who seek to reduce their CO2 footprint to learn from us. That should be our focus, versus agreeing to **unachievable targets that harm** our economy and the American people. (implying that Paris Agreement goals is unachievable)*

*Mr. President, it takes courage, it takes commitment to say no to the plaudits of men, while doing what's right by the **American people**. You have that courage and the **American people** can take comfort because you have their backs.* (again, reiterating the American people, the Paris exit is right commitment for American people)

Thank you Mr. President.

6.3 Demerits the Paris Climate Deal

SCOTT PRUITT, Environmental Protection Agency Administrator

<https://insideclimatenews.org/news/13042017/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-paris-climate-agreement-trump-tillerson-global-warming>

Pruitt said in PBS News Hour that, “Paris is something that *we need to really look at closely* (need rechecking), because it's something *we need to exit*, in my opinion.”(stating a personal view to wide audience). “It's a *bad deal* for America.” (the second sentence is a bolder phrase compared to the first sentence)

TRUMP

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-agreement/>

*“Not only does this deal subject our citizens to **harsh** economic restrictions, it **fails** to live up to our environmental ideals. (demeretting the Paris Deal) **As someone who cares deeply** about the environment, **which I do**, (puts merit on self) **I cannot in good conscience**(intolerance) support a deal that **punishes** the United States, which is what it does. The world's leader in environmental protection **while** imposing no meaningful obligations on the world's leading polluters. (a comparison of obligations of US as a protector and China and even India as polluters) For example, under the agreement, **China** will be able to increase the emissions by a staggering number of years – 13. **They can** do whatever they want for 13 years. **Not us**. (this time naming a comparison to China) **India** makes its participation **contingent** on receiving billions and billions and billions of dollars in foreign aid from developed countries. (showing India's dependence on finances from developed countries regarding participation) *There are**

many other examples but the **bottom line** is that the Paris Accord is **very unfair at the highest level** to the United States. (emphasizing the degree level) But according to Horsley (2017),

“China is on track to beat that target date by many years, according to the Climate Action Tracker and India is also ahead of schedule meeting its Paris commitments.”

At one percent growth, renewable sources of energy can meet some of our domestic demand but at three or four percent growth, which I expect, we need all forms of available American energy or our country will be at grave risk of brownouts and blackouts. (Emphasizing that renewable energy sources cannot meet American demands of energy)

Our businesses will come to a halt, in many cases, and the American family will suffer the consequences in the form of lost jobs and a very diminished quality of life. (those in sectors of available American energy will lost jobs if America will stay in the Agreement)

Even if the Paris Agreement were implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated it would only produce a 2/10 of one degree – think of that. This much....Celsius reduction in global temperature by the year 2100. Tiny tiny amount. (belittling the effect of the Paris Agreement)

In fact, fourteen days of carbon emissions from China alone would wipe out the gains from America...and this is an incredible statistic, would totally wipe out the gains from America’s expected reductions in the year 2030. After we’ve had to spend billions and billions of dollars, lost jobs and closed factories and suffered much higher energy cost for our businesses and for our homes. (For them, China emit so much carbon that America’s carbon emission cuts will be useless)

MICHAEL POMPEO’S PRESS STATEMENT ON THE U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PARIS AGREEMENT PRESS STATEMENT

<https://www.state.gov/on-the-u-s-withdrawal-from-the-paris-agreement/>

Today the United States began the process to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. Per the terms of the Agreement, the United States submitted formal notification of its withdrawal to the United Nations. **The withdrawal will take effect one year from delivery of the notification. (effectivity of the decision)**

As noted in his June 1, 2017 remarks, President Trump made the decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement **because of the unfair economic burden imposed on American workers, businesses, and taxpayers.** (Americans are victims) by U.S. pledges made under the Agreement. The United States has reduced all types of emissions, even as we grow our economy and ensure our citizens' access to affordable energy. Our results speak for themselves: U.S. emissions of criteria air pollutants that impact human health and the environment declined by 74% between 1970 and 2018. U.S. net greenhouse gas emissions dropped 13% from 2005-2017, even as our economy grew over 19 percent. (presenting data proofs)

The U.S. approach incorporates the reality of the global energy mix and uses all energy sources and technologies cleanly and efficiently, including fossil fuels, nuclear energy, and renewable energy. **In international climate discussions, we will continue to offer a realistic and pragmatic model – backed by a record of real world results – showing innovation and open markets lead to greater prosperity, fewer emissions, and more secure sources of energy. We will continue to work with our global partners to enhance resilience to the impacts of climate change and prepare for and respond to natural disasters. Just as we have in the past, the United States will continue to research, innovate, and grow our economy while reducing emissions and extending a helping hand to our friends and partners around the globe.** (same with Pruitt, Pompeo is implying commitment by action and not in words and argues that the United States have long been reducing emissions)

HR MC MASTER STATEMENT (US NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISER)

MCMASTER REJECTS REPORT U.S. WILL REMAIN IN PARIS DEAL AS 'FALSE'

By [THEODORIC MEYER](#) 09/17/2017 12:19 PM

EDT <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/09/17/mcmaster-paris-climate-deal-242820>

National security adviser H.R. McMaster on Sunday shot down a Wall Street Journal story reporting that the U.S. would remain in the Paris climate accord despite President Donald Trump's announcement in June that he would pull the country out.

*"That's a false report," McMaster told Chris Wallace on "Fox News Sunday." "The president decided to pull out of the **Paris accord because it was a bad deal for the American people and a bad deal for the environment.**" (agrees with Trump, Mike Pence and Pompeo that the Agreement is a bad deal for America)*

[The Journal](#) reported Saturday that Trump administration officials at a climate summit in Montreal had said the U.S. wouldn't leave the accord after all, citing multiple officials there. "U.S. officials in Montreal, led by White House senior adviser Everett Eissenstat, broached revising U.S. climate-change goals, two participants said, signaling a compromise that would keep the U.S. at the table even if it meant weakening the international effort," The Journal's Emre Peker reported.

