International Journal of Economic, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration (IJEBAS Journal) | ISSN (e): 2808-4713
Volumes 5 No. 5 (2025)

CLIMATE CHANGE AS A POLITICAL ISSUE: INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND THE ROLE OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Perveez Ahmad Khan
Independent Researcher
M. A in Political Science University of Kashmir.
Corresponding Email: parvaizkhan499@gmail.com

Received	: 22 June 2025	Published	: 27 July 2025
Revised	: 30 June 2025	DOI	: https://doi.org/10.54443/ijebas.v5i4.3578
Accepted	: 17 July 2025	Link Publish	: https://radjapublika.com/index.php/IJEBAS

Abstract

Climate change has emerged not only as an environmental and scientific concern but as a profoundly political issue, shaping and being shaped by international relations, economic development, and power dynamics. This paper examines the political dimensions of climate change, emphasizing the role of international cooperation and global governance in addressing the crisis. It analyzes key multilateral frameworks such as the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement, as well as the contributions of institutions like the IPCC. Despite growing consensus and increased participation, effective global action is undermined by geopolitical tensions, inequality, and weak enforcement mechanisms. The study argues that while progress has been made, significant reforms in global governance focused on equity, transparency, and accountability are essential for achieving meaningful and lasting climate outcomes.

Keywords: ***Climate change, Global governance, International cooperation, UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, IPCC, Environmental politics, Climate diplomacy, Climate justice, Multilateralism***

1. Introduction

Climate change is one of the most important and difficult problems of the 21st century. It is not simply an environmental concern, but also a political issue that goes beyond national boundaries and needs unprecedented levels of international collaboration. Climate change is a global commons problem at its heart. The advantages of stopping it are shared across the world, but the costs and obligations are not. The problem comes from the greenhouse gases that both developed and fast emerging countries have released into the atmosphere throughout time. Its repercussions, which include greater natural catastrophes, rising sea levels, food insecurity, and mass migration, are felt all across the world. Solving this problem isn't only a question of new technology or environmental research; it also means finding a way to bring together different political interests, economic agendas, and historical obligations in a wide range of countries. Over the past few decades, scientific agreement on the human causes of climate change has grown stronger.

This is mostly due to the work of organizations like the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which has systematically evaluated and communicated the risksof rising global temperatures (Hulme, 2009). But it has been far harder to turn scientific discoveries into useful political action. Power imbalances, national Sovereignty, differences in development, and conflicting economic interests all affect the politics of climate change. Wealthier, industrialized countries, especially those with powerful fossil fuel lobbies, have traditionally been the biggest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions. However, they typically fight against significant mitigation policies that may hurt their own sectors or make them less competitive in the global market (Keohane & Victor, 2016). On the other hand, poor nations, many of which are disproportionately affected by climate change while contributing very little to historical emissions, are asking for more flexibility, financial help, and recognition of their developmental requirements (Newell & Paterson, 2010). The Growth of nationalism, populist politics, and climate denial in different regions of the world has made these problems even worse. These things have made people less trusting of international institutions and reduced global unity. Geopolitical rivalry, especially between big powers like the US and China, make it harder to come up with unified international plans since climate obligations get mixed up with trade, security, and economic power challenges. International Agreements like the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement have been good at getting almost everyone to join in and setting global climate goals. However, they often don't have enforceable rules and depend on voluntary national commitments, openness,and peer pressure instead of binding obligations (Falkner, 2016; Clémençon, 2016). In the end, this leads to a governing structure that wants people to work together yet often fails to do so. In the end, seeing climate change as a political issue shows how important it is to have more fair, responsible, and open systems of global governance that can deal with not only the environmental aspects of the crisis but also the political, economic, and moral problemsthat are at its core. This article looks at the political difficulties of climate change, judges how well existing international cooperation efforts are working, and thinks about the important role that global governance must play in creating a fair and sustainable future.

