

**A thesis submitted to the Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy of
Central European University in part fulfilment of the
Degree of Master of Science**

**ANALYSIS OF THE US DEPARTURE FROM THE PARIS CLIMATE DEAL,
ONE OF THE KEY ENVIRONMENTAL DECISIONS IN
TRUMP'S FIRST 500 DAYS IN OFFICE**

Eva LUKONITS

July, 2018

Budapest

Notes on copyright and the ownership of intellectual property rights:

(1) Copyright in text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies (by any process) either in full, or of extracts, may be made only in accordance with instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European University Library. Details may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made. Further copies (by any process) of copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the permission (in writing) of the Author.

(2) The ownership of any intellectual property rights which may be described in this thesis is vested in the Central European University, subject to any prior agreement to the contrary, and may not be made available for use by third parties without the written permission of the University, which will prescribe the terms and conditions of any such agreement.

(3) For bibliographic and reference purposes this thesis should be referred to as:

Lukonits, EL. 2018. *Analysis of the US Departure from the Paris Climate Deal, One of the Key Environmental Decisions in Trump's First 500 Days in Office*. Master of Science thesis, Central European University, Budapest.

Further information on the conditions under which disclosures and exploitation may take place is available from the Head of the Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy, Central European University.

Author's declaration

No portion of the work referred to in this thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Eva LUKONITS

CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT OF THESIS submitted by:

Eva LUKONITS

for the degree of Master of Science and entitled: Analysis of the US Departure from the Paris Climate Deal, One of the Key Environmental Decisions in Trump's First 500 Days in Office

Month and Year of submission: July, 2018.

Abstract

The US exit from the Paris deal is one of the most important environmental decisions made by President Trump in his first 500 days in office due to the impact that far exceeds the US border. The US leader chose to pull the US out despite the presence of undeniable benefits that coexist with some implementation and funding push factors that, however, could have driven the exit without the influence of some stealth agenda. Whatever the motivation, the exit can lead to environmental and political outcomes, as the US may lose its coastline cities and even forfeit the global influence much to the pleasure of China that will fill the funding void. To avoid these and other adverse consequences, the US requires returning back to participation in the deal via a set of solutions that may help convince the president to reconsider what can be quite a rash environmental decision that may do the country no good favor.

Keywords: Paris, deal, climate, change, US, president, Trump, billionaire

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature Review.....	2
2.1. Environmental Decisions	2
2.2. The Decision to Withdraw from the Paris Agreement.....	3
2.3. The Subject of the Decision: What the Treaty Is about	4
2.4. Paris Agreement Advantages	5
2.5. Agreement Relevance Doubts	7
2.6. Disillusionment Fueled by Treaty Doubts and Perceived Injustice or the Actual and Hidden Agenda to Have Made Trump Abandon the Deal	8
2.6.1. Trump’s Personal Climate Change and Treaty Skepticism.....	8
2.6.2. Personal Animosity towards the Predecessor – When Feelings Take Precedence...9	
2.6.3. The America First Vision that Leave no Room for Climate Considerations	10
2.6.4. A Big Financial Burden, Its Increase, Intolerable Contribution Duration, the Push for Making Contribution Mandatory	11
2.6.5. The US Being Piggybacked on – Contribution Contrasts Lacking Economic Logic	12
2.6.6. The Non-Obligatory Nature of the Paris Financial Pool Contribution – the Early Doubts of Exit Relevance	13
2.6.7. The Real Beneficiaries of the Paris Deal Exit – the Lesser Known Corporate America	14
2.7. Decision Supporters	15
2.8. Decision Timeline	16
2.9. Consequences	17
3. Methodology	18
4. Results.....	20
5. Discussion	24
6. Solutions, Their Relevance and Viability	28
6.1. New President Election in Due Course	28
6.2. Let the Consequences of the Decision Do the Convincing	30
6.3. People Power: People to Communicate Their Paris Staying Will	37
6.4. American States and Businesses to Defy President’s Will	40
6.5. Big Businesses Will Foot Nation’s Bill Instead. How This Can Be a Mind Game to Force Trump to Make an About-Turn on the Exit Issue. Mainstreaming Rich Muslims’ Role in Trump Business Building Following Their Increased Commitment to the Deal as Another Influence Route	43

6.6. Favored Media as the Environmental Literacy Boosting Platform	46
6.7. Foreign Officials Talking Trump into Staying.....	50
6.8. The Flattery and Favoritism Tools	52
6.8.1 Flattery or Favoritism	52
6.8.2 How to Please the Fine Judge of Flattery, Mr. Trump	54
6.8.3 Why the Flattery Tool Is Destined to Work in the Case of President Trump	57
6.8.4 When It Has Already Worked at Least to Some Extent	58
6.8.5 When Flattery Fails. The Careful Choice of Private Paris Deal Negotiators	58
6.9. Family Advocacy	61
6.10. Pressure from Loan Providers – Deutsche Bank to Play an Environmental Champion	64
6.10.1. Different DB Owners and what They May Do to Help Reverse the Paris Exit Decision	64
6.10.2. Why DB Will Get Influencing Trump on the Paris Deal Regardless of Its Ownership Composition and the Individual Environmental Views of Owners	67
6.10.3. Why DB Will Succeed	70
6.10.4. Why DB May Not Succeed in Getting Trump to Reconsider	73
6.10.4. How to Increase the Willingness of DB Use of New Loan Rules and the Odds of Deutsche Bank Succeeding – Governmental Bail-out	75
7. Conclusion	81
Bibliography	85

List of Abbreviations

CFR: Council on Foreign Relations

DB: Deutsche Bank

EPA: Environmental Protection Agency

GDP: Gross Domestic Product

MP: Member of Parliament

NAFTA: North American Free Trade Agreement

NASA: National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NDCs: nationally determined contributions

NRA: National Rifle Association

SWIFT: Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication

UN: United Nations

UNFCCC: UN Framework Convention on Climate Change

US: United States of America

USSR: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

WS: Wall Street

WSJ: Wall Street Journal

1. Introduction

The leaders of nations are entrusted with the power to make decisions to the benefit of the nation that puts them into this administrative position. It is not only economic or political decisions that they have to make to serve people right, as the environment also requires much involvement since it determines the capacity of the leader to ensure the normal functioning of the nation. Donald Trump, the current president of the United States, chose to make a range of environmental decisions that despite some economic utility can do much damage to the US and even the planet as a whole. One of such crucial decisions was to pull the country out of the Paris Climate Agreement under the influence of legitimate economic drivers and unfitting motivations, such as enmity against the predecessor and conventional energy lobbyism. While the national park closedown and US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) changes are undeniable important decisions with the environmental ramifications of their own, the decision to pull out of the Paris climate deal may affect the global capability to fight climate changes by arresting the current initiatives and discouraging other participants, especially if other nations do not step up their financial involvement; therefore, solutions must be implemented to bring the US back to the deal.

The thesis will review environmental decisions in Trump's first 500 days in office focusing on the Paris exit decision, treaty nature, deal benefits and relevance doubts, the drivers of the exit, decision timeline, and its consequences. Then, methodology, findings, and discussion will offer deeper breakdown of the issue and its study nuances. The section on recommendations will offer potentially the most optimal ways of how to reverse the departure decision, with research wrapped up with concluding remarks.

The project aim is to study all manner of the environmental implications of the most important of environmental decisions made by Donald Trump during his first period of presidential tenure, such as the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement.

Research questions include: What are the environmental decisions made by President Trump in his first 500 days in office? What is the Paris Climate deal/agreement? What are the benefits of participation in the treaty? What are the push factors that shaped the exit decision of the president? Who supported the exit and facilitated it other than the president? What are the timeline and consequences of the decision? Are there any solutions that can be offered to contribute to decision reversal?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Environmental Decisions

In March 2017, Trump issued an executive order, in which he instructed the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to reevaluate the Clean Power plan that was still to come into force owing to legal complications as of the time of writing. In October, the EPA claimed that it would rescind it. In March 2017, Trump approved the Dakota Access oil pipeline delayed by former president Barack Obama in an effort to avoid taking the principal source of the drinking water for the Standing Rock Sioux.¹ In November 2017, the US reportedly ceased its commitment to the Paris climate agreement.² The Paris treaty was cancelled as such that posed a danger to the efforts of Trump to repeal the Clean Power Plan enforced under Obama as a range of guidelines and regulations that integrate emission caps and other rules considered

¹ Erin Brodwin. "Trump Is Dismantling Obama's Biggest Legacy – Here Are the Most Significant Changes He's Made." *Business Insider*, December 15, 2017, accessed June 15, 2018, <https://goo.gl/WewLzd>

² Jennifer Hansler. "5 Major Changes to US Environmental Policy in 2017." *CNN Politics*, July 13, 2017, accessed July 9, 2018, <https://goo.gl/ux9o7Q>

burdensome by fossil fuel industries.³ In early December 2017, the US leader signed two presidential proclamations to reduce the Grand Staircase-Escalante and Bears Ears national monuments that will contract from 1.35 million acres to 228 337 and from 1.9 to 1 million acres. Trump has not overlooked the EPA that has went through what was a radical transformation in 2017. Scott Pruitt, the administrator of the EPA, put it on the deregulation road increasing the number of meetings with fossil-fuel industry leaders rather than environmental organizations. The notion of “climate change” has disappeared from its 4-year strategic plan. The president has put forward the idea of slashing EPA’s budget by 30% that will target enforcement work and personnel, and liquidate some programs.⁴ Of these decisions, there may be none that would be of consequential proportions comparable to the exit from the Paris climate deal.

2.2. The Decision to Withdraw from the Paris Agreement

On June 1, 2017, in his speech upon return from an overseas trip to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, President Trump made his intention known to withdraw the country from the Paris Climate Accord in a move that he claimed would protect the US and its residents. What he also promised was to get the talks going to reenter the Paris Accord or a completely new transaction on the condition that the terms be fair to the nation and its taxpayers. The president maintained that he could not place other considerations before Americans’ wellbeing. The agreement was cosigned by a great number of countries. While announcing the decision, Donald Trump stressed that it was them that reaped the exclusive benefits of the US involvement, with American labor and taxpayers left to absorb the cost of the deal in the way

³ Tom McCarthy. “The Republicans who Urged Trump to Pull out of Paris Deal Are Big Oil Darlings.” The Guardian, June 1, 2017, accessed June 15, 2018, <https://goo.gl/1UGA2H>

⁴ Hansler 2017.

of shuttered factories, lower salaries, lost jobs, and greatly reduced economic production. From then on, the president claimed, the country stopped all efforts to enforce the non-binding Paris deal and relieved itself of the draconian economic and financial burdens foisted upon the country. By this stoppage, the president implied the end of the Green Climate Fund and the implementation of the nationally determined contribution.⁵

2.3. The Subject of the Decision: What the Treaty Is about

On 12 December 2015, a total of 196 parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) came to adopt the Paris Agreement, which is a new legally-binding framework for the attempt to resolve the climate change dilemma that is internationally coordinated. The deal arrived 23 years after the signing of the UNFCCC. It is a product of 6 years of climate change talks at the international level under the aegis of the mentioned convention. The deal took intense international pressure to reach. Countries resorted thereto for fear of the relapse of the Copenhagen climate conference back in 2009 and diplomacy has not faltered this time around. In some ways, the deal is a breakthrough in its own right, for it has exceeded expectations. Based on its Article 2, it sets a global warming objective of well below 2 °C on pre-industrial medians. The agreement defines a universal, legal framework to solidify the global response to the climate change threat, which makes it mandatory for all parties to make their contribution to climate change adaptation and mitigation. In other aspects, the deal leaves nations with much to negotiate. The agreement does not bind signatories to implement their nationally determined contributions (NDCs); neither does it formulate a

⁵ Donald Trump. Statement by President Trump on the Paris Climate Accord. White House. 2018, accessed June 15, 2018, <https://goo.gl/aKzBBh>

mandatory emission goal.⁶ As with most agreements, Paris deal must have had enough advantages of its own to get so many parties to sign on the dotted line and it still should have them.

2.4. Paris Agreement Advantages

The agreement seeks to achieve a range of critical targets that, if accomplished, will have much to offer to the environment. One of the first things that the agreement should do should be to reduce the maximum warming from 2°C (3.6°F) above preindustrial levels to “well below 2°C”, which can save New Orleans, Florida, and other cities and states. The deal also admits the relevance of balancing the contribution to and reduction of carbon footprint by individual nations.⁷ The benefit of the agreement is that it can help prevent the adverse outcomes of climate change on the planet and the human health alike. Bump (2017) identified that, although slow, the warming process leads to an increase in global temperatures and sea level, the latter caused by water warming-induced expansion and the melting of polar ice. Severe draughts, more extreme precipitations, flooding included, and enhanced ocean acidification due to the absorption of carbon dioxide by the ocean are also the products of climate change.⁸

When it comes to health impact, when warmer, temperature causes more mosquitoes to survive unharmed and contribute to mosquito-borne illnesses. The change of climate has a potential for aggravating asthma, so does it that for increasing the incidence of heat-induced

⁶ Charlotte Streck, Paul Keenlyside, and Moritz von Unger. “The Paris Agreement: A New Beginning,” *Journal for European Environmental & Planning Law* 13 (2016): 4-5, accessed June 15, 2018. <https://goo.gl/nuc3ng>

⁷ John Sterman. “The Paris Climate Agreement: Deliverance or Disappointment?” *Huff Post*, December 15, 2016, accessed June 15, 2018, <https://goo.gl/gkNu5>

⁸ Philip Bump. “Nine Reasons Trump’s Withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement Doesn’t Make Sense.” *The Washington Post*, June 1, 2017, accessed July 9, 2018, <https://goo.gl/kmzS6B>

lethal outcomes due to heat exhaustion and heatstroke. Worse, flooding stimulated by the rising level of water can claim human lives.⁹ Floodwater can mingle chemicals, waste, and sewage together in one nasty liquid mass.¹⁰ Sewage water, in turn, is contaminated with bacteria at all times.¹¹ Floodwaters caused by Hurricane Harvey and flowing through the neighborhoods and streets of Houston contained flesh-eating bacteria.¹² If water stands for days, bacterial growth may occur resulting in fungal growth on adjacent wetted surfaces.¹³ Moisture trapped inside buildings can lead to not only fungal growth but also health issues.¹⁴

While floods are often temporary side effects of natural disasters like hurricanes, there is the problem of the permanent flooding of the coastline claimed by the encroaching ocean water. By dealing with the change of climate, the Paris deal can help with what poses an existential threat to the welfare of coastal communities. According to Climate Change Map (2017), the most recent projections of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration predict that the sea level will have risen by 2 feet by 2060 and another 4 feet by 2100, which will leave a large share of the coastal US under water by the second century of the new millennium.¹⁵ If nothing is done about the rising sea level, 7 main American cities can submerge in 80 years' time. Under the worst-case scenario, hundreds of coastal cities and towns from Galveston, Texas to Atlantic City, New Jersey, will go missing. In recent years, Atlantic City, New Jersey, has already gone from being a bustling tourist location to being a ghost

⁹ Bump 2017.