But McMaster bashed the Paris deal after denying The Journal's story

"It gave the worst polluters the ability to continue polluting and emitting carbon without significantly reducing those levels," (concerning China and India) McMaster said on "Fox News Sunday." "The president is committed to the cleanest water on Earth, the cleanest air on Earth, to an energy policy that reduces carbon emissions but then also provides clean fossil fuels to generate growth in this country and globally." (praising Trump commitment)

McMaster was more equivocal in an interview with George Stephanopoulos on ABC's "This Week." Asked whether the U.S. would remain in the accord if the administration can negotiate better terms before 2020 — the earliest the U.S. can quit the accord under the terms of the deal — McMaster said it was a possibility.

*"If there's an agreement that benefits the American people, certainly," he said.
(same with Trump, he agrees to renegotiate when presented a better agreement that
will benefit America)*

6 The United States Governors in Action!

This chapter analyzes speeches (in transcripts) and statements of the US Governors that are members of the United States Climate Alliance to answer my second research question, RQ2: “How do the justifications of the Trump administration in withdrawing from the Paris Agreement disputed by the US state governments?”

6.1 Condemnation of the White House Decision to Withdraw from the Paris Climate Deal

Inslee (2017) condemns Trump’s action as “shameful” to the works in protecting the planet during the announcement of the formation of the United States Climate Alliance, as a response to President Trump’s decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Deal. Cuomo (2017), on the other hand, disputed the White House decision and describes it as “reckless” and “irresponsible”. Brown (2017) condemns the decision of withdrawal saying that the decision is “not good strategy for America, not even for everybody”. Brown (2017) condemns President Trump acting “AWOL” in the important endeavor. Massachusetts Governor Charlie Baker (2017), said he was “disappointed” in Trump’s decision. Gov. Gina Raimondo of Rhode Island (2017), described Trump’s decision “a tremendous mistake”. Governor Terry McAuliffe of Virginia (2017) condemns the Paris exit when he said that the withdrawal from Paris Climate Agreement by Trump “does not speak for the states and cities” in terms of fighting climate change and paving the way for a new energy economy. The phrase “does not speak for the states and cities” can also imply dis-aligning the Virginia State from the said decision. Sarcastically, Connecticut Governor Dannel P. Malloy, condemns the White House decision stating the words *absence of leadership from the White House* referring to its decision on climate change. If the leadership is absent, then, Malloy continued that it is *incumbent* (a seeming text tone that can mean mean, a “must”, a “duty”) upon states to take action in order to protect their residents. The whole statement implies that the White House is not present in taking action, so we must take the position to take action. Governor Roy Cooper of North Carolina also reiterates absence of leadership in the part of the White House, when he said, “In the *absence of leadership from Washington*, North Carolina is *proud to join* (also Gov. JB Pritzker of Illinois)

the U.S. Climate Alliance and *we remain committed* to reducing pollution and protecting our environment”. This statement emphasizes continuing efforts to protect

the environment in absence of White House leadership in protecting the environment. Roy Cooper sees the importance of clean air to health and economy when he said, “Clean air and a healthy environment *are vital* for a strong economy and a healthier future”. “So much of North Carolina’s economy relies on protecting our treasured natural resources and I’m committed to maintain the quality of the air we breathe *for generations* to come”. The commitment is not only for today but also for the future implying that the action for today can have advantage for the future. New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy condemns the U.S. federal government decision by joining the alliance and describe his decision to push back “against a federal government that continues to undermine and abandon initiatives to combat the reality of climate change”. Governor JB Pritzker of Illinois statement, “while the *president is intent on taking us backwards*, I will work hard every day to *move our state forward*”, implies disagreement to the decision of President Trump to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement and choosing to take action instead. In September, “the Alliance announced a suite of new commitments, including the deployment of \$1.4 billion to decarbonize transportation and take steps to protect natural and working lands as carbon sinks by 2020”. (US Climate Alliance, 2018)

New Mexico Governor Michelle Lujan Grisham also reiterates the unreliability of the federal government as she said, “We know all too well states *cannot rely “on” the federal government* right now to act responsibly”. She added, “And I have *full confidence* our commitments today will launch our state toward a robust transformation, with results delivered by each state agency to make a cohesive, effective whole” (text tone: a feeling of relief and confidence that commitments will not be wasted)

6.2 Shared Understanding of The Reality of Climate Change

Cuomo (2017) said that they are “not ignoring” the science and reality of the climate change. He further insisted that the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement has “devastating repercussions”, both to the country and to the planet. Brown (2017) contradicts Trump’s statement that “climate change is a hoax” by saying that this statement is the “exact opposite of all scientific and worldwide opinion”. Gov. Gina Raimondo of Rhode Island (2017), acknowledged the reality of climate change when she said that it can have “big impact” on Rhode Island, which is a home to United

States first offshore wind farm. Thus the Rhode Island state is determined to preserve the environment. By saying that the Paris Agreement “can create good-paying jobs”, she acknowledges the importance the pact. Hawaii Governor Ige said, “I applaud the work of Hawaii State Legislature to ensure that we can continue to deliver the island Earth that we want to leave our children”, implying an understanding of the importance of taking action. This work of the Hawaii State Legislature and the Hawaii Sustainability Initiatives are both part of sustainability goals by 2030 in achieving clean energy, sustainable communities, green education, work force and solid waste. (Hawaii State, 2017) Gov. Jay Inslee also understand the reality of climate change when he said that “those of us who understand science feel the *urgency* in confronting “one of the greatest challenges of our lifetime” (this he meant the climate change). The US state governors understand the “urgency” of the situation of climate change that is illustrated from the governors of California, New York and Washington’s action, who are all “Democrats”, in “launching” the coalition “just after” Trump announced the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement earlier in the “same” day. This implies a *quick response* and *disagreement* to the White House decision. Just one day after, June 2, 2017, Democratic governors of Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut announced their joining in the state climate alliance. Governor Terry McAuliffe of Virginia signed an executive order to cut carbon emissions by electric utilities in Virginia just *four days after* Trump’s announcement of Paris exit on June 1, 2017. Also, that *four days after* Trump’s announcement of withdrawal, that is June 5, 2017, there are already ten US state governments which joined the alliance including Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont and Virginia.