2. Climate Change as a Political Issue

Climate change is not merely a scientific and environmental concern; it is also a political one since it directly affects issues of national interest, economic growth, social fairness, and global power dynamics. Climate change is different from many other environmental concerns because it threatens the sovereignty of nation-states by requiring coordinated worldwide action on subjects like energy policy, commerce, land use, and technology development areas that are usually handled at the national level. The main political issue is figuring out who is to blame for the crisis and how to split the costs of fixing it and getting used to it. Historically, developed countries, especially those that industrialized early, have released the most greenhouse emissions. Because of this, they are often asked to take the lead in cutting emissions and paying for climate action throughout the world. But In many nations, ambitious climate policy is often blocked by political opposition from large fossil fuel lobbyists, worries about being less competitive in the economy, and the fear of losing employment or market share (Newell & Paterson, 2010). For Instance, the United States, Russia, and Saudi Arabia, which are all major oil-producing countries, have historically fought against strict regulations or binding emissions targets that could hurt their energy sectors. Instead, they have chosen to protect their own industries and economic interests (Keohane & Victor, 2016).

On the other hand, poor countries, many of which are very sensitive to climate consequences like droughts, floods, and food poverty, say they shouldn't have to give up economic growth or take the burden of the response without a lot of help from richer countries. The Notion of "common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities" (CBDR-RC) is important to these countries. It acknowledges that industrialized countries have a historical obligation and that not all countries have the same ability to deal with climate change. This idea is largely acknowledged in climate talks, but it is nevertheless a topic of debate anda sign of the underlying inequities that exist in international politics (Clémençon, 2016). So, politics in individual countries frequently make it harder for the world to take action. Many Governments have trouble passing strong climate policies because of climate denial, political polarization, and the power of entrenched corporate interests. This isespecially true when short-term political costs are higher than long-term environmental gains. Populist and nationalist Movements are growing across the world, which has also hurt multilateralism. Leaders are putting more value on national sovereignty and economic independence than on working together with other countries (Keohane & Victor, 2016).

Along with These structural and ideological hurdles, the consequences of climate policy on different groups of people are also quite political. When countries and people make decisions regarding carbon prices, investments in renewable energy, and support for adaptation, there are frequently winners and losers. For instance, those who work in businesses that produce a lot of carbon may be against climate laws that risk their jobs, and marginalised populations may suffer the most from environmental damage without getting enough rewards from efforts to fix it (Newell & Paterson, 2010). This unequal picture makes it harder for politicians to support broad climate action and makes people less likely to support global accords that they think are unfair or don't work. In the end, the politicisation of climate change is not only a failure of science or diplomacy; it is also a result of conflicting interests, structural imbalances, and the difficulty of finding a balance between protecting the environment and dealing with economic and political realities. To deal with climate change as a political issue, we need both international agreement and the political resolve to take on entrenched power structures and create fairer ways to make decisions and distribute resources.

3. International Cooperation on Climate Change

3.1 The UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), established in 1992, marked the first major global effort to address climate change through collective international action. It introduced the key principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities" (CBDR-RC), acknowledging that while all countries must participate in combating climate change, developed nations having contributed more to historical emissions should take the lead in mitigation efforts. Building upon the UNFCCC, the 2015 Paris Agreement was a landmark moment in climate diplomacy. Nearly all countries committed to limiting global temperature rise to well below 2°C, ideally 1.5°C, above pre-industrial levels. Unlike earlier frameworks like the Kyoto Protocol, which imposed binding targets only on developed countries, the Paris Agreement adopted a more flexible approach. It introduced nationally determined contributions (NDCs), allowing each country to set its own emissions reduction goals. This structure encouraged broad participation but came at the cost of enforceability; there are no penalties for failing to meet commitments. Instead, the Agreement relies on transparency, periodic review, and peer pressure to promote compliance. While the Paris Agreement succeeded in unifying global climate objectives, its effectiveness is limited by the voluntary nature of its obligations and the absence of strong enforcement mechanisms.