¹⁰ Rod Brouhard and Crystal Kline. *Disaster Preparedness: A Living Free Guide* (The USA: Penguin. 2014). <https://goo.gl/n2hkaF>

¹¹ Heinz R. Trechsel and Mark Bomberg. *Moisture Control in Buildings: Key Factor in Mold Prevention* (ASTM International, 2009) 88, <https://goo.gl/2FSHjR>

¹² Lynn Donelson Wright and C. Reid Nichols. *Tomorrow's Coasts: Complex and Impermanent* (Springer, 2018) 152. <https://goo.gl/u5FmEF>

¹³ Trechsel and Bomberg 88.

¹⁴ Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Homeowner's Guide to Retrofitting: Six Ways to Protect Your Home from Flooding* (Government Printing Office, 2016) 7, 2018. <https://goo.gl/xJegvg>

¹⁵ "Climate Change Map: Much of Coastal U.S. under Water by 2100, Estimates Show." *Sun Sentinel*, May 31, 2017, accessed July 9, 2018, <https://goo.gl/8nJW1D>

town.¹⁶ No matter how well designed or rational, aims sometimes tend to look utopian or surreal in terms of implementation viability or relevance, which may eventually leave the ones who endeavor to achieve them cold towards them.

2.5. Agreement Relevance Doubts

Jay W. Forrester Professor of Management John Sterman has outlined the reasons for Paris deal relevance skepticism. The problem is that the Earth has been warmed around 1°C (1.8°F) since the Industrial Revolution, which may have already launched the loss of Antarctic glaciers that may be irreversible. This loss will add over 3 feet to sea level rise in the long run, apart from melting in Greenland and elsewhere.¹⁷ Nations can make-believe they are fighting the problem with their meager promises. It is admitted that stronger pledges for emissions cut did not accompany the 1.5 °C target. Pledges are mere pledges, which concerns not only individual emission cuts but also provided funds. State contributions to the 100 billion dollars per year are neither pledged nor mandated.¹⁸ Furthermore, co-signees may be slow to commit themselves to the climate change reversal. Much as China has vowed to place a cap on emissions no later than 2030, it has made no pledge to reduce them after, while India sitting third on the list of top emitters is set to scale up emissions considerably between now and 2030. It is unclear if nations will adopt emission accounting that is scientifically sound or self-report emission cuts, which may involve dubious claims and double counting. Questionable accounting goes unchecked, as some developing countries rely on controversial and unverifiable emission cuts from land use change and forest preservation while the EU neglects

¹⁶ Melia Robinson. "7 Major US Cities Could Be Underwater within 80 Years – Here Are the Disturbing 'after' Images." *Business Insider*, July 18, 2017, accessed July 10, 2018. <https://goo.gl/um962w>

¹⁷ Sterman 2016.

¹⁸ Ibid.

the complete lifecycle biofuel emissions.¹⁹ The understanding of warming inevitability, the apathy of other nations that seem eclipsed by the financial value of harmful industrial progress, and other doubts are likely to have brought President Trump and his entourage closer to the agreement exit door or it may have been other reasons that did.

2.6. Disillusionment Fueled by Treaty Doubts and Perceived Injustice or the Actual and Hidden Agenda to Have Made Trump Abandon the Deal

2.6.1. Trump's Personal Climate Change and Treaty Skepticism

Maybe, Mr. President has quit not being a believer in climate change, as follows from his posts in social media where he maintains a solid presence. The Twitter archive of the president turns up an impressive 36 and 106 tweets, in which he used the concepts of “climate change” and “global warming.” All of these mentions communicate serious climate change skepticism.²⁰ He is loath to recognize the fundamental principle of common, albeit differentiated responsibility in global climate partnership. Trump has publicly acknowledged that the climate change is in the midst of progressing no more than he has admitted the anthropogenic factor in its origin, which is a general consensus of American scholars.²¹ American researchers can really be said to be in agreement since as many as 13 government agencies affirm the genuine nature of the climate change and the human role in the process.²² Still, nation's leader sticks to his vision all the while seeking the fallouts of treaty participation, including the financial ones. In his speech dedicated from deal exit, the president branded the

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Chris Cillizza. “Donald Trump Doesn't Think Much of Climate Change, in 20 Quotes.” *CNN Politics*, August 8, 2017, accessed July 9, 2018. <https://goo.gl/6wDHmk>

²¹ Hai-Bin Zhang, Han-Cheng Dai, Hua-Xia Lai, and Wen-Tao Wang. “US Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement: Reasons, Impacts, and China's Response,” *Advances in Climate Change Research* 8, no. 4 (2017), accessed June 15, 2018. <https://goo.gl/Hi97sH>

²² Cillizza 2017 “Quotes.”

Paris deal as unfair at the highest level to the US.²³ While active on Twitter where the billionaire has showered much criticism on climate change claim supporters, Trump is often not above throwing a jab at political adversaries, including the former president through any communication channels.

2.6.2. Personal Animosity towards the Predecessor – When Feelings Take

Precedence

The unrevealed motivation of the business mogul may have much to do with his feelings towards the predecessor. Researchers confirm Donald Trump's personal acrimony against his precursor. He finds enjoyment in getting the political legacy of Barack Obama demolished. Obama and Trump went into the public offensive against one another with a high extent of animosity. While it has been before that there was no good chemistry between the president in retirement and the current president, never has this been shown in public. Trump known for his strong personality has taken an anything-except-Obama stand and started to roll back the better part of his policies after entering the office, of which one is the Paris climate deal deemed the strongest of his political legacies.²⁴ This animosity cannot get any smaller. Obama has not wasted the opportunity create by the exit decision to condemn the president for his reversal of the US participation.²⁵ This animosity towards the ex-president may have sharpened his vision leading to its radicalization and the formation of the isolationist development trajectory leaving the US environmental development in recent years very polarized.

²³ Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang 2017.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Sabrina Siddiqui and Lauren Gambino. "Obama Condemns Trump for 'Rejecting the Future' by Exiting Paris Deal." *The Guardian*, June 1, 2017, accessed July 9, 2018. <https://goo.gl/bVJR4P>

2.6.3. The America First Vision that Leave no Room for Climate Considerations

The excessive focus on America First deviates considerably from the foreign policy philosophy of Obama. Trump's predecessor is convinced that the climate deal contributes greatly to the maintenance of the US advantage and secures employment, promotes the renewable energy industry and low-carbon economy, and boosts the climate security of the US.²⁶ By contrast, as per Trump, the climate deal was "terrible" for the reason that it placed the country at a permanent disadvantage and subverted the economy.²⁷ Trump is under the assumption that the climate agreement impairs both conventional energy industries and employment, and subverts the competitive advantage of the nation. From the political perspective, in former president's judgment, the deal solidifies the leadership of the country in international affairs while the current president sees it through the prism of American sovereignty diminution. Trump, the outright sceptic of the climate shift, depreciates the economic and environmental benefits of the Paris agreement placing the enormous weight on the economic costs of climate change mitigation, which falls in line with his isolationist and nationalistic America First vision.²⁸ To implement the vision, in which the US enjoys supremacy, Trump will need a very significant flow of funds that may come from scrapped initiatives.

²⁶ Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang 2017.

²⁷ Harry Cockburn. "Michael Bloomberg 'to Write \$4,5 Million Cheque to Cover US Commitment to Paris Climate Agreement'." *Independent*, April 23, 2018, accessed June 25, 2018. <https://goo.gl/jZwTmc>

²⁸ Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang 2017.

2.6.4. A Big Financial Burden, Its Increase, Intolerable Contribution Duration, the Push for Making Contribution Mandatory

The most realistic push factor in the deal that agrees well with the social welfare agenda of Trump assisted by money withdrawal from foreign military and other initiatives is the cost of being a party to the Paris Agreement. As explained, the idea of the treaty is for wealthy nations to raise 100 billion dollars a year by 2020 for helping poor states change their economies.²⁹ This is the financial manifestation of an earlier set target formulated in Copenhagen in 2009.³⁰ Not only the big contribution but also its extensive duration is the potential demotivator for the US president willing to commit funds elsewhere, preferable within the US as pledged. Gosden (2015) claimed that there was the intention of extending the collective mobilization through 2025. Moreover, another plan is to set a goal of setting the fund threshold at 100 billion dollars sometime before 2025.³¹ Another push factor may be the growing pressure of poorer states as to rendering financial commitments binding, which may test the patience of leaders like Trump by the probability of the pressure translating into actual legal duties and the early exit seems to be an effort to avoid their onset. Gosden (2015) confirmed that finance had been the major stumbling block in the Paris negotiations. The argument of developing states was that developed countries have not so much as met their 100-billion donation promise. Plenty of poorer nations are pushing for enhanced funds to become a legally mandatory demand, with the US rejecting the idea of such deal ratification.³² The

²⁹ Suzanne Goldenberg, John Vidal, Lenore Taylor, Adam Vaughan, and Fiona Harvey. "Paris Climate Deal: Nearly 200 Nations Sign in End of Fossil Fuel Era." *The Guardian*, December 12, 2015, accessed July 5, 2018, <https://goo.gl/sVvpvd>

³⁰ Emily Gosden. "Paris Climate Change Agreement: The Deal at a Glance." *The Telegraph*, December 12, 2015, accessed June 25, <https://bit.ly/2uAeUDp>

³¹ Gosden 2015.

³² Ibid.

feeling inside the president may have been that the US was being exploited in the content of the climate deal.

2.6.5. The US Being Piggybacked on – Contribution Contrasts Lacking

Economic Logic

The president may dislike the idea of disproportionate contribution despite there being 36 developed nations based on the UN classification.³³ The US has promised 3 billion dollars while Japan has half as much.³⁴ It may seem that the contribution amount is proportionate to the economy. Germany and France sit 4th and 7th as the biggest economies in 2018.³⁵ Still, Germany and France provide the equal amount of 1 billion dollars.³⁶ Frustrating to the president may be that China and India are not where they belong, which is on the list of contributors. China and India are the 2nd and 5th biggest economies in 2018.³⁷ Still, there is no information on their presence in the deal in the contributing status due to them being considered developing nations that seek help for economy transformation in the Paris deal context. Given the economy strength of these quasi-developing nations, developed ones, such as the US, have every ground to feel frustrated. One source claims that developed countries are calling for the revision of the crude 1992 definition that classifies 6 of the 10 world's richest nations as developing, which excludes financial contribution.³⁸ Another source of frustration may be that China was responsible for 28.03% share of global carbon dioxide emissions in 2015.³⁹ Despite generating

³³ The UN. *Country Classification*. 2014, accessed July 3, 2018. <https://goo.gl/zerhuq>

³⁴ Chris Fitch. "Green Climate Fund Is Go." *Geographical*, May 22, 2015, accessed July 6, 2018. <https://goo.gl/iqPdKz>

³⁵ "The World's Top 10 Largest Economies." *Focus Economics*, December 29, 2017, accessed July 3, 2018. <https://goo.gl/9kMHtV>

³⁶ Fitch 2015.

³⁷ The World's Top 2017.

³⁸ Gosden 2015.

³⁹ Dyfed Loesche. "Paris Climate Agreement Comes into Effect." *Statista*, November 4, 2016, accessed July 5, 2018, <https://bit.ly/2uzK9OK>

close to a third of global CO₂ emissions and having the second biggest economy, China is not a contributor. While the economic injustice makes sense, it may not be the case in the climate agreement.

2.6.6. The Non-Obligatory Nature of the Paris Financial Pool Contribution – the Early Doubts of Exit Relevance

Trump may have taken dislike to the deal that strongly encourages private capital participation, as Gosden (2015) stated that both private and public finances were welcome (Gosden 2015). De jure, there may be no documented demand to pay, which may cast the early doubt on exit legitimacy. Goldenberg et al. (2015) reassured that the only general agreement was mandatory. By contrast, some aspects, inclusive of climate finance and the promise to introduce curbs on emission by separate nations, are not legally binding (Goldenberg et al. 2015). Chapter 2 of the treaty called “intended nationally determined contributions” in itself indicates that the amount of donations is not fixed or determined by the economic performance of a party to the agreement. The mood of the language in the document is not demanding, as its authors use phrases, such as “welcome the...contributions” and “invitation ...to communicate...intended nationally determined contributions” (United Nations 2015). This lack of contribution requirement is reflected in the current situation around the fulfillment of fund pledges. While the likes of Japan, the UK, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands have provided 1.5, 1.12, 1, 0.5, 0.3, and 0.1 billion dollars respectively, which is as much as each of these promised to deliver. By comparison, France has provided around 0.6 out of 1 billion it pledged and the same partial provision holds true for Switzerland, South Korea, and some other smaller unidentified contributors. Italy, Canada, Australia, Spain, and Finland have provided no part of their 0.31, 0.3, 0.19, 0.16, and 0.1 billion dollars promised to

the climate fund (Fitch 2015). There may be the lesser known recipients of exit benefits than average Americans.

