

ENVIRONMENTAL SOVEREIGNTY VS. GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY: POLITICAL BARRIERS TO CLIMATE SUSTAINABILITY

Jyoti Jangir¹ and Virender Verma²

¹Assistant Professor, Political Science,
R. N. Ruia Govt. College, Ramgarh Shekhawati, (Sikar) India

²Principal, Govt. College, Rajaldesar, (Churu) India
Email: varma.virendra188@gmail.com

How to cite this paper:

Jangir Jyoti, Verma Virender
(2025) Environmental
Sovereignty vs. Global
Responsibility: Political
Barriers to Climate
Sustainability, Journal of
Global Resources, Vol. 11
(02)


DOI:

10.46587/JGR.2025.v11i02.024

Received: 07 June 2025

Reviewed: 18 June 2025

Final Accepted: 30 June 2025


OPEN ACCESS
Freely available Online
www.isdesr.org

Abstract: *Environmental sovereignty at this level involves understanding the dynamic relationship between national autonomy and international interdependence. Climate change poses an unprecedented threat to global ecosystems, economies, and societies. Despite growing scientific consensus and public awareness, coordinated international action remains insufficient. One of the core obstacles is the tension between environmental sovereignty the right of states to control their own environmental policies and global responsibility, which calls for collective action beyond national borders. The paper critically examines how political ideologies, economic dependencies, and historical power imbalances contribute to the resistance against global environmental cooperation. It explores the effectiveness and limitations of international climate agreements, such as the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement, in reconciling national interests with global commitments. Through a combination of theoretical insights, geopolitical analysis, and illustrative case studies including those of the United States, China, India, the European Union, and Small Island Developing States the research highlights the multifaceted political barriers that impede global climate governance. Ultimately, the paper argues that a reimagining of sovereignty, grounded in ecological interdependence and mutual accountability, is essential for overcoming these barriers and achieving climate sustainability.*

Key words: Environmental Sovereignty, Global Climate Governance, International Cooperation

Introduction

Environmental sovereignty at this level means understanding how a country's independence works together with its connections to other countries. Even though a country has main control over its land, it also has responsibilities to its neighbors and the world. International environmental laws and agreements, which countries usually join by choice, show how nations agree to limit some of their freedom to achieve shared environmental goals, like protecting nature, reducing climate change or stopping damage to the ozone layer. Climate change is a defining global challenge of the 21st century. Its impacts ranging from rising sea levels and extreme weather events to biodiversity loss and environmental degradation know no borders and threaten the stability and prosperity of communities worldwide. Addressing this crisis requires an unprecedented level of international cooperation and policy coordination. Yet, the political architecture of the international system is predominantly built around the notion of state sovereignty, where each nation has the exclusive right to govern its territory and manage its natural resources. This foundational principle of sovereignty creates a paradox in the context of climate action while the effects of environmental degradation are transboundary, the authority to mitigate those effects remains largely confined within national borders. Countries often formulate environmental policies based on immediate domestic interests such as economic growth, job creation, and political popularity rather than broader, long-term planetary concerns. This conflict between environmental sovereignty and global responsibility lies at the heart of international climate negotiations and remains a primary obstacle to achieving sustainable development on a global scale.

Conceptual Conflict: Sovereignty vs. Responsibility

Environmental sovereignty, rooted in the Westphalian model of nation-states, grants countries the authority to control and manage resources within their territorial boundaries without external interference. This principle, while fundamental to modern international law and diplomacy, becomes problematic in the context of environmental issues that transcend national borders. Climate change, pollution, deforestation, and biodiversity loss are inherently global phenomena; their causes and consequences are not limited to any single state, making unilateral action insufficient. In contrast, global responsibility implies a shared duty to address environmental challenges through cooperative, multilateral action. It acknowledges the interconnected nature of ecological systems and the moral and practical imperative for countries to act in the collective interest. This concept is embedded in international norms such as the “common but differentiated responsibilities” (CBDR) principle under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which seeks to balance national capabilities with the urgency of global action. However, the coexistence of these two paradigms creates a conceptual and operational conflict. While many nations publicly endorse global responsibility, they are reluctant to compromise their sovereign control over natural resources or accept externally imposed environmental standards. This resistance is often justified by appeals to economic development, national security, or political independence. As a result, international climate agreements frequently suffer from vague language, weak enforcement, and non-binding commitments, reflecting the difficulty of aligning national interests with global ecological goals.

International Agreements and their Limitations

Over the past three decades, several international agreements have been established to facilitate global cooperation on climate issues. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), adopted in 1992, laid the groundwork for subsequent treaties by recognizing the need for a global response to climate change. It introduced the principle of

CBDR, acknowledging that while all nations share responsibility, developed countries bear greater historical accountability. The Kyoto Protocol (1997) was the first major attempt to implement binding emission reduction targets. It required industrialized countries to cut greenhouse gas emissions, while allowing developing countries more flexibility. Despite its pioneering role, the Kyoto Protocol faced numerous challenges, including the refusal of key emitters like the United States to ratify the agreement, limited participation by developing nations, and insufficient penalties for non-compliance. As a result, its overall impact on global emissions was modest. The Paris Agreement (2015) marked a significant shift in approach by emphasizing nationally determined contributions (NDCs) instead of binding targets. This flexible framework was designed to encourage broader participation and adaptability. However, its reliance on voluntary commitments and the absence of enforcement mechanisms have led to uneven implementation. Countries set their own targets, which often fall short of the reductions needed to meet the agreement's goal of limiting global warming to well below 2°C.