3.2 The IPCC and the Role of Science

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) plays a pivotal role in international climate cooperation by providing a rigorous scientific basis for policy decisions. As a collaboration between thousands of scientists and endorsed by governments, the IPCC produces comprehensive assessment reports that compile the latest findings on climate science, impacts, mitigation, and adaptation. These reports have been essential in shaping international agreements like the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement by legitimizing the urgency and scope of the climate crisis. The IPCC's work is structured to be policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive, aiming to inform rather than direct political action. However, its outputs—particularly the Summary for Policymakers—are subject to negotiation among member states, which can sometimes dilute or politicize key messages. Despite this, the IPCC remains a cornerstone of global climate governance, providing a shared knowledge base that enhances coordination, builds trust, and drives public and political engagement. Its ongoing assessments serve as both a warning system and a guide for decision-makers, emphasizing the critical connection between science and international policymaking.

3.3 Challenges to International Cooperation

Despite a growing recognition of the climate crisis, several persistent challenges undermine effective international cooperation. Geopolitical rivalries, particularly between major emitters such as the United States and China, often impede unified action, as climate policy becomes entangled with broader strategic and economic concerns. Economic inequality further complicates cooperation; developing countries, which are disproportionately vulnerable to climate impacts and have fewer resources for adaptation and mitigation, demand greater support from wealthier nations. However, promised financial and technological assistance has often fallen short, eroding trust. Domestic political dynamics within countries also play a major role—climate skepticism, the influence of fossil fuel lobbies, and political polarization can obstruct ambitious national policies. Additionally, the architecture of global climate agreements tends to lack enforceable compliance mechanisms. The Paris Agreement, for instance, depends largely on voluntary commitments and peer pressure, which limits accountability. These factors contribute to a fragmented and uneven response to climate change, where progress is often slow, insufficient, and vulnerable to political shifts. Overcoming these obstacles requires not just technical solutions but also political will, equitable burden-sharing, and institutional reforms that build trust and strengthen enforcement.

4. The Role of Global Governance

Global governance refers to the institutions, norms, and processes that guide international cooperation. In climate politics, this includes both formal institutions (e.g., UNFCCC, IPCC, World Bank) and informal mechanisms (e.g., transnational networks, climate finance initiatives).

4.1 Strengths of Current Governance Structures

Current global climate governance structures demonstrate several important strengths that have enabled meaningful, though uneven, progress in addressing climate change. One major achievement is the **broad participation** they have facilitated, bringing together nearly every country in the world under shared frameworks like the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement. These forums have also succeeded in incorporating **non-state actors**, such as cities, private corporations, and civil society organizations, into the climate conversation, creating a more inclusive and decentralized approach to climate action. Another strength is the creation and promotion of **global norms and expectations**, such as the growing commitment to achieving net-zero emissions by mid-century. Even without legal enforcement, these norms influence national policy agendas and corporate behavior. Additionally, governance structures have enabled the development of **financial and technological support mechanisms**, most notably the Green Climate Fund, which channels resources from developed to developing countries to support climate mitigation and adaptation. Knowledge-sharing platforms, international reporting systems, and regular climate summits have further supported transparency and collaboration. These strengths highlight the capacity of global governance institutions to set the direction of climate action and coordinate efforts across diverse political and economic contexts.

4.2 Weaknesses and Gaps

Despite some notable strengths, current global climate governance structures suffer from significant weaknesses and gaps that hinder their effectiveness. One of the central issues is **fragmentation**. Numerous overlapping agreements, initiatives, and actors operate without coherent integration, which can lead to duplicated efforts, inefficiencies, and conflicting agendas. This fragmented landscape often results in **policy incoherence** and a lack of clear direction, particularly for developing countries with limited administrative capacity. Another key weakness is the **absence of enforcement and accountability mechanisms**. Most international climate agreements, including the Paris Agreement, rely on voluntary commitments and lack punitive measures for non-compliance, which limits their ability to drive consistent action. Additionally, there is a growing concern over **inequity** within global governance institutions. These structures are often dominated by the interests of powerful, high-emitting nations and global corporations, while marginalized communities and vulnerable countries those most affected by climate change are frequently underrepresented. As a result, the policies and financial flows tend to reflect existing power imbalances rather than address them. This lack of fairness undermines trust, reduces legitimacy, and weakens global solidarity essential ingredients for effective long-term cooperation on climate issues.