2.6.7. The Real Beneficiaries of the Paris Deal Exit – the Lesser Known

Corporate America

One may argue that Trump's decision to quit the deal is down to treaty relevance doubts, injustice-induced frustration, and the desire to improve the welfare of Americans at the expense of the climate funds. The question now remains of who these Americans are that will have Trump's decision improving their welfare. Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang (2017) suggested that interest groups were a defining characteristic of the US politics and the Administration of Trump is believed connected with the fossil fuel industry quite closely. These nonrenewable energy industries exert a potent clout over the Republicans and president's administration. The Administrator of the US EPA Scott Pruitt, Vice President Pence, and President Donald Trump are all personally tightly associated with the petrochemical tycoon Koch Industries. Upon US departure from the climate deal, Washington will endeavor to cancel climate regulation to benefit energy ventures, Koch Industries included.

Pruitt who anchored the legal battle against Clean Power Plan implemented during Obama's presidency insisted on withdrawal and made a point of denying the manmade reasons for global warming. The EPA chief was not alone in campaigning for the exit, as 22 Republican senators who had accumulated 10 million in coal, gas, and oil industry contributions since 2012 wrote an encouraging letter to President Trump on May 25, 2017 (Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang, 2017). Overall, a nonprofit organization Public Citizen has estimated the number of Trump administration officials with ties to the Koch group at 44 individuals, which found its reflection in the 2017 report (Gee 2018). Still, Pruitt is not the only climate change denier who has backed

the Paris decision. Robert Mercer, the patriarch of the Mercers who have been the patrons of the climate change denial movement and the clandestine billionaire megadonors, and his daughter Rebekah Mercer funded and arranged the campaign of Donald Trump by pumping at least 10 million dollars into Breitbart News and throwing millions more at the network of think tanks and right-wing websites (Kaufman 2018). At least one source explains the motivation of the Paris exit as the effort to raise what blocked the repeal of other environmental policies that disagreed with the corporate nonrenewable interests. The pro-withdrawal letter sent to Trump and co-signed by several scores of senators argued that the Paris treaty posed a danger to the efforts of Trump to cancel the Clean Power Plan from the Obama era (McCarthy 2017). Such way or another, the president could not have made the decision unsupported and supported he was.

2.7. Decision Supporters

Trump was not alone in making the decision or at least supporting the idea. More than 20 Republican senators sent the president a letter, in which they tried to reason him into abandoning the treaty. John Barrasso from Wyoming, Roy Blunt from Missouri, and John Boozman from Arkansas are among the senators who petitioned for the decision (These Senators Are Complicit n.d.). It was after the 22 Republican senators sent the letter that big-money coal, gas, and oil supporters received the return on their investment they had pumped into the campaigns of the senators estimated at over 10 million dollars (McCarthy 2017). It is not only senators who have influenced or who keep influencing the environmental decision, as sources point to more high-profile political figures. One of such is Scott Pruitt serving as the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. He criticized the climate deal as something that the nation needs to quit. This statement became one of the strongest

renunciations of the agreement ever made by a Trump administration member. Another climate sceptic is Steve Bannon serving as a senior counselor to the president supports Pruitt and arguing for the exit of the deal. Although losing influence to Trump's son-in-law Jared Kushner, Bannon has done much to phase the nation out of the deal. Bannon along with his productive media arm, Breitbart News, is still regarded as an influential voice in the Trump administration. The counselor has been instrumental in president shepherding via a series of executive actions to rollback a large share of climate efforts made by the previous administration in its time (Chemnick and Lehmann 2017). The letter was but one of the events in a long chain of developments that paved the way for the decision.

2.8. Decision Timeline

The groundwork was laid for the decision over quite an extensive period. On May 26, 2016, Trump voiced his intention to rescind the Paris climate treaty if president. On December 7, 2016, he appointed climate skeptic Scott Pruitt to be at the head of the Environmental Protection Agency. On December 12, Trump made Rex Tillerson, the ex-CEO of oil giant ExxonMobil, the new Secretary of State. On March 15, 2017, the president declared himself willing to reexamine tighter fuel standards for motor vehicles. On March 24, Trump endorsed Keystone pipeline to the tar sands oil developments of Canada that has garnered a measure of controversy. On March 28, nation's leader signed an executive order that left it gutted Obama climate policies, such as Clean Power Plan, which he did in a bid to save the US coal industry, as follows from his political rhetoric (AFP n.d.). On May 25, 2017, a group of senators sent a letter to Trump, in which they urge him to abandon the international environmental agreement in question (Inhofe et al. 2017, 1-2). On June 1, Donald Trump notified that he would withdraw the country from the Paris agreement and admitted that he was keen to be in talks over a new

global treaty (AFP n.d.). These events that expedited the departure of the US from the agreement will have adverse consequences.

2.9. Consequences

Any decision has consequences, whether positive or otherwise, so does the Paris withdrawal although the outcomes seem largely negative, which is a general consensus of multiple sources that a search engine quest returns. An article published by Council on Foreign Relations is one of such sources that stated that the US exit had a potential for subverting the resolve of other nations to implement their tough emission reduction. For the US to step back may lead to current efforts being arrested that now aim to minimize climate change inducing costly coastal damage (McBride 2017). Worse, the impact of the decision will make itself felt in the US. Apart from sending the global temperatures rising by 0.3°C, the cancellation of domestic climate change legislation that comes with the withdrawal decision, millions of residents already affected by droughts, hurricanes, and floods will incur further damage and loss (Shakya and Abeysinghe 2017).

The negative impact of the departure from the deal on the US can also be in the political dimension. Foreign policy professionals, including the former Under Secretary of State R. Nicholas Burns claims that this backtracking can hamper the American clout on a range of unrelated diplomatic matters. Stewart Patrick from Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) associated the exit with the threat to the national prosperity and security caused by US leadership being sabotaged in the aftermath. CFR's two other experts, Sagatom Saha and Varun Sivaram, explained the influence diminution outcome. China will step up to replenish the leadership vacuum created by the US' vacation of the Paris deal member position. The exit will cede the US clout in the green energy race and solidify China's grip on South China Sea and

other territorial disputes. China is already negotiating a new alliance with the EU to promote common climate policies, without the US being involved (McBride 2017). To avoid these potential and predicted consequences of the environmental decision, Americans and nations other than the US, and even international organizations like the EU had best take actions for the US to return to the agreement or at least keep adjusting industry performance to Paris standards.

3. Methodology

The abundance of opinions provided by politicians, journalists, industry experts, and researchers from different countries made it unnecessary to perform the independent survey of their views already pre-recorded in articles, books, and other sources. Therefore, the thesis focused on the compilation of the pre-collected data and opinions that were subject to the subsequent analysis helping gain a deep understanding of all aspects related to the Paris exit decision that has clear environmental implications. Since the project sought to get to understand the main reasons and motivations of the issue in question, such as the Paris withdrawal, and discover dominant tendencies in expert opinions and thoughts, it was using the qualitative research model. The stages of bibliography collection and literature review required the application of the systematic review method that consisted in a comprehensive search upon the formulation of the research questions, the assessment of the quality of bibliography entries, the extraction of the most relevant information, and its further cross-sectional distribution coupled with synthesis. The analysis that gave the project much-needed originality was of the staple instruments in the research and writing process applied not only in the discussion but also the section dedicated to recommendations. Trend analysis helped with the identification of the

main trends in the scholarly discourse. The deficit of investigation into some of the Paris exit motivations and other aspects made the use of exploratory research relevant.

The project faced a range of limitations, of which one is the deficit of information in reports, journals, and books owing to the relative novelty of political and economic developments, on which the project dwelt and even centered. Still, newspapers were handpicked carefully and the selection criterion was the readership and the history of these sources that guarantee that reputation and strong journalism traditions are valued too much for inaccurate fragment of data or opinion to find its way into the sources. A variety of good sources required payable subscription for the access to be granted, yet trial periods and the use of the limited number of articles allowed accessing them. One more limitation is associable with solutions, the principal part of the project. Some of the solutions could probably help change the mindset of the president whose survivalist brilliance has allowed him to stay in business in the toughest times and made him too good a strategist to miss the Paris involvement opportunity, yet intelligence services that do the monitoring are so efficient that the US leader must have already browsed through the solutions offered by the project that bears the name of the commander-in-chief in its title; thus, he will be aware of Fox News probably trying to change his attitude.

Every effort was made to ensure that the project complies with the standards of academic ethics. Every fragment of information borrowed from outside sources was referenced in the form of in-text citations and footnotes. The use of in-text citation allowed drawing the visual border between ideas and data integrated from outside sources and student's analysis and logical bridges that ensure due cohesion by linking chapters, paragraphs, and smaller content fragments. All unreliable sources were excluded at the stage of bibliography compilation to avoid the incorporation of inaccurate data or facts. A special focus was placed

on reputed authors whose credentials were applied as one of source selection criteria in the belief that their reputation is key to the quality of information borrowed for the project. The project employed the full names of officials and other actors involved in the Paris deal issue in some way or other, as there was no need to keep confidential the names reported by open-access sources, such as newspapers and books.

4. Results

The study of literature has allowed identifying a range of environmental decisions made by the current president of the United States. Hansler (2017) reported the cessation of nation's commitments to the Paris Climate Agreement in November 2017, while McCarthy (2017) explained that the withdrawal cleared the path for at least one more decision, the cancellation of the Clean Power Plan, an essential Obama-era policy. Brodwin (2017) composed a list of president's environmental decisions, including the approval of the Dakota Access oil pipeline delayed by Obama. Similarly to previous source, Hansler (2017) also listed all actual decision affecting the environment, including the signing of presidential proclamations to reduce national monuments and the transformation of the Environmental Protection Agency now facing budget cuts, tighter cooperation with fossil fuel actors, and the marginalization of the climate change concept excluded from agency's 4-year plan. Still, the most crucial decision may be that to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, which the US leader announced with a great deal of pride on June 1, 2017, as follows from president's speech (Trump 2017). While, according to Trump (2017), he has left the door open for a potential return on better contributory terms, the agreement deserves criticism for placing an economic burden on taxpayers, cost jobs, causing factories to go into closedown, and curbing economic production.

In reality, the description of the Paris deal by Streck, Keenlyside and von Unger (2016, 4-5) pointed to no mandatory contribution for any of 196 parties. The legal product of 6 years of climate change negotiations formulates an important temperature reduction goal. While the contribution to the decrease in emissions seems required, the amount is not regulated. Sterman (2016) pointed to the benefits of being a co-party to the climate agreement, including the reduction of the carbon footprint by individual nations and the maximum warming, which will save a variety of US cities and states, including Florida and New Orleans. Bump (2017) was more specific in treaty utility associating it with the minimization of the incidence and intensity of draughts, floods, and precipitation. The researcher also stressed the impact of climate change on the human health through asthma aggravation, heat exhaustion, heatstroke, and the spread of illnesses borne by mosquitos. Floodwater in itself is dangerous in health terms, as Brouhard and Kline (2014) indicated that it might blend with sewage, while Trechsel and Bomberg (2009, 88) described sewage as contaminated with bacteria most often. Wright and Nichols (2018, 152) gave an insight into potential waterborne pathogenic organisms that may come in the shape of flesh-eating bacteria. Trechsel and Bomberg (2009, 88) explained another way in which floodwater can pose a threat to health suggesting that standing water stimulated the growth of fungi while Federal Emergency Management Agency (2016, 7) confirmed that this outcome may be due to water being trapped in walls left wetted by floods. By comparison, Climate Change Map (2017) showed another way in which the climate deal benefits the US. The predictions of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration are devoid of optimism, as a 4-feet sea level rise will bury a large portion of the US under water by 2100. Robinson (2017) came to a similar conclusion revealing 7 major American cities as endangered, including Galveston and Atlantic City.

However, besides benefits, there are Paris deal doubts likely to blame for the US exit. Professor John Sterman (2016) mentioned a range of such, including the potential irreversibility of glacial melting and sea level rise, the uncertainty of pledges, the slow pace of commitment to the deal, and the lack of appropriate auditory mechanisms. The decision to abandon the climate pact may be the natural outcome of US president's skepticism. Cillizza (2017 "Quotes") pointed that the climate change denial manifests itself in Trump tweets that abound with global warming and climate change hashtags and carry much doubt despite the convincing findings of 13 US government agencies. Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang (2017) reported that the president failed to acknowledge the process of climate change and the human role therein preferring to stress Paris deal injustice to the US. Researchers also identified such unconventional motivation for deal exit as the desire to squash the legacy of the predecessor due to personal animosity towards Obama. This feud is likely to grow bigger, thereby strengthening the exit resolve of Trump, as Siddiqui and Gambino (2017) reported the vocal criticism of Trump's decision by Barack Obama. This tensed relationship could have polished Trump's America First vision implemented via the departure from the deal. Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang (2017) pointed to Paris deal understandings by both presidents that are poles apart. Both Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang (2017) and Cockburn (2018) specified that, unlike Obama, Trump perceived the agreement as such that precluded his domestic welfare prioritization or economy development.

Another push factor consists in the perceived financial burden of the agreement. Goldenberg et al. (2015) identified that rich nations were expected to collect 100 billion dollars each year until 2020 while Gosden (2015) admitted that the contribution period was extended to 2025 and that the 100 billion would be made minimal in the coming years. Gosden (2015) also revealed that poorer nations were pushing for the mandatory funding boost for wealthy

treaty co-signees. Another set of findings suggests that the US president may be frustrated by US financial exploitation in the context of the deal that lack economic logic. Fitch (2015) disclosed that the US pledged 3 billion dollars or twice the amount of Japan's intended contribution. France and Germany offer the equal amount, 1 billion dollars per each of the two. The amount is equal although the former is twice as far from the top position on the list of global economies as the latter, as follows from the rankings provided by the World's Top (2017). Another source of frustration may that China and India that, based on World's Top (2017) list of economies, are the 2nd and 5th economies are fund beneficiaries rather than benefactors. Gosden (2015) attributed this issue to the outdated 1992 classification of states that ranks 60% of top nations as developing. Worse, China does not contribute a cent despite its tremendous carbon footprint. Loesche (2016) found the nation to source almost a third of global carbon dioxide emissions.