Apart from this, the effectiveness of these agreements is undermined by political instability, changes in leadership, and domestic policy reversals. The withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement under President Trump in 2017, and its subsequent re-entry under President Biden, illustrates how climate commitments can be contingent on domestic political priorities rather than sustained international consensus. These fluctuations erode trust among nations and weaken the credibility of global climate governance. In general, while international agreements provide a necessary framework for cooperation, their limitations reflect the enduring influence of state sovereignty, the lack of enforceable mechanisms, and the deep divisions between developed and developing countries regarding responsibilities and capacities. For global sustainability to be achieved, future agreements must address these structural weaknesses and foster a stronger sense of collective accountability.

Political Barriers to Cooperation

- **Nationalism and Populism:** In recent years, the rise of nationalist and populist governments around the world has posed a significant challenge to international climate cooperation. These political ideologies often emphasize national interests, cultural identity, and economic independence over multilateral agreements and global obligations. Leaders with populist agendas may reject climate science, portray international treaties as infringements on sovereignty, and prioritize short-term domestic gains over long-term environmental sustainability. This has led to a retreat from international forums and weakened commitments to global environmental goals. The inward-looking policies of such regimes hinder collective efforts, reduce trust among nations, and obstruct the implementation of ambitious climate action plans.
- **Economic Dependency on Fossil Fuels:** Many economies particularly those of major oil and gas producers are heavily reliant on fossil fuel industries for revenue, employment, and national development. This dependency creates powerful domestic lobbies that resist climate policies threatening their economic interests. Transitioning to renewable energy requires massive investment and policy shifts, which can be politically costly. As a result, leaders often delay or dilute environmental commitments to avoid political backlash. This economic entrenchment in carbon-intensive industries significantly impedes the shift toward sustainable development. Without targeted strategies for a just transition that addresses economic concerns, these countries are unlikely to support or fully implement global climate agreements.

- **North-South Divide:** The historical and ongoing disparity between developed (Global North) and developing (Global South) countries remains a central issue in climate negotiations. Developing nations argue that industrialized countries bear the greatest responsibility for historical greenhouse gas emissions and should thus lead in mitigation efforts while providing financial and technological support. However, developed countries often fall short in fulfilling their pledges, leading to frustration and distrust. This division fuels debate over fairness, equity, and capacity, complicating consensus in international forums. The persistent North-South divide highlights the need for climate justice and the equitable distribution of climate responsibilities and resources.
- **Lack of Trust:** Trust is a foundational element of effective international cooperation. Yet, trust among nations remains fragile in climate negotiations due to inconsistent commitments, broken promises, and political volatility. Countries are reluctant to take bold actions if they fear that others will not follow through, creating a cycle of inaction. Additionally, suspicions about data transparency, monitoring mechanisms, and unequal treatment further erode cooperation. This deficit of trust makes it difficult to establish binding agreements or enforce accountability, as nations prioritize safeguarding their interests over collaborative problem-solving. Rebuilding trust will require transparency, reliable financing, and demonstrated leadership by major emitters.

Case Studies:

- **China and India:** As emerging economies with large populations, China and India prioritize development, energy access, and poverty reduction. While both invest in renewable energy, they continue to rely heavily on coal. Their climate stance emphasizes historical emissions by developed countries, calling for equity and financial support rather than uniform obligations in global agreements.
- **European Union:** The EU plays a leading role in climate diplomacy, setting ambitious emission targets and implementing the European Green Deal. However, internal divisions among member states over energy policies and economic capacity pose challenges. While collectively progressive, discrepancies in national interests sometimes undermine the EU's unified stance on global climate action.
- **United States:** U.S. climate policy is inconsistent, shaped by political shifts. Under Democratic leadership, the country supports international cooperation, as seen in its rejoining of the Paris Agreement. Republican administrations often prioritize economic interests over environmental commitments. This volatility undermines trust and highlights how domestic politics affect global sustainability efforts.
- **Small Island Nations:** Countries like the Maldives and Tuvalu are on the frontline of climate change, facing sea-level rise and existential threats. They advocate strongly for stringent global action and climate justice. With limited emissions but high vulnerability, they highlight the moral urgency for major polluters to take responsibility and provide financial support for adaptation.

Geopolitical Implications

Climate change increasingly intersects with global security, trade, and migration. Environmental issues are becoming tools of soft power and diplomatic leverage. Major powers use climate narratives to justify trade sanctions or shape international norms, further politicizing the sustainability agenda. These dynamics complicate efforts to achieve equitable and effective climate action.