Describing his joining the alliance, Illinois Gov. JB Pritzker said it is his “stand on the side of science and reason” , meaning belief in science stating that climate change is real. “*We know that climate change is real and we know we must act.*”, he said. Governor Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico take the bold action acknowledging “scientists”. “*Scientists have made clear that action is needed to prevent calamitous climate change fallout in our lifetimes*”. Then adding “It’s up to us” (now action depends to us). Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer today announced her plans to join the U.S. Climate Alliance at a press conference in

Lansing, February 4, 2019. She stated that, “We’ve got to take action to protect our state from the effects of climate change”. She agrees with the findings of science that climate change is a reality that needs attention. “*The science is in, and it’s time* (also sense of immediacy) we get to work to mitigate the impact of climate change for the sake of our kids and future generations in Michigan.”

Wisconsin Governor Tony Evers today announced his plans to join the U.S. Climate Alliance, February 2019. Governor Evers stated that, “It’s a new day in Wisconsin and it’s time to lead our state in a new direction where we *embrace science* (also means believing in science), where we discuss the *very real implications of climate change* (in contrast to Trump’s climate change as a hoax), where *we work* to find solutions, and where *we invest* in renewable energy (confirmation of action against climate change). By joining the U.S. Climate Alliance, we will have support in *demonstrating* that we can take climate action *while growing our economy* at the same time.” (a sense of being a model to others that taking action against climate change does not hinder economic progress).

Nevada Governor Steve Sisolak joined the U.S. Climate Alliance only year 2019. He stated that “I said in my State of the State address that *I will not spend a single second debating* (with no doubt) the *reality of climate change and its impact* on our state.”

Governor Tom Wolf of Pennsylvania stated that, “Pennsylvania is proud to join this bipartisan coalition of 24 governors, representing over half of the U.S. population *to work ,to implement policies* (taking action not only in words) that uphold the commitments our nation made in the Paris Agreement. He condemns the federal government “*turning its back on science and the environment.*”

Montana Governor Steve Bullock joined the US Climate Alliance two years after it was formed. He stated during his announcement to join the alliance that, “*Climate change is already impacting our way of life and our economy*”. (*already impacting* implies you can feel it for yourself ‘tone)

“*Today we’re here to make clear that this administration will stand on the side of science and of reason,*” Pritzker said at a morning news conference. (Briscoe, 2019)

“We know that *climate change is real*. (Gov. Pritzker, 2019) He said this during news conference, “*We know there is a threat, and I think there’s just no disputing it anymore. And we know we must act.*” (to a wide audience, implying there should be no doubt to act)

6.3 Coordination to United States Climate Alliance Committed to an Equal Force of Climate Action

Some US governors acknowledge the importance of collective efforts against climate change. Governor Jay Inslee said that “*collective efforts to act on climate will ensure we maintain the United State’s commitment to curb carbon pollution while advancing a clean energy economy*”. The word *ensure* implies security and sureness. Hickenlooper of Colorado said, “This is a grassroots-based movement” and continued, “That groundswell will build into a national movement”. This statement declares that the alliance is a movement from the ground perspective and can bloom into a bigger, larger movement, of national, whole America.

Inslee (2017) was proud to say that the inaction of the White House has met “an equal force of action from the states” through the United States Climate Alliance. Washington will continue to step up towards climate action. Cuomo (2017) then commits the New York State by saying “to meet the standards of the Paris Climate Agreement” in signing executive order to confirm New York State leadership role towards its citizens, environment and the planet. This is despite the inaction of the White House towards the Paris Deal goal. New York together with the state of California and Washington, represent 68 million people that accounts 10% of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. (New York State, 2017) Brown (2017) agreed to other governors in the United States Climate Alliance joining California to “step up”. Gov. Charlie Baker and Vermont Gov. Phil Scott, Republican governors in New England, announced “commitment” to fulfill the tenets of the international pact of Paris. Gov. Charlie Baker (2017) said, that their administration looks forward to “continued”, bipartisan “collaboration with other states” to protect the environment, grow the economy and deliver a brighter future to the next generation”. This statement from Baker came month “after” urging the Trump administration to remain

in the pact. Republican Governor Phil Scott (2017) says Vermont is “joining despite” Trump’s decision to leave the historic international pact. Oregon Governor Kate Brown (2017) is *confident* with meeting the climate goals in the Paris Climate Accord when she said “Yes!, We can work together and move in that direction to meet the Paris Accord goals”. As a matter of fact, Oregon is a model in reducing carbon emissions, though a relatively small state, eliminating the use of coal in generating electricity and reducing fossil fuel use in transportation. (Mapes, 2017) Speaking to the City Club, Brown said that “future generations will judge them how they tackle climate change”. Hawaii Governor Ige (2017), acknowledges the impact of climate change when he said that “what we do *now for the future* of Hawaii can make a global impact. This acknowledgement was evident in Governor Iges signing of two bills addressing climate change, namely : “(1)SB 559 to expand strategies and mechanisms to reduce greenhouse gas emissions statewide in alignment with the principles and goals adopted in the Paris agreement and (2)HB 1578, to establish the Carbon Farming Task Force within the Office of Planning to identify agricultural and aquacultural practices to improve soil health and promote carbon sequestration in the state’s agricultural and aquacultural sectors.” (Hawaii State, 2017) The governor of Colorado, Gov. John Hickenlooper, on the other hand, joined Colorado in the US Climate Alliance and issued an executive order at Red Rocks Park on July 11,2017, to cut greenhouse gas emissions before 2025 by 26%. Though it will be challenging since “in Colorado, 55% to 60 % of electricity currently comes from burning coal”. It can also be challenging when the state agencies use of renewable energy is voluntary. “The order directs state agencies to work with utilities to maximize use of renewable energy voluntarily without increasing costs to taxpayers.” (Finley,2017) Hickenlooper said “You’ll be able to drive an electric car from Colorado to the Pacific, and from Denver to Moffat County, without fear”. He said this confidently because of the plan to create charging corridors along highways in Colorado. He said that, “Colorado will create charging corridors along highways to reduce range anxiety, a fear among electric vehicle drivers that batteries will die”. In line with the Paris deal goals, Hickenlooper is committed to sincere plans cut emissions. “The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment *now must* (meaning “to have” as urgent as it can) develop a system for tracking greenhouse gas emissions”, Hickenlooper said. Hickenlooper added that “regardless of what the federal government decides to do”, the state of Colorado will accelerate the work committed toward Paris Climate goals.