However, a range of personal interests reveal themselves in the exit decision as well. Gosden (2015) pointed to the expected public and private funding encouraged by the deal. Still, Goldenberg et al. (2015) made a remark that challenges the financial push factor, as the researcher indicated the lack of financial obligations. The tone in the studied parts of the Paris agreement formulated by United Nations (2015) is encouraging at the most but no obligating. The lack of obligation is confirmed by the current payment situation described by Fitch (2015) who showed some nations as not having paid yet. This brings the search to the real beneficiaries of the exit decision. Zhang, Dai, Lai, and Wang (2017) revealed the bond between EPA Administrator Pruitt, Vice President Pence, President Trump, and the petrochemical tycoon Koch industries. It was also found that 22 Republican senators who had accumulated 10 million dollars in contributions from conventional energy producers lobbied the exit through a letter to president Trump. Gee (2018) mentioned twice as many officials with Koch ties in president's

administration relying on the results of the investigation by a nonprofit. Kaufman (2018) dispersed any doubts by revealing the Koch family to be billionaire megadonors and climate change deniers.

The group of beneficiaries corresponds with that of decision supporters. These Senators Are Complicit (n.d.) and McCarthy (2017) both mentioned the 22 senators who sent the letter urging Trump to withdraw from the deal. Chemnick and Lehmann (2017) mentioned two top officials who have lent a particular support to the decision, including EPA Administrator Pruitt and Senior Counselor Steve Bannon. Although supported, Trump could not pull the US out in one day, which took a range of efforts. AFP (n.d.) mentioned the appointment of Paris sceptic Pruitt, the approval of the Keystone pipeline, the cancellation of the Clean Power Plan, and the exit encouragement letter from a group of Republican senators as events that preceded and influenced the withdrawal of the nation from the Paris deal.

Although it was not rash, the decision has consequences that can make Trump reconsider the decision. McBride (2017) identified that the US exit can subvert the resolve of other nations to reduce emissions and even paralyze many current efforts. Besides international outcomes, the treaty can create a domestic impact on the nation. Shakya and Abeysinghe (2017) warned about the danger of natural calamities, such as drought and hurricanes that are fraught with damage and losses. McBride (2017) also looked at the consequences of deal exit faced by the USA, yet the researchers drew attention to the threat posed to national security and wealth over the loss of influence of the US and its accumulation by China.

5. Discussion

As befits the men of business, President Trump has wasted no time in making decisions in his new capacity. By the time he was barely a year into his office, the billionaire-turned-

president had initiated the procedure of Clean Power plan termination, approved the Dakota Access oil pipeline, announced the US withdrawal from the Paris Climate deal, signed proclamations cutting the territory of national monuments, and started the transformation of the Environmental Protection Agency. All decisions scream pragmatism and economic benefits in some ways, as they reorient state spending from environmental initiatives towards social welfare cultivation or lift restrictions that blocked economic opportunities, as is the case with the national monuments and the pipeline. While each of these environmental decisions has important implications, none comes close to matching those of the Paris deal exit that can affect the international climate change efforts. The president took a special pride in getting it announced during his White House speech and motivated the departure by the serious financial burden put on the shoulders of taxpayers.

While there is economic sense in the pullout, the treaty embracing 196 nations seems useful based on its goal of temperature restraint via a concerted international effort. More than that, its tone is far from demanding in the way of financial participation. When it comes to utility, it expects nations to work towards decreasing the carbon footprint and the maximum warming which will make it possible to mitigate natural disasters, including floods and draughts. The collective effort will reduce the impact of climate change on human health affected by heatstroke, heat exhaustion, asthma, and medical states caused by waterborne bacteria to be found in floodwater caused by hurricanes that can be left poorly mitigated if the climate deal loses its parties. The deal helps battle the rising level of sea that can engulf US cities like Galveston and Atlantic City and save the US coastline that can sink by 2100 given nonactivity and ignorance.

Still, there was something to let doubts creep in, which may be the irreversibility of the process of glaciers' melting. Pledges made by nations do not carry legal weight, which would

ensure their implementation. The process of commitment may not be too quick while the accounting procedures do not seem defined. President Trump has had multiple reasons to grow disillusioned over the US participation in the treaty or feign disillusionment. Trump has “tweeted” his desire to reject climate change by whatever means possible. All the tweets turned up by the archive communicate the skeptical mood of the man who lives in climate change denial that also rules out any human involvement in the issue despite the valid evidence offered by 13 American government agencies, which hints at the hidden agenda of the exit rather than just relative environmental illiteracy. One of the reasons for Trump to oppose the deal that is not public is the feud between him and his predecessor and the exit is an effort to trample out his environmental legacy. His vision of America coming first seems to be the continuation of the quarrel, with Trump rejecting the Paris deal as affecting economic development, which contravenes the rhetoric of Obama. To exit the deal and stomping thereon verbally are Trump’s ways to differentiate himself from Obama and denigrate his environmental accomplishments. Such disparagement would not be possible without economic rationales that are not senseless.

It is true that top nations are expected to collect 100 billion each year before 2020, to make it a minimal amount after, and to keep contributing at least till 2025. Worse, developing nations want this donation formalized and regulated through legally obliging mechanisms, which may have angered the US president who wants money staying in the US to go into domestic developmental projects instead of it being dispersed on global eco-initiatives. The feeling inside Trump before the fateful decision could have been that the US was being exploited. Truly, the contribution of nations defies economic logic supported by the status of nations’ economies. Germany should give as much as France does, as its economy is twice that of France. China and India should have become treaty contributors a long time ago rather than the recipients of funds allocated to developing nations for economy transformation. The

outdated classification keeps the second and fifth world's economies in the developing nations category. Apart from absorbing funds, without providing any, China is the biggest carbon dioxide supplier, which gives a state leader every reason to feel betrayed by the deal.

While these multiple push factors may justify the US decision, the matter is that the treaty does not obligate its participants funding-wise. The encouraging rather than demanding tone of the document as well as the failure of staying nations to contribute the pledged funds partially or otherwise vindicate the deficit of the legitimate financial exit drivers, which brings one closer to the actual US interest group that wants the US out of Paris. Researchers point to the link between the president, the vice president, and EPA administrator and the petrochemical Koch clan. A reported 22 Republican senators that were pushing the US towards the exit door and received 10 million in contributions from energy companies also have ties to the Koch family mired in the notoriety, as do 44 president's administration members. In quitting Paris, the administration is let loose in the way of putting an end to other climate policies from the Obama era so much despised by coal and other harmful industries.

These decision supporters kept influencing the president pending the announcement of the decision over a period that included the appointment of Pruitt the administrator of the EPA and the sending of the exit request letter to the US leader along other developments. While the interest groups do stand to gain from their hands coming untied, the nation seems to lose, as natural calamities will not be daunted while the US influence will degenerate, with China pushing the US aside. While the increase of the contribution from other nations that will have to fill the financial vacuum will mitigate environmental risks even in the US due to the environment and climate not being isolated and owned by individual nations, the influence loss may not recuperate from the exit unless the US is back before long, yet this process will require a set of solutions to get Mr. Trump to reverse the decision.

6. Solutions, Their Relevance and Viability

6.1. New President Election in Due Course

A widely known American politician and environmentalist Al Gore pointed to a possible solution to the exit issue suggesting that the US could remain in the climate deal if a new president moves into the White House in 2020 (Oppenheim 2017). This option is very viable if one goes into the legal particulars. The former vice president explained that the signatories would not be able to quit the agreement until November 2019. Even so, the genuine departure will not be finalized pending the year to follow. Once a new president is sworn in, he or she can do so little as give a 30 days' notice, which will place the nation back among treaty participants. The first date upon which the new leader can de jure abandon the treaty is the first day after the coming presidential election in 2020 (Oppenheim 2017).

There are some buts, one being that Trump can accumulate public support and run for president again and the other being that a new president can share the same environmental view. When it comes to alternative or potential new presidents, Republican Ted Cruz is already busy getting himself ready for a 2020 office run (Kelly 2016). Much evidence points to his eagerness and power ambition. Texas Senator Ted Cruz presumably plotted to deny the Republican presidential nomination to the billionaire in defiance of the rule of presidential candidates not colluding in campaigning (Janda et al. 2017, 226). More importantly, Akhtar and Palagiano (2017, 44) explained that Ted Cruz who had been a candidate for Republican nomination for Presidential elections was one of the vocal Paris deal opponents who would like it abandoned. One of the environmental postulates that he flatly rejects is that people are to blame for the climate shift (Akhtar and Palagiano 2017, 44). On the positive side, politicians can change their convictions if it proves beneficial for them to do so. If the exit stirs much

unrest among people mobilizing protestors and Paris stay proponents, Cruz can “piggyback” on the quitting decision and people’s opposition to Trump. To this end, he will need to own the anti-Paris advocacy mistake and fall to distancing himself from the climate deal rejection before long.

Still, such predictions are very untimely. On no account can one predict who runs for the office come 2019, still less wins, yet what is for certain is that there will be no Trump among the frontrunners and also-rans vying for the position unless he develops some like to the office, which he seems to lack at this point. Von Drehle (2017) claimed Donald Trump not to look happy in his current job that does not allow him to meet whomever he pleased or say whatever it was that he wanted to say when he used to be an entrepreneur. He finds himself isolated, which takes its wearisome toll on him, and his discontent makes itself observed on his face. Trump admitted in a conversation with the journalist it was not polls that empowered; it was the ratings that did. Being drawn to the fame of presidency, he likes being talked about (Drehle 2017). While it is true that he has made himself one of the most talked individuals on Earth, the context of this discussion shaped by the way in which he generated it, which was in part by leaving the treaty, does not get him pleased rating-wise, which is why he may be on the quitting road. He will definitely see his time out and even finish the tenure on a high note and in style since he is not a quitter, as follows from his grit, ironclad determination, and solid personality honed by the tough business environment and the ability to withstand the punches of the business fate. However, one may not have to think radical while looking for possible solutions. Americans will not have to solve the exit dilemma by waiting for as long as what is left of President Trump’s tenure runs, as the consequences of the decision may force Trump to reenter the deal much earlier.

6.2. Let the Consequences of the Decision Do the Convincing

The US and other parties need not have expressed any concern or threaten retaliation over the months. As a matter of fact, they may do nothing about the withdrawal if Trump is not beyond renegotiating the deal on new terms. Then again, such return rhetoric may be the oral implementation of the exit impact minimization strategy of the leader who is adamant about leaving. The strategy apparently seeks to diminish the backlash of other nations, as the leaving decision has reputational consequences reinforced by the environment-related urgency of participation in the agreement by countries, particularly economic powerhouses. That said, the nations and nonstate actors do not need to worry about possibly blank populism aimed at reputation retention since the consequences of leaving the agreement will haunt the president in some way or other.

It may be to get other nations valuing the US more that Trump quitted the treaty in the belief that this would create a funding vacuum never to be filled prompting other nations to beg for the US to stay put on the deal that takes years to quit on its own contributory terms that should be more favorable in the sense that the share of the US Paris funding will be reduced. The president may want to show that he will have none of the US being forced to be the biggest sponsor. The withdrawal money saving has a ring of his pre-election vision of preventing money drain from the US for whatever purpose, be it climate change reversal efforts or humanitarian aid to a war-torn nation. The problem is that other participants seem to have chosen to step up to make up for funding, as it gives them extra weight on the geopolitical scene increasing their say on the matters of global importance, which will throw the US on the periphery, without any deal comeback being requested by other parties to the Paris agreement.

Although focused on the domestic economy, Trump is unlikely to be willing to see the US influence waning.

Besides, Trump's plan of increasing the welfare of Americans may reach a brick wall if the withdrawal leads other nations to retaliate in the way of trade, which will cut back state chest commerce proceeds required for investment in "making America great again." Trump's catchphrase depends much on trade, as one of the crucial means of budget replenishment. Based on data on the exports of services and goods, this article of income is accountable for 11.9% of nation's GDP (United States – Exports 2018). Being the top global trader that it is, the US produces and earns upwards of 20% of the global income. If the nation would not have been making trade liberalization efforts since the WW2, its income would not be 9% higher than what it would have, without such efforts having been made or being made (Economy & Trade n.d.). Thus, the nation stands to lose if European functionaries retaliate over the Paris decision and there seems to be much to lose if trade income is affected and retaliate they will. According to Casella (2017), Martin Schulz, a German political candidate at the time of writing confronted President Trump verbally, without engaging directly though. He pledged to retaliate in response to Paris withdrawal by declining to be in talks with the United States over a transatlantic agreement. The US, he claimed would not be able to gain a better market access if it kept disrespecting the rules of climate protection (Casella 2017).

It may seem that politicians are not being emotional or rash. Still, such response is not impossible, as it is also like politicians to have a swing of mood and a change of heart despite them needing to think straight and pragmatic while in power. This susceptibility to the influence on the attitude of politicians has precedents and one is Canada-based involving its former prime minister. The official served in this capacity between 2006 and 2015 (Mann 2017, 7). Harper was the advocate of the cooling relations with China resting convinced that

Canadians would not want them selling out their belief in human rights, freedom, and democracy. Harper was resolute, such that he skipped the opening ceremonies of the 2008 Summer Olympics in Beijing (Lewis and Everitt 2017, 321). Even so, the relations took an unexpected turn for the better 4 years later. A report emerged in 2012 of pandas being shipped to Toronto in the context of China's signature "Panda diplomacy" aimed at foreign relations' amelioration. The article admitted that the arrival of the bamboo-munching animals was a lucid sign of the bilateral relations being as warm as ever, contrary to the chill of the Canadian prime minister in the first 3 years of his tenure (MacKinnon 2012). The relations could not have improved over the human rights situation that had much to do with them getting worse since, in 2014, a Beijing-based journalist from the Telegraph described the HR status quo as "worst in decades" (Moore 2014).