Role of International Organizations and NGOs

International organizations like the United Nations, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and many global NGOs play an important role in fighting environmental problems. They help by spreading awareness, doing scientific research, giving expert advice, and training people and governments on how to handle climate change. These groups also help bring countries together to make plans and agreements for protecting the planet. However, they often face challenges. One big problem is that many countries do not want to give up control over their own decisions. This makes it hard for international groups to take strong actions or make sure countries follow the rules. NGOs and civil society groups have helped push governments to do more by raising their voices, organizing protests, and demanding better environmental policies. These efforts have made some positive changes. But to solve big global problems like climate change, the world needs stronger international leadership and more political commitment from governments. Real change will only happen when countries are willing to cooperate more and give more power to these global organizations.

Pathways to Reconciliation: Bridging Sovereignty and Global Climate Action

- **Redefining Sovereignty Through Ecological Interdependence:** The traditional concept of sovereignty as exclusive control over a territory is increasingly incompatible with the global nature of environmental challenges. Redefining sovereignty in terms of ecological interdependence recognizes that national well-being is inherently linked to global ecological stability. This redefinition supports multilateral cooperation without undermining national identities, offering a framework where global climate goals enhance rather than threaten sovereign interests.
- **Strengthening Multilateral Institutions:** To address climate change effectively, institutions like the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) must be empowered with more binding enforcement mechanisms. Strengthened governance structures can help mitigate power imbalances and ensure greater accountability in international climate agreements, reducing the ability of powerful states to undermine collective action.
- **Encouraging Climate Clubs and Regional Cooperation:** Regional coalitions or “climate clubs,” such as the European Union’s Emissions Trading System (ETS), provide opportunities for like-minded states to collaborate on ambitious climate action. These clubs can create incentives for others to join by offering trade benefits, technology sharing, and financial aid, promoting a bottom-up model of global cooperation that circumvents the deadlock in larger forums.
- **Leveraging Technology and Financial Transfers:** Technological assistance and financial aid to developing countries are vital in aligning global responsibility with national capabilities. Through mechanisms like the Green Climate Fund and clean technology partnerships, wealthier nations can help lower-income states transition to low-carbon economies, thus promoting fairness and mutual benefit while reinforcing trust in international cooperation.

Conclusion

The struggle between environmental sovereignty and global responsibility reflects one of the core tensions in international politics: how to balance national interests with the needs of the global commons. As climate change continues to escalate, the political barriers rooted in state sovereignty, economic competition, and power asymmetry threaten the effectiveness of collective climate action. This research has explored how these dynamics play out through

international frameworks, national case studies, and ideological conflicts. The way forward demands a transformative approach to global governance one that reimagines sovereignty not as insulation from global pressures but as an interconnected duty to shared ecological futures. Strengthening international institutions, incentivizing cooperative coalitions, and ensuring equitable resource and technology distribution are critical components of this transition. Without such a shift, the promise of climate sustainability will remain elusive, and the costs of inaction will be borne disproportionately by those least responsible. The path to climate sustainability is not only a scientific or economic challenge it is, at its core, a political one. Overcoming this will require visionary leadership, collective moral courage, and a redefinition of what it means to act in the national interest within an interdependent world.

References

1. Bernstein, S. (2005) Legitimacy in global environmental governance. *Journal of International Law and International Relations*, 1(1–2), 139–166.
2. Biermann, F. (2014). *Earth system governance: World politics in the Anthropocene*. MIT Press.
3. Bodansky, D. (2016) *The Art and Craft of International Environmental Law*. Harvard University Press.
4. Bulkeley, H., & Newell, P. (2010) *Governing climate change*. Routledge.
5. Falkner, R. (2016) The Paris Agreement and the new logic of international climate politics. *International Affairs*, 92(5), 1107–1125.
6. Gupta, J. (2014) *The history of global climate governance*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Held, D., & Hervey, A. (2011) Democracy, climate change and global governance. In J. S. Dryzek et al. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society* (pp. 263–275). Oxford University Press.
8. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2021) *Sixth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2021*. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/>
9. Jordan, A., Huitema, D., Van Asselt, H., Rayner, T., & Berkhout, F. (2010) Climate change policy in the European Union: Confronting the dilemmas of mitigation and adaptation? *Cambridge University Press*.
10. Keohane, R. O., & Victor, D. G. (2011) The regime complex for climate change. *Perspectives on Politics*, 9(1), 7–23.
11. Klein, N. (2015) *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. Simon and Schuster.
12. Newell, P., & Paterson, M. (2010) *Climate capitalism: Global warming and the transformation of the global economy*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Okereke, C. (2008) *Global justice and neoliberal environmental governance: Ethics, sustainable development and international co-operation*. Routledge.
14. Roberts, J. T., & Parks, B. C. (2007) *A climate of injustice: Global inequality, North-South politics, and climate policy*. MIT Press.
15. Sachs, J. D. (2015) *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.
16. UNEP. (2023) *Emissions Gap Report 2023*. <https://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2023>
17. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (1992) *UNFCCC*. <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>
18. United Nations. (2015) *Paris Agreement*. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf
19. World Bank. (2020). *World Development Report 2020: Trading for Development in the Age of Global Value Chains*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2020>
20. Yamin, F., & Depledge, J. (2004) *The international climate change regime: A guide to rules, institutions and procedures*. Cambridge University Press.