This step by the Colorado state is disregarding the White House decision and not persuaded to take the White House course of inaction. “This order is *not a mandate* for utilities and we’re really trying to build a *collaborative framework*”. It implies that the plans to cut emissions, though not mandatory, the Colorado state is trying to collaborate in efforts to cut emissions for the future generation. “This is the future of jobs for our kids and for our grandkids”, he said. “Colorado already has cut greenhouse gas emissions by thousands of tons a year and Hickenlooper called greater cuts essential for clean air and an economy increasingly dependent on a healthy natural environment.” (Finley, 2017) He continued saying, “We will tap into this market force that is *already moving*”. In here, Hickenlooper is emphasizing robust economic activity around renewable energy sources like wind and solar energy. This statement is a contradiction to Trump’s claim that the United States economy will move forward even without the Paris Agreement, imposing intolerable financial burdens on Americans.

As a matter of fact, “Gov. Cooper signed into law House Bill 589, Competitive Energy Solutions for North Carolina, which will roughly double North Carolina’s solar generation over the next four years and it has also risen to #2 nationally for installed solar capacity and is home to over 34,000 clean energy jobs because of a range of state policies”. (Raleigh, 2017) But this is not surprising since it has already been a work of North Carolina governor towards healthier environment even before he assume office. “Legal battles fought by then-Attorney General Cooper forced polluters including the Tennessee Valley Authority to clean up their emissions when the federal government would not”. Governor of New Jersey, on the other hand, “issued an Executive Order to begin the process of reentering the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) – a cooperative, market-based program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, joining seven other Alliance States engaged in the program. He has also directed the Board of Public Utilities to begin the process of advancing 3,500 MW of offshore wind energy generation by 2030 – the most ambitious statewide goal to date.” (2018, US Climate Alliance) This goes to show that US state governments in the alliance are showing both the United States and the world that the ambitious goal of the Paris Agreement is achievable. “The 2017 analysis by the Climate Alliance, shows that under current policies alone, Alliance

states are on track to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 24-29 percent below 2005 levels by 2025.” (2018, US Climate Alliance)

Nevada Governor Steve Sisolak said, “By joining the U.S. Climate Alliance, we are taking *bold steps* (implying full force) to *ensure* (implying a true commitment) a better, healthier future for our children. With these ambitious goals and commitments to reduce our carbon footprint, *I am determined* (a tone of courage) to make Nevada part of the solution.”

“I am proud to join with states that are leading the way towards new climate solutions, and taking concrete actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions”, Governor Tom Wolf of Pennsylvania said. States like Pennsylvania *must take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect our communities, economies, infrastructures, and environments from the risks of a warming climate.*” (a tone of commitment)

Montana Governor Steve Bullock (2019), “*How we choose to respond to the changes around us offers a pivotal opportunity to both safeguard our traditional strengths and diversify and grow new opportunities for our future.*”(to respond to climate change is an opportunity) “*Like all difficult issues we tackle here in Montana, I know we can find a path forward by getting together, rolling up our sleeves, and focusing on the values we share in common.*” (a tone of cooperation even in difficult times)

Gov Pritzker has said, “to set Illinois on a path toward *100 percent* “clean, renewable energy,” (a bold and full commitment ; he said this during the campaign trail)

6.4 Urge Other States to Join the US Climate Alliance

The “announcements” of the US state governors urging other US states to join the Climate Alliance imply an “encouragement” and “openness”. Gov. Charlie Baker (2017) joined the alliance “after speaking” with Governor Cuomo and Governor Scott. Governor Terry McAuliffe of Virginia and New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy said that they are “proud” in joining the alliance, prompting other states to join. McAuliffe is also urging other states to join when he said that “it will be up” to the American people (meaning up to their decision) to step forward and “in Virginia, we are doing just that” (a sign of urging). Though the decision depends upon the American people, McAuliffe is trying to prove a point of example that they are already stepping up and urging others to step up too. Governor Cuomo statements uttering words like *welcoming* and *looking forward* to collaborating and maintaining the momentum in the global effort, also means “encouragement” and “welcoming arms” towards other states to join the US Climate Alliance.

The United States Climate Alliance was also able to urge Governor Hogan of Maryland to join the alliance, a Republican. He joined after seven months, which is longer way than what the other US governors earlier decision of joining the alliance. However, this can also be a political move. He, together with the Massachusetts Governor Baker and Vermont Governor Scott, are the only Republican governors to join the alliance. Asked in early June when most US governors joined the alliance, Hogan said, “He was *unsure* what the intention of the group is” and suggested it was *unnecessary for Maryland to join* because the state had already accomplished what most of them need to try to shoot for”. And that Hogan will participate “as long as the U.S. Climate Alliance adds value, shows true bipartisanship, and avoids Washington, D.C.’s politics-as-usual, corrosive tactics and distractions.” Previously questioning the purpose and intention of the U.S. Climate Alliance, Hogan joined after all.

7. Discussions and Conclusion

Jurgen Habermas defines communicative action as interaction of actors capable of speech and action that reach common understanding of the situation and coordinate action through agreement. That common understanding is a product of criticizable validity claim and assumes that the speaker provides reasons for his claims that are raised. He offers his own distinctive definition of rationality through the theory of communicative action – one that involves speaking and acting subjects, a consensual form of social coordination. It reconstructs reason from an individual actor among other knowledgeable social actors where language is a medium for coordinating action. Coordination through language requires actors or speakers oriented towards reaching understanding, thereby engaging themselves in communicative action. Communicative action succeeds when the pursuit of individual goals reached shared understanding that their goals are reasonable.