Just as Canada's top government official can change his attitude and act accordingly under the influence of emotions like pleasure and gratitude to the Chinese gift, so too can other politicians like Schulz whose frustration over Trump's exit from the Paris deal can make economic decisions like market de-liberalization unconducive to the domestic economic agenda of the US president. Schulz did not beat Merkel to the top position, yet he may with time, as the political arena is testing derby of big players, which offers plenty of challenges that, if not handled well, may cost even a general favorite like Merkel her career paving the way for a new top face of German politics. Given the complicated environment, the electoral transparency, the lack of corrupt political culture that makes politicians to cling to power, and a solid democratic tradition and system of Germany, the nation may have a new leader ascend who may retaliate against Washington.

Sometimes, the best strategy is the extemporizing strategy that is all about waiting. President Trump may himself choose to backtrack on his Paris decision in part due to the loss

of influence and say on the geopolitical arena and the economic consequences for Trump that such outcome implies. As reported by Cohen (2017), having witnessed Trump's decisions, including the Paris withdrawal, foreign leaders consider him alarming rather than serious. They share an understanding that he is not worth relying on; therefore, they have set about reshaping alliances and reconfiguring the networks that constitute the global economy bypassing the US and reducing its standing (Cohen 2017). What Donald Trump is doing is giving up the US global leadership to genuine world leaders who are grabbing the momentum to protect their residents while placing their economies firmly on the clean energy track. A seismic shift in the global order is to be witnessed, as China, Europe, and others lead the way forward (Greenpeace 2017).

If no longer influential in geopolitical matters that may involve military conflicts, the US may someday find itself marginalized and blocked from military exploits that the president himself may wish going on. As explained by Zenko (2017), Trump expanded every war inherited from Obama despite having vowed to deliver peace. The president appears to be dropping bomb at unprecedented levels. Trump in the first 8 months into his tenure has already cleared 6 precision airstrikes in Libya and bombed every nation that his predecessor did in the 8 years of his spell. In his 9th month in power, the incumbent leader of the US increased the number of bombs used to shell the nations to 26 172, thereby surpassing the number of bombs applied in 2016. By increasing the number of airstrikes to 33 in Somalia by the end of 2017, Trump released more bombs than George W. Bush and Obama did in the period that followed the country's intervention in early 2007 (Zenko 2017). Trump even considered the invasion of Venezuela not yet at war with other countries and pressed aides about the feasibility of the move (Goodman 2018).

There is a clear economic rationale behind it being important for the US to have been bombing these turbulent nations and keeping the conflict alive and glowing at the very least. Maguire (2017) reported that no politicians but Trump had benefitted the most from the spending spree of the National Rifle Association (NRA) in 2016 that pumped more than 30 million dollars into Trump as a presidential candidate. The NRA, as it is explained, is the most powerful and the biggest group lobbying for or against gun rights, with the better part of its power attributed to money spent during election campaigns (Wilson 2012, 350). Other researchers similarly point to the representative role of the NRA deemed to be the major mouthpiece for both gun owners and producers and the third members of the “right-to-bear-arms trinity” (Wilson 2005, 88). When it comes to how it was that the group benefitted the then presidential candidate, they spent on Trump more than they did on other candidates in the course of 2008 and 2012 presidential election cycles that comprise 145 House and 45 Senate races (Maguire 2017). Trump took to repaying this investment and gun producers were in line for dividends.

While a president, Trump was rather quick to reassure the NRA that he would be championing them. In April 2017, he told the assembly of gun rights advocates that the attack that was being waged against the Second Amendment in the past 8 years had come to a conclusive end. While mass shootings in Tehama County, Sutherland Springs, and Las Vegas caught everyone’s attention, Washington has fought shy of discussing measures that may anger the association (Maguire 2017). Thus, Trump seems interested in military conflicts in the Middle East and Africa due to potential contribution of the lobbying benefactors to his personal wealth. The president may prefer to reconsider his decision if he is not to lose the influence of the US allowing it to stay engaged in foreign military conflicts that benefit him directly by

spurring domestic arms production sold abroad, which meets the interest of the arms benefactors of the entrepreneur-turned-president.

Extemporizing or waiting for consequences to limit the economic opportunities of the US president has at least one flaw that questions the possibility of Paris deal getting the US marginalized, as is required for the emergence of the influence reduction driver of the return to climate deal. The United States may be too strong to find itself on the periphery of geopolitics. De Haldevang (2017) estimated the US defense at 664.1 billion dollars. By contrast the combined budget of its European NATO allies is equal to 238.8 billion in the comparable currency (De Haldevang 2017). Thus, it comes as no surprise why high-ranking NATO officials and commanders disbelieve in Europe's chances of self-defense. Huggler (2016) cited the view of Frederick Hodges, lieutenant-general and commander of US army in Europe, that Russia had a potential for seizing the capitals of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia in just 36 hours. The military commander admitted it his interview with Germany's Zeit that the military bloc did not have the sufficient contingent in place to keep the eastern flank of NATO safe pointing to the need to stand united (Huggler 2016). This opinion could seem but an exaggeration of a commander who may wish the US relevant on the global arena. Still, similar pessimism runs through the rhetoric of the senior-most NATO official who is not an American. Allison (2018) noted that a NATO chief acknowledged that the EU cannot protect Europe if alone due to it is not having the nuclear weapons owned by North Korea, China, and Russia. The US as a strategic nuclear force remains the ultimate guarantor of NATO's security (Allison 2018).

Even this view of the relevance of the US and its nuclear umbrella is possible to conquer. First, a much-feared outright act of aggression and territorial annexation by Russia that can be legally bracketed with an act of hostility or war will not be condoned, with a retaliatory backlash following. The possibility of this response and its further impact on the

kleptocratic Russian regime that leave it without the financial lifeblood serve as demotivators. Dangremond (2018) offered an excellent view into the scope of kleptocracy in Russia by disclosing the fortune of Kremlin's longstanding leader. Bill Browder, Hermitage Capital Management CEO, estimated it at 200 billion dollars, which is more than the estimates of Celebritynetworth.com of 70 billion dollars (Dangremond 2018). Whichever of these is accurate, billions of dollars are not what a state official can gain while in power, which confirms the kleptocracy claim, and this fortune may be threatened by any conflicts that affect the capacity to increase the capital. The war on any European state would immediately trigger the electronic payment system blockade at a very minimum. Cook (2015) stated that the blockade of such system monopolized by SWIFT will lead to archaic approaches being in use. This sets a country back by decades and makes it incur losses that run into tens of billions of dollars (Cook 2015). Any act of aggression against sovereign NATO members will launch a minimum of the sanction response that ruins the very relevance of Russian corrupt officials being occupying their offices.

There is no way the Russian president pays out of his pocket to fund a war that the nation cannot afford even now that it is not at any war with a NATO member. Even if he does, it will not last the Russian army months of fighting. NATO can rest convinced that Russia is not a threat in the military sense, which reduces the influence of the US that its strength gives it. To embark on a war against Europe and it is a full continent that engages in the situation due to the military response unity of the military bloc, a nation needs a huge economy. The Middle East Media Research Institute (2018) explained that the Russian share of the global economy was a mere 3,5% and that it was on the decline with the result that it will drop by 1% in 2 years' time. To put more visually comprehensible, the GDP of California is twice that of Russia (The Middle East Media Research Institute 2018).

Second, Europe has some solutions of how to prepare itself defensively for a life without the US. NATO Europe will fare better pooling resources and increasing defense expenditure, enhancing the capabilities that the region can manage unassisted, that is, without the US, and showing Trump how much his nations needs Europe in part by having a more influential say in foreign policy issues (De Haldevang 2017). Therefore, Europe can do without the US due to the very low likelihood of Russian threat's materialization and the possibility of region's defensive and political evolution, which adds to the feasibility of the recommendation to wait for Paris deal exit to cause US global influence reduction along with economic losses for Trump who will not stand to gain from the lobby money by stoking up the active stages of conflicts or initiating new ones to offer economic opportunities for arms producers and other actors, such as construction businesses. If waiting for new presidential elections or waiting for Paris exit is not an option, as both recommendations take time, people can take the matter of Paris involvement into their own hands.

6.3. People Power: People to Communicate Their Paris Staying Will

Then again, his stance on the climate change matter may not be all-American, that is, universally shared even by all members of his electorate who could not have voted for him out of support of all of his electoral promises. Although supporting his immigration vision, they may not have much good to say about the environmental philosophy that materialized in the quitting decision. Thus, a good way to address the decision and its consequences may be to set the anti-Paris portion of the political elite listening again to what people have to say regarding the rash decision that Washington made, without having previously discussed its rationales in the context of a referendum or at least a nation-wide poll. This part of the elite need reminding of their accountability required by the status. There may be no better way to remind politicians

of their status requiring them to serve the nation and its interests right under the social contract, which is viable given the culture of protests, their history of productivity, and the developed democratic model reinforced by actual constitutionally provided liberties and rights. The US supreme commander may have much sympathy for the Kremlin leader and his discretionary governance mechanism, yet the US is a different political model built around checks and balances and transparency and it is operated in a different political era largely free from any dictatorial features in the developed world. If Trump is to retain the reins of power, he will have to listen to his voters and cater to their demands, of which some may relate to Paris return.

Americans are anything but apolitical or civilly apathetic, which means they will not be sitting idle in the lethargic expectation of a change of heart in Washington. Chan (2017) reported thousands of protesters to have already marched in Washington, DC and throughout the nation in support of greater environmental protections (Chan 2017). The decision in itself has ensured people will be filmed flooding the streets of big American cities in numbers by news agencies' cameramen, which speaks volume for the viability of the measure. On June 2, 2017, Pope (2017) admitted that far more Americans were currently aware of the Paris Climate Agreement than 24 hours ago. On no previous occasion has climate been as dominant on the media landscape of all nations bar Syria and Nicaragua than it was the day before. Even at the point of agreement signing by all of the world, there was no such buzz (Pope 2017).

Unsurprisingly, this growing awareness has translated into what can be a very serious backing of the climate deal by Americans of whatever demographic. A Washington Post-ABC News poll has interesting decision support figures to offer. Opposition to Trump's move surpasses support by around 2-to-1 margin. In percentage terms, it appears that 28% of respondents support the move while 59% clearly do not (Clement and Dennis 2017). Another source reported that almost 70% of Americans, the majority of people in all 50 states included,

is supportive of the climate agreement. As per the poll performed by the Yale Program on Climate Change Communication in November 2016, around 7 out of 10 registered voters, which is equivalent to 69%, are united in the belief that deal involvement is necessary, as against just 13% of those who do not share this view and side by President Trump (Wilts 2017). Americans grow disillusioned about the economy-related utility of the decision. Just 32% of interviewees associate the exit with the boost to the national economy. A remaining 42% and 20% of respondents is inclined to link the decision to detrimental and neutral economic outcomes (Clement and Dennis 2017).

Still, these numerous potential protesters may not be of much use until organized and spearheaded by politicians, which is quite possible based on the Paris deal support breakdown by two principal parties. Wilts (2017) pointed that the prevalent majority of Democrats or 86% welcomed the treaty. Even 51% of Republicans are of the same view (Wilts 2017). Another source similarly describes the deal support situation in the camps of the main parties, as Republicans are said to be not as unanimous in their support of the exit as Democrats are in their collective opposition thereto. While the 67% of the Republican majority reportedly backs the president, this figure declines to 22% among political independents and 8% of Democrats. In other words, only more than 6 in 10 independents and 8 in 10 Democrats disagree with the departure from the international climate deal (Clement and Dennis 2017). While one should not expect Republicans to take the field against one of their own, Democrats can help organize protestors and contribute to the return cause through their legal efforts if people maintain their vocal support of the Paris deal. People may need help that may come from local administration officials and even businesses.

6.4. American States and Businesses to Defy President's Will

Although important, these actions may not be this ultra-important, for American states enjoy much autonomy in terms of legislation, which will allow individual states to comply with Paris Agreement expectations, without the US being a part of the treaty. Chan (2017) reported that states had mostly retained their environmental commitments. California, for example, put forward even stricter environmental policies in its direct response to federal rollbacks (Chan 2017). Governors, including Washington Governor Jay Inslee, California Governor Jerry Brown, and New York Governor Andrew Cuomo, have already aired their commitment to the Paris Agreement. The three officials have announced the establishment of the US Climate Alliance, which is a coalition that will assemble American states supporting the deal and combatting climate change aggressively. Although Republican governor Charlie Baker of Massachusetts has not aligned himself with the alliance, he has pledged to contribute. Opposing the exit decision also are mayors. There is claimed to be a group called Climate Mayors that comprises 83 mayors that represent 40 million Americans. The organization that includes Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti and New York City Mayor Bill De Blasio among others will be adopting, honoring, and maintaining commitments to climate deal objectives (Mills 2017).

Active actions like protests may not be as much needed as may be believed by some, as companies mirror the same defiant approach that states, such as California, apply, which may sabotage Trump's environmental deregulations cemented by nation's departure from the international agreement. Chan (2017) admitted that American businesses were not supportive of the exit. Main US companies claim that they would slow down environmental deregulation and maintain the US engagement in the international climate policy before they would follow president's lead (Chan 2017). In the light of this pro-Paris enthusiasm, another

recommendation cannot but suggest itself. This stance of companies makes it viable to recommend the cooperation between American business players and the EU that is active on the climate change front and that seems willing to cooperate directly with US commercial entities.

Boffey, Connolly, and Asthana (2017) informed that the EU had vowed to bypass Washington. The economic bloc it is reported will be cooperating with US business leaders as much as it will be with state governors, which will allow fulfilling the historic commitments of the agreement (Boffey, Connolly, and Asthana 2017). Trump may be left with no choice but to retaliate against American businesses for this defiance via legal tools like tariffs that will make the life of businesses harder to live. At least one legal measure has been taken already. Horowitz (2018) reported the enforcement of the 10% and 25% tariffs on aluminum and steel imports. Despite benefitting domestic metal producers, damages whatever producers import the materials, including carmakers (Horowitz 2018). Whether the measure is down to the economic rationality, the desire to meet the interest of lobbyists, or a retaliation measure against the pro-Paris business sector, it does hurt the ventures. Still, businesses' deal cooperation may be a viable solution since the president will not dare initiate another screws-tightening measure that may put the remaining business ties at risk.