4.3 Toward Better Governance

To overcome current shortcomings, global climate governance must be reformed to become more effective, inclusive, and enforceable. A critical area for improvement is the **strengthening of transparency and verification mechanisms**. Enhanced monitoring and reporting systems can ensure that countries not only make ambitious pledges but also follow through with real action. Independent verification of emissions data and progress on climate goals would build trust and accountability. Another priority is **increasing financial and technological support** for developing countries. Many low-income nations lack the capacity to implement necessary mitigation and adaptation strategies, and without meaningful assistance from wealthier nations, global progress will remain uneven. Expanding **technology transfer mechanisms** and climate finance particularly grants rather than loans—would help bridge this gap. Additionally, the role of **non-state actors** should be further formalized and empowered. Cities, businesses, and civil society organizations are often more agile and innovative than national governments and can drive climate action from the bottom up. Finally, the establishment of a **global carbon pricing framework** would be a transformative step toward internalizing the environmental costs of greenhouse gas emissions. Such a framework could help level the playing field economically and provide a consistent market signal to drive decarbonization. Together, these reforms can strengthen the architecture of global governance and make international climate cooperation more just, effective, and resilient.

Conclusion

Climate change is not only a scientific or environmental issue but one of the most complex and urgent political challenges facing the international community. While overwhelming scientific consensus has clarified the nature and severity of the threat, the political response both nationally and globally has remained fragmented, slow, and insufficient. International cooperation, anchored by institutions like the UNFCCC, the Paris Agreement, and the IPCC, has made important strides by fostering shared goals, building consensus, and encouraging participation from a wide range of actors. However, these efforts are undermined by persistent geopolitical rivalries, economic inequalities, and the absence of robust enforcement mechanisms. Many countries continue to prioritize short-term national interests over long-term global sustainability, and wealthier nations have often failed to fulfill their commitments to support more vulnerable populations.

Global governance, in its current form, has shown the ability to convene stakeholders and shape international discourse, but it remains limited in its ability to compel action, ensure fairness, and resolve systemic imbalances in responsibility and capacity. To meet the scale of the climate crisis, reforms are essential. Governance must become more equitable by empowering developing nations and marginalized communities, more accountable through stronger monitoring and compliance mechanisms, and more adaptive by integrating non-state actors and innovative policy tools like global carbon pricing. Ultimately, combating climate change requires a reimagining of international cooperation—not just as a technical necessity, but as a moral and political imperative. Only by strengthening global governance and aligning national interests with global needs can the world achieve the collective action needed to confront and overcome the climate emergency.

References

1. Clémençon, R. (2016). *The two sides of the Paris climate agreement: Dismal failure or historic breakthrough?* Journal of Environment & Development, 25(1), 3–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1070496516631362
2. Falkner, R. (2016). *The Paris Agreement and the new logic of international climate politics.* International Affairs, 92(5), 1107–1125. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12708
3. Hulme, M. (2009). *Why We Disagree About Climate Change: Understanding Controversy, Inaction and Opportunity.* Cambridge University Press.
4. Keohane, R. O., & Victor, D. G. (2016). *Cooperation and discord in global climate policy.* Nature Climate Change, 6(6), 570–575. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2937
5. Newell, P., & Paterson, M. (2010). *Climate Capitalism: Global Warming and the Transformation of the Global Economy.* Cambridge University Press.
6. Bodansky, D. (2010). *The art and craft of international environmental law.* Harvard University Press.
7. IPCC. (2023). *Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) Synthesis Report.* Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/
8. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). (2015). *Paris Agreement.* https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf
9. Ostrom, E. (2010). *Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change.* Global Environmental Change, 20(4), 550–557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.07.004
10. Dimitrov, R. S. (2016). *The Paris Agreement on Climate Change: Behind closed doors.* Global Environmental Politics, 16(3), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP_a_00361