The Trump administration justifies the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement by positioning American people (coal businesses, manufacturing workers, taxpayers, American families, working class) as victims of the Agreement. It justifies the withdrawal by putting China, India, Europe and developing countries, which are receiving funds from the United States as taking advantage to American people, putting a validity claim that the withdrawal is good for the American society. They reiterated that even long before, United States is already committed to cut carbon cut emissions, portraying itself as a hero for protecting the Americans first. The Trump administration demerits the Paris Agreement as a bad deal, big disadvantage to economy. These validity claims justified by the Trump Administration are disputed by the US state governors, which are members of the United States Climate Alliance.

In this thesis, the US governors reached a common understanding of the urgency of the situation in acting upon the objectives of the Paris Agreement, prompting them to form an alliance among themselves, within their life-worlds of shared convictions despite the lack of support from the Trump Administration. They interact through the United States Climate Alliance that serves as a forum wherein they are all capable of speech and action free from domination. The US state governors in the alliance seek an understanding that climate change is real and coordinated their plan to take action

against climate change and commit to the goals of the Paris Agreement, through the US Climate Alliance.

In strategic action, the actors are oriented towards success to achieving their predetermined goals while incorporating how others react strategically to their action. In resolving conflicts, actors engage in communicative action fostering communicative understanding to aid a goal-oriented action. But between the Trump administration and the US governors, a consensus failed. Both groups of actors have not searched ways reciprocally in finding agreement on how to address the goals of the Paris Agreement towards climate change. A consensus is not reached for the Trump administration and the US governors to compromise and failed to reach a common understanding of the goals of the Paris Agreement or the climate crisis, the United States Climate Alliance pursued their goals with strong consensus oriented toward understanding. The strategic action of the Trump administration therefore encouraged communicative action among the US governors in the US Climate Alliance among their common life-world that goes across the other life-world of the Trump administration. In short, this thesis suggests that actors in strategic action encourage communicative action of other group of actors, within their own life-world in reaching common understanding. In this case, the Trump administration and the US governors that are members of the United States Climate Alliance are still in conflict with the former's decision of withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. Both groups of actors did not reached consensus towards compromise and understanding. Yet, as the international community awaits the next US presidential election November this year, a consensus to coordinate these two groups towards a pursuance of a common goal towards climate change also remains uncertain. For further research, it would also be interesting to study the failure or the inability of other side of the Trump administration known as the "globalists", consisting of White House economic advisor Gary Cohn, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, Secretary of Energy Rick Perry, Senior Advisor Jared Kushner and even Trump's own daughter Ivanka Trump, Senior Advisor to the president (Women's Issues and Policy), to persuade US President Trump to stay in the Paris Agreement.

8 References

Dunne, T., Kurki, M., & Smith, S. (2007). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Böhringer, C. (2003). THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: A REVIEW AND PERSPECTIVES. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 19(3), 451-466.

Clarke, M. & Ricketts, A. (2017) Donald Trump and American foreign policy: The return of the Jacksonian tradition, *Comparative Strategy*, 36:4, 366-379, DOI: [10.1080/01495933.2017.1361210](https://doi.org/10.1080/01495933.2017.1361210)

Dabbous, M., Milea, C., Simoens, S., François, C., Dussart, C., Chachoua, L., Borissov, B. & Toumi, M. (2019) Why “American Patients First” is likely to raise drug prices outside of the United States, *Journal of Market Access & Health Policy*, 7:1, DOI: [10.1080/20016689.2019.1650596](https://doi.org/10.1080/20016689.2019.1650596)

Glencross, A. (2016). *Why the UK voted for Brexit: David Cameron's great miscalculation*. Springer.

Goodwin, M., & Milazzo, C. (2017). Taking back control? Investigating the role of immigration in the 2016 vote for Brexit. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(3), 450-464.

Hobolt, S. B. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), 1259-1277.

Inglehart, R. F., & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash.

Ikenberry, G. J. (1999). Institutions, strategic restraint, and the persistence of American postwar order. *International security*, 23(3), 43-78.

Mearsheimer, J. (1994). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*, 19(3), 5-49. doi:10.2307/2539078

Meskill, L. (2013). UNESCO's World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenging the economic and political order of international heritage conservation. *Current anthropology*, 54(4), 483-494.

Mitzen, J. (2005). Reading Habermas in anarchy: multilateral diplomacy and global public spheres. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 401-417, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055405051749>

Ndubuisi, N., & Onoriode, M. B. (2018). ICC and Afrocentrism: The Laws, Politics and Biases in Global Criminal Justice. *Groningen Journal of International Law*, 6(1), 146-160.

Kelemen, R. D., & Vogel, D. (2010). Trading places: The role of the United States and the European Union in international environmental politics. *Comparative Political Studies*, 43(4), 427-456.

Sampson, T. (2017). Brexit: the economics of international disintegration. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 31(4), 163-84.

State of Washington, (2017). Inslee, New York Governor Cuomo, and California Governor Brown announce formation of United States Climate Alliance Retrieved from <https://www.governor.wa.gov/news-media/inslee-new-york-governor-cuomo-and-california-governor-brown-announce-formation-united>

Swales, K. (2016). Understanding the Leave vote. *NatCen Social Research*, 7.

Von Borzyskowski, I., & Vabulas, F. (2019). Hello, goodbye: When do states withdraw from international organizations?. *The Review of International Organizations*, 14(2), 335-366.

Wells, C. (1987). *United Nations, Unesco and the Politics of Knowledge*. Retrieved from

https://books.google.no/books?hl=no&lr=&id=XfqwCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR13&dq=why+US+withdraw+from+UNESCO+israel&ots=-A50ow19ng&sig=BKfLTKgJSfVJ4wBCCInBENo2TiA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=why%20US%20withdraw%20from%20UNESCO%20israel&f=false

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). UK: Oxford University Press

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Pearson Education. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Language+and+power&publication+year=1989&author=Fairclough+Norman

Fairclough, N. (2001). The discourse of new labour: Critical discourse analysis. *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*, 1, 229-266.