Multiple sources described how Trump's business practices have left businesses disgruntled after they had performed work at his business objects without due remuneration. Reilly (n.d.) reported that hundreds of entrepreneurs alleged that Trump still owed them money. Such practices have put many out of business, as they were forced to file for bankruptcy (Reilly n.d.). Even if paid, companies have often been entitled only to partial work compensation. One business owner remembers receiving just 70 000 out of 231 000 dollars owed by Trump after years of fighting through the bankruptcy court (Dolan and Schneider 2016). Thus, if businesses

cooperating with the EU on the Paris deal do rise after president putting the heat on them, they will gain a massive support that can have serious reputational outcomes for president' rating that seems valued by him. Worse, his existing partners have cut ties with him. If it were profitable to cooperate with his business, they would not have. Such all-American backlash may give another powerful impetus for the few business partners that are still around.

Evidence shows that Trump may not have too many partners willing to do business with him, as many have deserted. Peterson and Taylor (2017) presented the list of ventures that have severed business bonds with the Trump business. Uber, Nordstrom, Neiman Marcus, Macy's, Hope Shopping Network, Shoes.com, Belk, Wayfair, Bellacor, Jet, and Shop Style are on the list (Peterson and Taylor 2017). Univision, NBC Universal, Televisa, Farouk Systems, Rabbit Cerveceria, and Ora TV are also among the companies no longer doing business with the billionaire or his family members (Chew 2015). Such potential partners' drain will not sit well with the billionaire, as some of his sectors may not be doing too well presently. Washington Post (2018) admitted that the merchandising empire of the billionaire had faded. In 2015, the billionaire in question listed 19 ventures paying him to distribute or produce Trump-branded consumer merchandise. In the weeks that preceded article's release, only 2 were listed as selling his commodities, of which one is a Turkish company selling Trump furniture while the other one is a Panamanian company that is selling home commodities and bed linens. Others have stopped cooperation for reasons, such as licensing agreement expiry and a hostile immigrant and Muslim rhetoric (Washington Post 2018).

This solution should work. Trump does not operate isolated and his projects are not self-sufficient in the sense that foreign and domestic contractors and suppliers are required. Given the way in which he treated some of these in the past and the reputation that this treatment won him, he cannot have too many enthusiastic partners left to dump, as follows

from the above-presented facts. There is a minor risk, however, that some unscrupulous companies choose to stand aloof or, worse still, capitalize upon the juncture created by boycotting companies to increase their consumer segment, thereby forcing businesses out of protests against Trump actions, which will weaken the backlash of US companies in response to president's potential clampdown on businesses who maintain Paris deal cooperation. While a measure of solidarity should be expected from a large number of companies in the event of Trump's retaliation for Paris cooperation, it will never be that all businesses come to a standstill and issue an ultimatum, as nonactivity can put the lid on many ventures.

6.5. Big Businesses Will Foot Nation's Bill Instead. How This Can Be a
Mind Game to Force Trump to Make an About-Turn on the Exit Issue.
Mainstreaming Rich Muslims' Role in Trump Business Building Following
Their Increased Commitment to the Deal as Another Influence Route

The former mayor of New York City, billionaire Michael Bloomberg promised to write a check that is worth 4.5 million dollars to cover the American contribution to the Paris deal (Cockburn 2018). At least one source raises the amount of the donation to 15 million that Bloomberg provided to the UNFCCC (Kirsch 2017). Besides fulfilling the US contribution vow at least partially, the contribution even if in the form of a promise may encourage other US tycoons to follow the lead, whether to patch their image or offer help selflessly. According to Cockburn (2018), the former official admitted that he would provide funds from Bloomberg Philanthropies for the pact in the years to come if the US did not start moving in the opposite direction towards rejoining. The ex-mayor expressed a hope in an interview with CBS that Trump would have changed his mind by the following year (Cockburn 2018). Bloomberg's

hope makes perfect change seeing as how rocky the relationship between the two is and how motivational the role of ex-mayor's contribution can prove to be in the light of the relationship.

The pledge of the former NYC mayor will not sit well with the president, which is where another benefit of Bloomberg's move lies. If Trump is to be trusted as a source of the explanation of what caused a rift the relations between billionaires Trump and Bloomberg, according Bump (2016), the current US president claims as though it had been the former NY mayor being mean to him that had led to the outcome. In reality, the former mayor of NY is in many ways what Trump wants to be, that is to say, a very wealthy individual who runs a media company and who transformed his riches into political power. Bloomberg was the richest NY resident to race for the top position in 2016. Worth 40 billion dollars, he beats Trump fourfold and this may be the most optimistic fortune difference calculation. Based on Bloomberg media estimates, Trump's wealth is only a 13th of his (Bump 2016). Other sources like Forbes reiterate the figure placed at 3,1 billion dollars (Neate 2018).

Prior to the elections, he made a bold statement to slam Trump questioning his wealth referring to him as a con man (Bump 2016). A con man is the individual who reasons people to give him their property or money by lying to them (Collins Cobuild 2016, 267). Bloomberg went even further by calling Trump a hypocrite (Bump 2016). The former mayor also suggested that Trump's hypocrisy was the richest thing about him (Associated Press 2016). This was an act of financial disparagement that questioned the validity of one of the two forces on which Trump's image of the man is built, apart from popularity with women of all ages. If there is one thing that Bloomberg's patented intention to cover Paris' contribution will do, it will be to make Trump be at pains to prevent Bloomberg from paying for the nation, of which Trump is a leader. Besides the idea of money reorientation back to the US, the exit move bears associations with the US not being able to shoulder the burden any more. The president will

not suffer the hated rival to pay, as he does not want him strong in the eyes of the public after his ego suffered much. Still, the ex-mayor is not the only one who can influence Trump's Paris intentions by touching on the raw.

Muslim nations must make a contribution or take a vocal role in the deal to make the front pages, which will bring interesting stories to the forefront with the help of media, of which one did some rounds several years back, yet it was not a mainstream news, which it can be once the Middle East does something remarkable in the climate deal that is on everyone's lips, which will ensure associated story's circulation. Timmons (2015) authored the article called "Wealthy Muslims Helped Trump Build His Empire." The claim is valid since the licensing and real estate articles of president's income were reliant on rich Muslims and Muslim-backed businesses based in the US and elsewhere (Timmons 2015). Other than Quartz, the article appeared in Forbes, as per the preliminary Google keyword search, which means that such type of story has not received its proper coverage and that it has a clear readership potential. What story's enhanced circulation under the influence of the increased Muslims' role or financial involvement in the climate agreement will do will be to make Trump wish to push the story out of circulation by giving a far greater new of US' full return to the deal.

This effect of the article on Muslims' help in Trump empire building will live up to its motivation expectation since the article challenges billionaire's self-sufficiency, which he has always tried to prove going to great lengths to do so, as seen in the publication of self-praising books and similarly lauding declarations. As quoted by Wilson (2017, 52), Trump claimed that the working class liked him in the knowledge that he had not inherited what he had built. The reality, however, may be different, as his real estate empire rests upon appealing to the very wealthy (Wilson 2017, 52). Middle Eastern nations may not be interested in the US regaining its international standing that comes with rejoining the deal, which is a potential weakness of

the solution that consists in Middle East's greater Paris deal financial involvement required to bring media attention to the region and its role in Trump's not-so-independent rise to the financial elite, which will help the news get into the emotional dialogue with the president. Media business may also assist in reshaping the climate vision of the president given the accurate illustrative content.

6.6. Favored Media as the Environmental Literacy Boosting Platform

To explain the negative impact of withdrawal on Trump's own business is what media can do and explaining he seems to need. According to Bump (2017), the president is said to have never shown the genuine understanding of the climate change issue. While engaged in politics, the billionaire has held almost every possible stance on the climate change. In late 2009 he signed a letter in support of a stronger action on renewable energy. A couple of months later, in January, the entrepreneur referred to the cold weather outside as a proof against global warming. Sometime after, he claimed the climate change legislation to provide the nation with a competitive edge. Later, Trump developed an ardent opposition to wind energy after it had become known that an offshore wind farm was considered close to his golf course in Scotland. Then, a woman residing in Iowa asked whether the billionaire was supportive of wind energy subsidizing prior to state's 2016 caucus, he replied in the affirmative. In the course of 2016 election, he had himself interviewed by the New York Times and the Washington Post. He told the Times that he was maintaining an open mind on the issue despite preserving skepticism since, sometime in the 1890s, there was an all-time record high temperature and since the nation has always had storms. He downplayed the anthropogenic factor behind the climate change in the interview to the Post (Bump 2017).

In some ways, the president is correct on the count of the lack of connection between an environmental change and human activity. A study by NASA researchers found that the sea level rise was due to cyclical patterns in the Arctic Ocean circulation rather than global warming tendencies (Stibbe 2015). Even in Medieval, there was a warm period that spanned 400 years from 900 to 1300 A.D. (Strom 2007, 79). In Medieval, there were not so many smokestack industries to pollute the air except blacksmiths and some other craftsmen. Still, the US leader did not take into account that the Industrial Revolution involving the intense consumption of coal started in the 19th century and that it is likely to have raised the temperature by the 1890s mentioned by Trump to disassociate the current temperature change from manmade activities. Another issue disregarded is that the reason for previous warm periods not to have caused the flooding of cities was that the ice mass was most likely much greater than it is now and that many cities currently threatened by the encroaching water were but a wilderness or wasteland not occupied by residents, which could be why no attention was paid to the climate change in medieval or earlier periods. Even if noticed, the reduction of the available coastline was likely attributed to the Scourge of God.

The source reporting the lack of deep climate change understanding by the president implies that Trump would not change his position this often if well aware of the environmental phenomenon. This inconsistency in the attitudinal stance on climate points to the possibility of changing Trump's conviction. Trump needs explaining that renewable energy initiatives like the wind farm near his golf course in Scotland are a shield against the rising water induced by the climate shift towards much warmer temperatures that threaten his businesses. Since fervent opposition was a response to the renewable energy initiative, Trump seems to value his assets too much wanting to keep them safe from whatever may pose an existential risk to them. The billionaire has important vulnerable assets to protect since, according to Bump (2017), the

billionaire owns a range of properties that lie close to the ocean. His resort at Mar-a-Lago is located in Palm Beach, Florida. Southern Florida is one of the American locations that is at the forefront of the rising sea level danger (Bump 2017). If there is one medium through which to change the vision of the president by communicating the danger to his business assets, it is a cable TV outlet for a number of reasons.

The president reportedly does not like to read and even skips written intelligence reports, as opposed to previous leaders (Kwong 2018). Another source suggests that the billionaire does not read from want of time. Still, he tells his 44,2-million-strong Twitter following to buy a book authored by an anchor on his favorite morning show “Fox and Friends” (Glum 2017). The Fox may be so high on the favorite list of President Trump that it is unsurprising that some reports confirm that the influence of Fox News on the president is alarming. As revealed, the warm embrace of the billionaire by the network and even a direct communication with him at times have enabled the influence of Trump as far as his most consequential executive and policy decisions are concerned. To visualize his influence, in March 2017, the president put New York U.S. District Attorney Preet Bharara out of job all of a sudden, as did he 45 other federal attorneys appointed by his predecessor. Although presidents routinely tend to oust the ones employed in these positions once in office, the firing decision came less than 1 day after Sean Hannity claimed on his Fox News program that Obama-era Justice Department and other federal government appointees were in need of purging. Despite the White House denial of any connection between the program and the decision, Bharara fired following the broadcast was the one asked by Trump to stay in the position 2 months before the program being aired on TV (Parsnow 2018).

The president will be certain to be in the audience if Fox News does present a proper climate change program with a trusted expert. CNBC reports that the current president spends

his executive time between 8 and 11 a.m. most often watching TV and “tweeting” (Rosenfeld 2018). Trump will be unlikely to watch programs other than Fox News since, as is reported, he blasts other media as fake in his speeches (Parsnow 2018). Other outlets Trump will not be watching in the morning or any other daytime due to their negative coverage. As follows from one of the reports, media have been ruthless since him taking charge of the country. The Media Research Center estimated the percentage of negative reports when the president was several months into his reign at 89%, as compared with 91%-93% reported by Harvard (Perkins). Thus, the likelihood of Trump watching Fox News on a daily basis is more than high.

Now it remains to be identified whether the outlet will embark on the mission to increase the climate awareness of the US leader by focusing on entrepreneur’s prized assets and even state assets that are prerequisite to “making America great again.” Fox will be best served by using the phrase that will draw president’s attention to the topic and indicate that the slogan will be impossible to implement if the rising water claims the large swaths of land where greatness is planned to be built by the business visionary. Fox News claims that hurricanes have always been the case (Driessen 2017). The rhetoric of Trump seems built on this article, as follows from his view mentioned in one of the preceding paragraphs on his lack of deep climate change awareness. At the same time, the coverage of Fox News features climate change articles, including the one that presented the view of a writer John Stossel that climate change is real (Stossel 2017). In terms of climate change coverage on Fox News, much also depends on the owner of the outlet and his attitudes to the president and the climate issue.

Who owns the conservative Fox News Channel is Rupert Murdoch, a media tycoon and a native of Australia (Scribner and Chapman 2015, 697). It is likely that Murdoch will want to put more climate change programs if only to spite Trump since there is “no love lost” between the two, as media would put it following Murdoch’s comment. The Australian mocked Trump

over his immigration stance after the phone call and referred to him as “idiot” (Smith 2018). Few people would let it slide. The problem is that Murdoch is ignorant in the way of climate change. As was reported, the media mogul put a terrible misunderstanding of climate science on display in a Sky News interview. It is only logical that his media empire has become the major source of global warming misinformation (Nuccitelli 2014). One could hope that Fox will keep placing more climate change reports to convince Trump, without the chairman causing content managers to do so, yet he may have the main say on what will be aired. It follows from a Washington Post article that Murdoch is a known micromanager. The entrepreneur is a “journno guy” at heart who began his career acquiring, helming them, and micromanaging newspapers (Wemple 2017). Another news article also confirms Murdoch’s intense involvement in his media content management claiming the chairman to micromanage Fox TV operation (Brandweek 1996, 4). This, it is arguably only if Murdoch sells him media business, stops editorial intervention, or steps down that the Fox News can start its attitude-changing mission. Apart from the private sector, officials who are on good terms with the US leader can also try to convince Trump into returning.

6.7. Foreign Officials Talking Trump into Staying

There are multiple precedents of Trump changing his mind. Days before the article saw cyber release, reports emerged that described the US president as gravitating towards rendering the NAFTA agreement null and void unilaterally only to have a change of heart hours after the report surfaced. What happened was that Trump had a conversation with Enrique Peña Nieto, the president of Mexico, and Justin Trudeau, the prime minister of Canada. In his interview to the Washington Post, Trump admitted that he had set his mind on terminating the deal before holding the phone talks. The Canadian and Mexican president called him and told the US

colleague they wished he would reconsider. Trump said they had asked nicely whether renegotiation could be possible (Cillizza 2017). Thus, Trump appears to like being asked; however, the uncertainty surrounding the US participation in the deal may have already undermined the negotiation enthusiasm of some politicians.

Thus, when it comes to the viability of foreign officials' approaching Trump on Paris exit reconsideration, it may be that they will not be making efforts to get the US to reconsider walking out on the deal, still less be flattering the president given his attitude. According to Peker (2017), days before this being published, a spokeswoman in the White House suggested in a statement that the stance of the administration on the deal had not altered. Still, she claimed as though the stand of Trump on departure had never been set in stone (Peker, 2017). This seesaw policy may not do Washington any favor. First, Trump makes an earth-shattering declaration of leaving only to suggest the country would stay if on the right terms. Then, the spokeswoman rules out that the claim was ever firm. On the other hand, the earlier-cited fragment of Trump's declaration placed logic foci very accurately in the June speech in the White House by voicing the quitting intention and pointing to renegotiation if there be better terms.

There is no guaranteeing officials across the world will perceive this conditioned uncertainty, as each has a cultural background of his or her own that may accept or reject such lack of resolve. Cognitive Psychologist Dr. Winston Sieck cited the results of a study that revealed Americans and the Chinese alike to admire them who are decisive (Sieck 2018). Apparently, the Chinese may not favor indecisiveness on the part of others, including Americans, especially seeing that they do not have it in them to act that way based on the finding, which should minimize their willingness to do anything to bring the US back into the Paris treaty fold to alleviate the contributory burden through a more equal distribution of the

funding duty. Still, flattery and favoritism in Asia may be used to urge Trump by Asian states whose cultures have much room for indecisiveness tolerance. According to Ng et al. (2015), researchers identified that people of East Asian cultural backgrounds were more indecisive relative to European backgrounds. The cultural distinction is associated with the so-called naïve dialecticism, which is a lay belief system that is believed by researchers to tolerate contradictory information (Ng et al. 2015). This tolerance holds especially good for the Japanese who have an admiration for behaviors that are ostensibly indecisive provided that the decision that needs making is comprehensive (Yates et al. 2010, 435). The Paris deal issue may be too delicate a matter to be settled via a simple talk over the phone, that is to say, it may require the use of some mood modification tools on the part of political negotiators. If able, they can try some business favoritism and even flattery so much valued by the American leader.

6.8. The Flattery and Favoritism Tools

6.8.1 Flattery or Favoritism

Nations have already had nothing good to say on the decision. Such criticism is the exact opposite of flattery so much appreciated by the leader who may choose to make a Paris U-turn if only to secure a round of applause and compliments on his prudence and the ability to own mistakes. Luce (2018) stated that it was to influence the USA that world leaders applied flattery and China may be an excellent case in point. Donald Trump received a state-visit plus while on his visit to Beijing last November. President Xi Jinping did better than hosting a lavish dinner, as he performed a personal tour of the Forbidden City for the US president and the first lady. This was the most pompous red carpet ever rolled out by the Asian nation. So impressive was the reception that Donald Trump forgot his trade demand on his agenda at least for the present. As much as Beijing had a list of American goods for the parties to discuss, the US

leader in too good a mood to spend any of his time in China talking business. Once back, all he did was tweet to express gratitude and assure he will never forget the lovely experience (Luce 2018). Rather than be flattery, as the journalist defines the way in which China treated Trump, it was more of the preferential treatment of a very important person that the Asian state needs content to reap some trade dividends. A string of countries has found ways to offer favors to the billionaire and his businesses, which should increase their negotiation position and influence on the US president allowing the efficient use of flattery and other tools of Paris attitude change.

A number of foreign ventures have assisted with the development of properties where the Trump organization keeps a commercial interest. In Uruguay, a businesswoman selling units in the Trump Tower Punta del Este claimed that she was positive about the tower construction being finalized, which she claimed in the firm conviction that Trump would become the next US president (CREW n.d.). Foreign leaders make investments that can be regarded as bounties or efforts to receive access to the US leader via his sprawling business empire. To this end, what Indonesia has done is built a road to reduce the drive between the new high-end golf course and resort of Trump and the major airport on the Bali island. The federal government of Panama has intervened to make certain that a sewer system that encircles a towering 70-story sail-shaped skyscraper of Trump in Panama City would be completed. Elsewhere, governments have donated public land, endorsed permits, and eased environmental regulations for billionaire's developments, thereby provoking a multitude of conflicts (Kumar 2018). Foreign governments wasted little time approving the trademark applications of Trump since him being elected. Trump-branded merchandise receive profitable legal protection in the major foreign markets. China alone authorized 38 trademarks not a long time after his inauguration while the Chinese territory of Macau did 4 more (CREW n.d.).

The leaders of nations who may do the Paris soliciting could be the ones who have done much good to his foreign businesses, as such favors pair politicians with positive associations, which makes Trump look much more favorable at the official. A 20-year tax exemption and other business tradeoffs can make the US president much more receptive to a negotiator from the nation that creates such conducive business climate for Trump. In the light of the 500-million loss in the first year of presidency and the presence of loss-making ventures like golf courses, such politician will be deemed even more positively by the US president who likes nothing better than having his business functioning well in his absence from the business managerial duty. This preferential treatment increases the likelihood of flattery perception during private climate talks with Trump.

6.8.2 How to Please the Fine Judge of Flattery, Mr. Trump

Now the origin of the flattery-wielding negotiator has been recommended, it would be wise to consider the flattery instrument and assess its viability in the Paris return talks. As one of the journalists put it, the more outrageous flattery is, the greater a chance is that it gets one everywhere (Luce 2018). Foreign politicians and business executives can hold a meeting or conference with Trump to ask him to share his recipe for business success as if wanting to learn from his models and practices and adopt the principles of his business in their homeland. They can discuss his success and inflated performance indices that the billionaire would often use in his election campaign to rally the electorate behind him. Still, the main effort to please the esteem of the US leader has already been done, as Trump has been named the next Nobel Prize candidate and nations, particularly the ones who can source a political negotiator, ought to support the award candidacy and that publicly.

Moon Jae-in, the president of South Korea made no secret of his opinion that Trump deserves nothing short of a Nobel prize for his summit with Kim Jong Un (Luce 2018). The prize may arguably be the best flattery to use to influence Trump's climate deal exit decision. If the US leader does achieve the coveted prize, the announcer must be sure to tell the recipient that the world would like to see him awarded in the coming year once his nation leads by example by increasing its financial footprint on the deal. The probability to become a two-time Nobel winner and bask in this glory is an excellent stimulus for any "famoholic." Trumps has given the early signs of such flattery appreciation. According to Sabur (2018), President Trump claimed that everyone thought that the illustrious award should be bestowed upon him or even that everyone believed him to deserve it. The feasibility of this flattery tool is undeniable, as there have been award precedents, with people in the same leadership capacity awarded.

Collins (2016, 250) reported the last Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to have been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1990 for his key part in the peace process. Among his various efforts, what was done was to repudiate the Brezhnev Doctrine in 1988 that let no East European nation to abandon the Soviet bloc on penalty of forceful intervention. He also contributed greatly to USSR's dissolution (Collins 2016, 250). Barack Obama also received the award shortly after assuming president's position (Sabur 2018). Still, the choice set on Obama begot some controversy (Sabur 2018). The belief was that the nomination of the president who was just 9 months into his first term was premature and that this brief period was insufficient for such international recognition (Graham 2016). If Obama receive the prize despite the nomination being considered dubious by some, Trump stand an excellent chance, as there may be no doubts as to the importance of what he has done to achieve the award in fact and in law.

The Norwegian Nobel Committee claimed in 2009 that the then president had made colossal attempts to solidify international cooperation and diplomacy between people (Andrews 2012, 105). This formulation is quite vague and lacks accuracy that would give the decision the aura of legitimacy and finality. In fact, many leaders have matched this assessment criteria over the years, which increases the odds of Trump gaining the prize for his North Korean achievement that seems to be an actual achievement. This is what differentiates Trump from Obama. Luce (2018) pointed that the Nobel Prize was granted to Obama for nothing more than just a promise of what he would do. The committee attached particular importance to his vision of and work for a world without nuclear weapons (Andrews 2012, 106). Since Obama received the award for doing as little as promising, Trump is certain to win, as he appears to have already made a measurable progress towards the resolution of the North Korea nuclear dilemma. Liptak (2018) stated that Trump and Kim had already signed that the document, in which Kim reaffirmed his resolute and solid commitment to the full denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. In return, the US provides security guarantees (Liptak 2018).

Bookies have already made the early prediction of the odds of Trump winning the prize that they believe are 2 to 1 (Carroll 2018). Other sources point to the rising probability. Following the historic meeting in Singapore, bettors placed the likelihood at 6:4, which gave Trump a 40% chance, which was 10% up on earlier 2:1 predictions. Odds were also placed at 4:6, which otherwise indicates the 60% chance (Millstein 2018). Stated otherwise, the president may be in a pole position to secure the award. If foreign politicians primed for negotiation with Trump offer the public support of the candidacy, thereby increasing their positive perception by the American leader, the Nobel odds will grow even higher. If they do materialize, Mr. President should be left grateful and more predisposed to a constructive private Paris dialogue with such candidates from his nomination supporting nations.

6.8.3 Why the Flattery Tool Is Destined to Work in the Case of President Trump

As Henry Kissinger once put it, he would give his consent to anything as soon as he was done feasting upon Peking duck (Luce 2018). Everyone has what makes him pleased or happy the most, whether perceived with taste-related, visual, or auditory receptors. Luce (2018) pointed that the business history of Trump gave insight into what makes a good deal, the first rule being to place his name on everything. No Trump Tower would now be standing if not adorned with his showy imprint, which is why it is very prudent of the South Korean president to have made the Nobel offer (Luce 2018). Thus, whoever contributes the greatest to the award and the placement of Trump's name in the Noble history book should assume the negotiator role. This award will flatter will do more pleasing and praising than thousands of words, which gives the president the much-needed routine dose of esteem that many believe him to deserve or claim him to. Donald Trump is no stranger to praising himself and having himself praised.

As stated by Mann (2017), both the president and his cabinet have the same job, which is to praise and overpraise Trump on camera. Shortly before this article being published, the president could be heard reassuring he is one the few leaders if not the first and only one to have passed so much legislation and done so many things (Mann 2017). Trump declared himself a "really smart and stable genius" (Associated Press 2018). US top officials always get to use praising opportunities. While talking in Trump's presence, Alexander Acosta, labor secretary, used phrases, such as "privileged to be here," "deeply honored," and "I want to thank you." Reince Priebus who is the chief of staff thanked the president "for the opportunity and the blessing to serve" his agenda. Mike Pence, the vice president of the US, reassured Trump that it was the greatest privilege of his life to be serving to the president in his capacity. On Thanksgiving Day, the cabinet of the president thanked him a combined total of 46 times. They

used words “great,” “honor,” and “privilege” 32, 15, and 7 times in that order (Mann 2017 “Flattery”). All this is the case due to president’s extreme appreciation of praise or flattery. Mann (2017) explained that flattery was the cocaine of Mr. Trump that caused him to grow addicted thereto.

6.8.4 When It Has Already Worked at Least to Some Extent

In 2017, French President Macron invited the US leaders to visit the July 14th Bastille Day parades in the capital city. Trump reciprocated for the warm treatment and hospitality when hosting the French counterpart in the US by giving him the full pageantry that differed much from what Angela Merkel received while there. The treatment of the German chancellor who arrived later in the week stood in a sharp contrast, as she did not receive much other than a working lunch. Where Macron arrived was at Andrew’s air base, which is the dedicated airport of the US president. By contrast, Merkel had to arrive at Dulles, which is the major commercial airport. The mood of the two European leaders also offered grounds for contrasting treatment speculation. Macron looked like a child at a fun fair while Merkel resembled the individual on a visit to a dentist holding back the tears of sorrow (Luce 2018). Thus, the flattering treatment of Trump worked, as is evident in the contrast between the treatment of the French and German leaders.

6.8.5 When Flattery Fails. The Careful Choice of Private Paris Deal Negotiators

While potentially efficient, the approach does not work at all times. Luce (2018) suggested that Macron’s endeavor did not come to much. Trump had been expected to change his Paris exit decision, yet the plan did not come to fruition. All that happened was that Trump developed a taste for grand military tableaux. He even came to request of the Pentagon to

consider a similar parade on Washington Mall much to the disappointment of Washington traditionalists (Luce 2018). Although the warm reception of Trump in France led to mutuality, Macron did not succeed much in reasoning Trump back into the climate deal for a reason. Grunstein (2017) explained that Macron had offended Trump in some ways in part by claiming that his resolute handshake with the US leader was to show he would not be intimidated by him. Trump did not take kindly to this public callout. Nor was he happy about Macron having trolled him publicly by inviting US innovators to come to France to dream up the future of green energy and rephrasing Trump's slogan, which he turned into "Let's make the planet great again" (Grunstein 2017). Thus, not only is flattering treatment but also the perception of the solicitor shaped by his Trump attitude and declarations is important as the qualification criteria for candidates to hold Paris talks with the US president on the exit decision reversal.