Hajer, M.A., (1993). Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalization of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Britain. In F. Fischer & J. Forester (Ed.) *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*. (pp.43-75). Duke University Press: Durham

Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 18(3), 329-342.

Wodak, R. (2011). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. *Discursive pragmatics*, 50-69.

Horsley (2017), Trump's Speech On Paris Climate Agreement Withdrawal, Special Series Fact Check <https://www.npr.org/2017/06/01/531090243/trumps-speech-on-paris-climate-agreement-withdrawal-annotated?t=1593725496283>

Ludden, J. (2017). Trump's Speech On Paris Climate Agreement Withdrawal, Special Series Fact Check <https://www.npr.org/2017/06/01/531090243/trumps-speech-on-paris-climate-agreement-withdrawal-annotated?t=1593725496283>

Kurtzleben (2017). Trump's Speech On Paris Climate Agreement Withdrawal, Special Series Fact Check <https://www.npr.org/2017/06/01/531090243/trumps-speech-on-paris-climate-agreement-withdrawal-annotated?t=1593725496283>

Inslee, New York Governor Cuomo, and California Governor Brown announce formation of United States Climate Alliance June 1, 2017

Retrieved from <https://www.governor.wa.gov/news-media/inslee-new-york-governor-cuomo-and-california-governor-brown-announce-formation-united>

New York Governor Cuomo, California Governor Brown, and Washington Governor Inslee Announce Formation of United States Climate Alliance JUNE 1, 2017 Albany, NY Retrieved from <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/new-york-governor-cuomo-california-governor-brown-and-washington-governor-inslee-announce>

Gov. Baker Enters Mass. Into Multi-State Climate Alliance After U.S. Withdraws From Paris Agreement June 02, 2017 Retrieved from <https://www.wbur.org/news/2017/06/02/baker-massachusetts-joins-climate-alliance>

Vermont to Join US Climate Alliance

Republican Gov. Phil Scott says Vermont is joining a coalition of states committed to upholding the Paris climate agreement despite President Donald Trump's decision to leave the historic international pact.

June 2, 2017 Retrieved from <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/vermont/articles/2017-06-02/vermont-to-join-us-climate-alliance>

Rhode Island to Join States in Paris Climate Agreement Pact

Gov. Gina Raimondo says Rhode Island will join a group of states committed to upholding the Paris climate agreement, after President Donald Trump withdrew the United States from the international pact.

June 2, 2017 Retrieved from <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/rhode-island/articles/2017-06-02/rhode-island-to-join-states-in-paris-climate-agreement-pact>

Oregon Will Join Climate Change Coalition To Meet Paris Goals

by [Jeff Mapes](#) June 2, 2017 Retrieved from <https://www.opb.org/news/article/oregon-paris-climate-change-goals-kate-brown/>

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE NEWS RELEASE: GOVERNOR JOINS U.S. CLIMATE ALLIANCE, WILL SIGN BILL ALIGNED WITH PARIS AGREEMENT Posted on Jun 2, 2017 Retrieved from <https://governor.hawaii.gov/newsroom/governors-office-news-release-governor-joins-u-s-climate-alliance-will-sign-bill-aligned-with-paris-agreement/>

Gov. McAuliffe announces Virginia's joining of U.S. Climate Alliance *Jun. 5, 2017*
Retrieved from

<https://www.whsv.com/content/news/Gov-McAuliffe-announces-Virginias-joining-of-US-Climate-Alliance-426544371.html>

United States Climate Alliance adds 10 new members to coalition committed to upholding the Paris Accord

June 5, 2017 Retrieved from <https://www.governor.wa.gov/news-media/united-states-climate-alliance-adds-10-new-members-coalition-committed-upholding-paris>

Colorado signs on to U.S. Climate Alliance, joining states committed to exceeding Trump's rejected Paris climate targets

Gov. Hickenlooper orders statewide greenhouse gas emissions cut July 11, 2017
Retrieved from <http://www.denverpost.com/2017/07/11/colorado-signs-us-climate-alliance-joining-states-committed-paris-climate-agreement/>

North Carolina Joins 14 States in Bipartisan U.S. Climate Alliance *Alliance Reports States are 'On Track' To Hit Emissions Reductions Targets September 20, 2017*
Retrieved from <https://governor.nc.gov/news/north-carolina-joins-14-states-bipartisan-us-climate-alliance>

Dance, S. (2017). Maryland will join alliance of states supporting Paris climate agreement, Hogan says January 10, 2018 Retrieved from <https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/environment/bs-md-hogan-climate-alliance-20180110-story.h>**United States Climate Alliance (2018)**[New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy Joins U.S. Climate Alliance February 22, 2018](https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2018/2/22/new-jersey-governor-phil-murphy-joins-us-climate-alliance) Retrieved from <https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2018/2/22/new-jersey-governor-phil-murphy-joins-us-climate-alliance>

United States Climate Alliance (2018) [Illinois Governor J. B. Pritzker Joins U.S. Climate Alliance](https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/1/23/illinois-governor-j-b-pritzker-joins-us-climate-alliance) January 23, 2019 Retrieved from <https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/1/23/illinois-governor-j-b-pritzker-joins-us-climate-alliance>

Illinois joins U.S. Climate Alliance January 23, 2019 Retrieved from <https://week.com/2019/01/23/illinois-joins-u-s-climate-alliance/>

[New Mexico Governor Michelle Lujan Grisham Joins U.S. Climate Alliance](https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/1/29/new-mexico-governor-michelle-lujan-grisham-joins-us-climate-alliance) January 29, 2019 Retrieved from <https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/1/29/new-mexico-governor-michelle-lujan-grisham-joins-us-climate-alliance>

[Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer Joins U.S. Climate Alliance](https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/2/4/michigan-governor-gretchen-whitmer-joins-us-climate-alliance) February 4, 2019 Retrieved from <https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/2/4/michigan-governor-gretchen-whitmer-joins-us-climate-alliance>

[Wisconsin Governor Tony Evers Joins U.S. Climate Alliance](https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/2/12/wisconsin-governor-tony-evers-joins-us-climate-alliance) February 12, 2019 Retrieved from <https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/2/12/wisconsin-governor-tony-evers-joins-us-climate-alliance>

[Nevada Governor Steve Sisolak Joins U.S. Climate Alliance](https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/3/12/nevada-governor-steve-sisolak-joins-us-climate-alliance) March 12, 2019 Retrieved from

<https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/3/12/nevada-governor-steve-sisolak-joins-us-climate-alliance>

[Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf Joins U.S. Climate Alliance April 29, 2019](#)

Retrieved

from

<https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/4/29/pennsylvania-governor-tom-wolf-joins-us-climate-alliance>

[Montana Governor Steve Bullock Becomes 25th Governor to Join U.S. Climate Alliance July 1, 2019](#)

Retrieved

from

<https://www.usclimatealliance.org/publications/2019/7/1/montana-governor-steve-bullock-becomes-25th-governor-to-join-us-climate-alliance>

Briscoe, T. (2019). Gov. J.B. Pritzker commits Illinois to climate change fight as study shows extreme weather convincing more people January 23,2019 Retrieved from <https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-met-jb-pritzker-illinois-climate-change-20190123-story.html>

New York State (2017). New York Governor Cuomo, California Governor Brown, and Washington Governor Inslee Announce Formation of United States Climate Alliance Retrieved from <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/new-york-governor-cuomo-california-governor-brown-and-washington-governor-inslee-announce>

Finley, B. (2017). Colorado signs on to U.S. Climate Alliance, joining states committed to exceeding Trump's rejected Paris climate targets. The Denver Post. Retrieved from <https://www.denverpost.com/2017/07/11/colorado-signs-us-climate-alliance-joining-states-committed-paris-climate-agreement/#comments-anchor>

Raleigh (2017). North Carolina Joins 14 States in Bipartisan U.S. Climate Alliance. Retrieved from <https://governor.nc.gov/news/north-carolina-joins-14-states-bipartisan-us-climate-alliance>

Baxter, H. (1987). System and Life-World in Habermas's "Theory of Communicative Action". *Theory and Society*, 16(1), 39-86. Retrieved June 18, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/657078

Bjola, C. (2005). Legitimizing the use of force in international politics: A communicative action perspective. *European Journal of International Relations*, 11(2), 266-303.

Bolton, R. (2005). Habermas's theory of communicative action and the theory of social capital. *Association of American Geographers, Denver, Colorado, April, 2*.

Dietz, J. L., & Widdershoven, G. A. (1991). Speech acts or communicative action?. In *Proceedings of the Second European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work ECSCW'91* (pp. 235-248). Springer, Dordrecht.

Eriksen, E. O., & Weigård, J. (1997). Conceptualizing politics: strategic or communicative action?. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 20(3), 219-241.

Forester, J. (1992). Critical ethnography: On fieldwork in a Habermasian way. *Critical management studies*, 46-65.

Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. MIT press: Massachusetts [https://books.google.no/books?hl=en&lr=&id=fmYjgiUMy7EC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Habermas,+J.+\(1990\).+Moral+consciousness+and+communicative+action.+MIT+press:+Massachusetts&ots=-biJ12CeHl&sig=6Av-k3lTl7OUcwnXDD0lpPtI7nA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Habermas%2C%20J.%20\(1990\).%20Moral%20consciousness%20and%20communicative%20action.%20MIT%20press%3A%20Massachusetts&f=false](https://books.google.no/books?hl=en&lr=&id=fmYjgiUMy7EC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Habermas,+J.+(1990).+Moral+consciousness+and+communicative+action.+MIT+press:+Massachusetts&ots=-biJ12CeHl&sig=6Av-k3lTl7OUcwnXDD0lpPtI7nA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Habermas%2C%20J.%20(1990).%20Moral%20consciousness%20and%20communicative%20action.%20MIT%20press%3A%20Massachusetts&f=false)

Habermas, J. (1975). Towards a reconstruction of historical materialism. *Theory and Society*, 2(3), 287-300.

Habermas, J. (2015). *The theory of communicative action: Lifeworld and systems, a critique of functionalist reason* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved from https://books.google.no/books?hl=en&lr=&id=kGSzCgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT5&dq=habermas+theory+of+communicative+action&ots=xlwrAafuIT&sig=0VtTWpxAg2hrneHxmXhNtx9KW2g&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=habermas%20theory%20of%20communicative%20action&f=false

~~Hajer, M. A., Hoppe, R., Dunn, W., Jennings, B., Healey, P., Dryzek, J., ... & Rein, M. (1993). *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*. Duke University Press.~~

Healey, P. (1992). Planning through debate: The communicative turn in planning theory. *Town planning review*, 63(2), 143.

Heath, J. (2003). *Communicative action and rational choice*. MIT Press. [https://books.google.no/books?id=3i-QXQQOfZQC&printsec=frontcover&dq=Heath,+J.+\(2003\).+Communicative+action+and+rational+choice.+MIT+Press.&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwinw8G89JjqAhXvtYsKHfvoA-4Q6AEwAHoECAAQAg#v=onepage&q=Heath%2C%20J.%20\(2003\).%20Communi-cative%20action%20and%20rational%20choice.%20MIT%20Press.&f=false](https://books.google.no/books?id=3i-QXQQOfZQC&printsec=frontcover&dq=Heath,+J.+(2003).+Communicative+action+and+rational+choice.+MIT+Press.&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwinw8G89JjqAhXvtYsKHfvoA-4Q6AEwAHoECAAQAg#v=onepage&q=Heath%2C%20J.%20(2003).%20Communi-cative%20action%20and%20rational%20choice.%20MIT%20Press.&f=false)

Heath, J. (2006). 'Legitimation crisis' in the later work of Jürgen Habermas. *University of Montreal*.

Herbert, A. L. (1996). Cooperation in international relations: A comparison of Keohane, Haas and Franck. *Berkeley J. Int'l L.*, 14, 222.

Holzinger, K. (2004). Bargaining through arguing: an empirical analysis based on speech act theory. *Political Communication*, 21(2), 195-222.

Johnson, J. (1991). Habermas on strategic and communicative action. *Political theory*, 19(2), 181-201.

Kruger, H. (1991). Communicative Action or the Mode of Communication for Society as a Whole. In Honneth, A., & Joas, H. (Eds.). *Communicative action: essays on Jürgen Habermas's The theory of communicative action*. (pp.140-164) (MIT Press. Retrieved from

[https://books.google.no/books?hl=en&lr=&id=0vppNCJLZ1MC&oi=fnd&pg=PP13&dq=Honneth,+A.,+%26+Joas,+H.+\(Eds.\).+\(1991\).+Communicative+action:+essays+on+Jürgen+Habermas%27s+The+theory+of+communicative+action.+MIT+Press.&ots=7-JN7Zh3Cu&sig=Dlyc5Ps0a9IB3KyXNuvKGRUmLCk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Honneth%2C%20A.%2C%20%26%20Joas%2C%20H.%20\(Eds.\).%20\(1991\).%20Communicative%20action%3A%20essays%20on%20Jürgen%20Habermas's%20The%20theory%20of%20communicative%20action.%20MIT%20Press.&f=false](https://books.google.no/books?hl=en&lr=&id=0vppNCJLZ1MC&oi=fnd&pg=PP13&dq=Honneth,+A.,+%26+Joas,+H.+(Eds.).+(1991).+Communicative+action:+essays+on+Jürgen+Habermas%27s+The+theory+of+communicative+action.+MIT+Press.&ots=7-JN7Zh3Cu&sig=Dlyc5Ps0a9IB3KyXNuvKGRUmLCk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Honneth%2C%20A.%2C%20%26%20Joas%2C%20H.%20(Eds.).%20(1991).%20Communicative%20action%3A%20essays%20on%20Jürgen%20Habermas's%20The%20theory%20of%20communicative%20action.%20MIT%20Press.&f=false)

LYNCH, M. (2002). Why Engage? China and the Logic of Communicative Engagement. *European Journal of International Relations*, 8(2), 187–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066102008002002>

Umapathy, K. (1988). The Language-Action Approach: Information Systems Supporting Social Actions. In Lyytinen, K., & Hirschheim, R. (Eds). *Information systems as rational discourse: An application of Habermas's theory of communicative action*. (pp.59-70) Springer Retrieved from

[https://books.google.no/books?id=_YDSMaeAZIC&pg=PA69&dq=Lyytinen,+K.,+%26+Hirschheim,+R.+\(1988\).+Information+systems+as+rational+discourse:+An+application+of+Habermas%27s+theory+of+communicative+action.+Scandinavian+Journal+of+Management,+4\(1-2\),+19-30.&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwinuszZvqAhWs8qYKHRQiCOAQ6AEwAHoECAUQA#v=onepage&q=Lyytinen%2C%20K.%2C%20%26%20Hirschheim%2C%20R.%20\(1988\).%20Information%20systems%20as%20rational%20discourse%3A%20An%20application%20of%20Habermas's%20theory%20of%20communicative%20action.%20Scandinavian%20Journal%20of%20Management%2C%204\(1-2\)%2C%2019-30.&f=false](https://books.google.no/books?id=_YDSMaeAZIC&pg=PA69&dq=Lyytinen,+K.,+%26+Hirschheim,+R.+(1988).+Information+systems+as+rational+discourse:+An+application+of+Habermas%27s+theory+of+communicative+action.+Scandinavian+Journal+of+Management,+4(1-2),+19-30.&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwinuszZvqAhWs8qYKHRQiCOAQ6AEwAHoECAUQA#v=onepage&q=Lyytinen%2C%20K.%2C%20%26%20Hirschheim%2C%20R.%20(1988).%20Information%20systems%20as%20rational%20discourse%3A%20An%20application%20of%20Habermas's%20theory%20of%20communicative%20action.%20Scandinavian%20Journal%20of%20Management%2C%204(1-2)%2C%2019-30.&f=false)

Martin, R (2005). Between Consensus and Conflict: Habermas, Post-Modern Agonism and the Early American Public Sphere. *Polity*, 37(3), 365-388. Retrieved June 27, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/3877112

Miller, B. (1992). Collective Action and Rational Choice: Place, Community, and the Limits to Individual Self-Interest, *Economic Geography*, 68:1, 22-42, DOI: [10.2307/144039](https://doi.org/10.2307/144039)

Mitzen, J. (2005). Reading Habermas in anarchy: multilateral diplomacy and global public spheres. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 401-417, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055405051749>

Müller, H. (2004). Arguing, bargaining and all that: Communicative action, rationalist theory and the logic of appropriateness in international relations. *European journal of international relations*, 10(3), 395-435.

Risse, T. (2004). Global governance and communicative action. *Government and opposition*, 39(2), 288-313.

Risse, T. (2000). "Let's argue!": communicative action in world politics. *International organization*, 54(1), 1-39.

Appendix

Statement by President Trump on the Paris Climate Accord (Transcript)

June 1, 2017

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-accord/>

Michael Pompeo's Statements On the U.S. Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement PRESS STATEMENT

MICHAEL R. POMPEO, SECRETARY OF STATE

November 4., 2019

<https://www.state.gov/on-the-u-s-withdrawal-from-the-paris-agreement/>

HR Mc Master Statements (US National Security Adviser)

McMaster rejects report U.S. will remain in Paris deal as 'false'

By **THEODORIC MEYER**

09/17/2017 12:19 PM EDT

<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/09/17/mcmaster-paris-climate-deal-242820>

Acronyms

CDA – Critical Discourse Analysis

TCA – Theory of Communicative Action



Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet
Noregs miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003
NO-1432 Ås
Norway