There is an art to dealing with specific politicians. While Macron's uncompromising image carries the logic of its own, it is important to give the appearance of revering and acknowledging the superiority of some although that is not the case. In the case of diplomacy with Trump, there is no room for the second ego, which will prove counterproductive. Political negotiators must be seen to be admitting Trump superior at least while in a private meeting with the president. Furthermore, business has honed his personality making him pragmatic, assertive, uncompromising, and ruthless and the state is his operational ground that he sees through the business prism possibly regarding state capital as his temporary assets that he must protect and augment as his own. He projects his personality and managerial style built on the lack of compromises honed by survivalist mindset on the political arena; thus, there should be no expecting him to be mild or subject to compromises if they jeopardize his current goals of state prosperity facilitated by spared climate funds.

Therefore, it is crucial to show Mr. president how clean energy can benefit financially his country helping increase his current temporarily managed business in the shape of the US. One must make no mistake about Trump's genuine motivations in the current capacity. Although interested in his business empire, the billionaire is not all about self-interest, as making the US great again is more than just a catchy slogan. If successful in its implementation, he will immortalize his name, thereby pleasing his ego. Therefore, negotiators must be wise to show the president verbally how the climate agreement can help him with the mission of going down in the annals of history as the only US president who saved at least 7 big American cities from the rising water. One has no way of making the nation great again if a part thereof is barely peering out of the ocean unless the submerged attraction is in the plan of the billionaire, yet the submerged coastal United States is clearly not in the definition of Trump's greatness.

Not all politicians are a good fit for the flattery mission. Luce (2018) referred to President of Council on Foreign Relations Richard Haass who revealed that Angela Merkel is genuinely incapable of flattering. Nor can Theresa May be of much use, as she is said to lack requisite chemistry with the US president. No European top politicians bar Emmanuel Macron are willing to play the flattery game (Luce 2018). Still, Macron may not be suitable given his previous trolling, which is why non-European politicians may be the best options, especially if they have flattered the Trump. As has been reported, the president of Uganda Yoweri Kaguta Museveni publicly expressed his love towards Trump who he claimed talked to Africans frankly (Taylor 2018). Still, the Ugandan president is not the best option. Trump opined that Museveni must spend his time isolated, in prison, where he belonged as well as branding Ugandans cowards, as they tolerate him clutching at power by mistreatment and voting manipulation (Green 2016). If the West looks eastward for a Paris negotiation candidacy, the choice may fall on Russia considering the special bromance or bond between the US and

Russian presidents. Luce (2018) suggested that Trump kept expressing admiration for Putin if not envy. A part of the reason is that Russia makes light work of troublesome journalists, that is, deals with them with ease (Luce 2018). Yet again, the notorious Kremlin leader is a bad choice, for it would be an unethical tradeoff for the world to have Trump talked back into the deal by the aggressor. Besides, this Putin would just as soon witness the climate-induced deluge as help with the US return to the Paris agreement. He seems too eager to witness the world living disunited over the Paris deal issue to offer any help. If the deal throws countries into disarray, he will be left pleased since such disagreement will rock world's stance on Russian economic sanctions. Thus, it may be better to choose a candidate in the West with a similar political culture and mentality and increase his appeal by making him issue flattering Trump comments or offering preferential business conditions to billionaire's business, or better still, it is unnecessary to look further west than the UK where politicians have already publicly supported the current US president. Stone (2016) lists a number of candidates. Nigel Farage, the former UK Independence party leader, Philip Davies, the hard-right Tory MP for Shipley, and Jacob Rees-Mogg, Conservative MP, are among potential candidates (Stone 2016). The only problem is that the country is unlikely to discriminate in favor of local Trump business, which is more characteristic of Asian and other non-European nations with string paternalistic and other traditions. While flattering foreign leaders can be of use, they may not be as efficient as family members who naturally have a special bond with the US leader.

6.9. Family Advocacy

Who better to change the view of the president than his own family? They must evoke much more trust in the US leader since any of their counsels is not that which comes from an entrepreneur or a foreign leader not interested in anyone else's prosperity but his or her own.

Such family bond building greater trust increases the receptiveness of Trump making family negotiators arguably the best choice for changing the Paris mindset of the US leader. When it comes to family candidates, Cam (2017) suggested that Ivanka Trump served in the capacity of a senior adviser to the president. She is one of the few females close to the country's highest position. She quite liberal and able to top the policies of her father to the left (Cam 2017). Ivanka has been joined by her husband, Jared Kushner. What the pair has already managed to do is to reason Donald Trump to exclude the language critical of the climate agreement from an executive order he signed during his first 100 days in a desire to target the climate change policies from the days of Obama (AOL.com. Editors 2017).

While it is unlikely, it may so happen that Trump's daughter and son-in-law stop short of advocating the climate deal participation. If so, nations can try to interest the aides, as China will Kushner at times. Entous and Osnos (2018) reported that the Kushner family had gained 400 million dollars from the deal with China's Anbang Insurance Group. Trump's son-in-law is considered China's lucky charm. They did not even expect him to turn out to be as compliant as he is (Entous and Osnos 2018). Still, China should not help advance the business interests of Kushner to convince him to influence Trump if he abandons his current advocacy efforts since China may be the least interest in the US returning to the deal, as country's departure deducts from its geopolitical influence and clears space for China to gain greater weight through deal's contribution and involvement.

The real problem, however, is that some White House figures could be eroding the influence of Ivanka Trump. AOL.com. Editors (2017) stated that there were conservative figures in the White House who had been critical of the role of president's daughter. The criticism reportedly took a strong tone on social media used by conservative users to call for Trump to neglect the counselling pair (AOL.com. Editors 2017). The conservative users could

not have chosen a better communication channel, as the president takes a special delight in talking to his electorate on Twitter, which increases the likelihood of exposure to these pleas. Still, this sabotaging counterinfluence may prove futile, as a report claims that Trump's daughter and son-in-law are a source of emotional support, to which the president resorts whenever necessary (Worley 2017). This support the president may need following the exodus of some high-profile aides. As was reported, Robert Iger, the boss of Disney, and Elon Musk, the founder of Tesla, both considered the biggest business leaders, have vacated their positions in the high-powered business advisory panel of the US president being distraught over his Paris decision (Rushe 2017).

Even if President Trump does make a decision stand firm on the deal exit, he may still be swayed by the family who may change this initial decision. Important is that the family aides are the last ones to talk to Trump before he must make the final decision on the Paris deal and announce it with an air of finality. Phillips (2017) explained the inclination of the billionaire to change his initial decisions by referring to a former aide of the president who wished to stay anonymous who revealed that Trump trusted his instincts to shape initial opinions only for the influence of advisors and new information to change his attitude. Some of the biggest abrupt policy reversals on the principal matters tend to happen immediately he talks to an individual directly involved on the other side (Phillips 2017). Other sources also confirm his habit to seek a piece of advice from a variety of outside and inside advisers until the last minute (The Associated Press 2017). As opposed to the majority of other politicians, Trump is said to be completely fine with changing his mind at any given point with very scarce rationalization (Phillips 2017).

To quote a number of examples when Trump changed his initial opinion under the influence of later discussion and new information, it was after the US president had met with

his Chinese colleague that he removed the currency manipulator label from the Asian nation. While at a joint news conference with Jens Stoltenberg, NATO secretary, Trump admitted the military bloc not obsolete despite having previously suggested otherwise. Having met with insurance chief executives following inauguration, the president who looked set to cancel the Affordable Care Act slowed down admitting that he did not expect it would prove such a complicated subject (Phillips 2017). This case goes to prove that the president made some pre-office decisions, without having dug deep into the matters and that explanation may fill the gap in the knowledge of specific issues, such as the Affordable Care Act or the Paris Climate Deal. When family influence and other less complicated ways to reshape the climate vision have been tested to no avail, loan providers can come into play.

6.10. Pressure from Loan Providers –

Deutsche Bank to Play an Environmental Champion

6.10.1. Different DB Owners and what They May Do to Help Reverse the Paris

Exit Decision

Even if national interest in the shape of trade retention does not prevail, personal financial interests may force the president into having a change of heart on the Paris deal. Although wealthy and capable, Trump is not self-sufficient in financial terms; neither are plenty of other businesses of different proportions. As is reported, Deutsche Bank remains one of the principal lenders of Donald Trump providing loans for his real estate projects (BBC 2017). The institution shifts from polluting business partners (Agence France-Presse 2017). Still, billionaires have a way of coming to terms with partners even despite some contrasting visions. The problem for Trump is that DB is far from monolithic in terms of ownership whose composition points to there being an entire range of organizations in possession. Germany

holds the largest chunk of the bank estimated at 57%. The EU exclusive Germany holds 21% sitting second from top. The US places third having accumulated 13% of its assets. Switzerland possesses 7% while a remaining 4% belongs to the unidentified groups of others (Deutsche Bank 2014). In 2017, China was reported to have secured a significant share of the banking institution that experts place at 10% (MacFarlane 2017). The ownership of DB may be even more fractured than described. As follows from the June 2017 NASDAQ data, 244 organizations owned more than 17% of the German bank. Among these countless owners are Credit Agricole SA, HSBC Holdings, JP Morgan Chase, Norges Bank, Vanguard Group, and Goldman Sachs Group. Influence reportedly moved to the group of Anglo-American investment bankers a decade earlier (Brewster et al. 2012, 452).

Important is that the US business, which may be partially represented by the group that is prevalent in the ownership structure of DB, is not dominated by Trump companies and that other big ventures who could be in possession of Deutsche Bank, upon which the president depends in terms of construction loans, are none too pleased with the US departure from its Paris commitments and affiliation. The withdrawal decision set many fuming, including the business and political elites, which potentially indicate the presence of many frustrated DB owners. D'Angelo (2017) confirmed that big businesses had condemned the exit decision. Hundreds of companies have issued a demand that the US not be moving towards the Paris exit door (D'Angelo 2017). The multitude of DB owners in the shape of business and other elites makes it hard for the multibillion entrepreneur to be in their good graces again to ensure that construction and other business loans are provided and that the terms are favorable; therefore, a solution to the Paris exit dilemma may be for bank owners to offer an ultimatum or use other conviction leverages to force the US reentrance of the deal. The push for the return to the environmental deal by the bank is quite possible given the support of the Paris Agreement by

businesses and DB's nonacceptance of loaning to polluting borrowers, as will be demonstrated in what is to come.

There may be an even greater known co-owner of Deutsche Bank to influence Trump's Paris withdrawal through a loan decision. It did happen that the Rothschild Bank allied itself with the international projects of the German Deutsche Bank alongside the Royal Dutch-Shell Oil Company (Nowell 1994, 45). Other book authors went further than pointing to the cooperative association between Rothschilds and DB. Deutsche Bank appears to be one of the big banks controlled by the business clan (Tay 2015). The extent to which it is was not identified. The German bank giant has already been active on the climate front, as follows from reports suggesting that it has pulled out of coal projects with an eye to meeting the Paris climate pledge (Agence France-Presse 2017). The current pro-Paris stance of Deutsche Bank agrees well with that of the Rothschilds, which gives further backing to the ownership claim linking the family to the German giant. Hell (2017) pointed to family's interest in the Paris deal. The Rothschild and Rockefeller funds along with other actors who have contributed trillions of dollars are advancing the global carbon deal (Hell 2017). If the family does control the lender that supplies Trump business with loans and if other banks are no alternative for the current White House host, the Rothschilds can try making the president revise his decision to quit the environmental deal, whether by offering better terms or citing the unfeasibility of loan over the noncompliance of the entrepreneur with the new corporate philosophy of the bank shaped by the Paris commitment.

6.10.2. Why DB Will Get Influencing Trump on the Paris Deal Regardless of Its Ownership Composition and the Individual Environmental Views of Owners

The sceptics of the solution may posit that the German bank will keep lending regardless, as the media landscape is flooded by similarly unethical business reports of German, French and other business elites pushing for the reconsideration of the Russian sanctions despite its outright display of foreign aggression, which indicates the unethicity of many businesses; still, even if unethical, Deutsche Bank may not see many benefits, whether financial or otherwise, in the continuation of business with Trump's entities. That the bank has started to refuse to do business with coal ventures gives one to understand that it must have realized that the days of the nonrenewable are numbered. By offering loans to environmentally sustainable ventures, it maintains its own CSR image, which gives it a competitive edge that is what draws customers who are growing more eco-aware. Furthermore, sustainable business borrowers are more than likely to return and that promptly, as such businesses connect well with the new generation of consumers, which prompts such ventures to expand and return asking for new loans.

Deutsche Bank may even go so far as to cut its ties with the American billionaire who is the current 45th president of the US in the light of its perceived financial self-sufficiency. It may seem that DB will fare well avoiding cooperation with Trump inasmuch it has multiple revenue segments to cushion the impact of separation with the billionaire. Statista (2018) offered the breakdown of DB's income articles. Households alone generate income to the amount of 186.69 billion euros. Financial intermediation, commercial real estate activities, manufacturing, retail and wholesale trade, fund management activities, public sector, and the unidentified group of other are accountable for 52.09, 29.18, 27.57, 19.25, 18.67, 13.51, and

58.67 billion euros respectively (Statista 2018). Still, it would not be rational to believe in bank's power of forcing Trump into Paris reversal or its strong negotiation position.

DB is not well placed to abandon its customers, especially big ones, seeing as how poor its performance indices are presently. Arons and Comfort (2018) reports bank's income to have collapsed to its 7-year low, with the institution posting the third annual loss, which leaves investors no room for optimism. DB is the worst performer over 12 months' period in the BE500 Banks & FS Index. Its index is equal to -12.7%, as against Commerzbank that enjoys 63% (Arons and Comfort 2018). Unsurprisingly, the bank has made the decision to downsize its workforce by 7,000 positions while the chairman has faced a no-confidence revolt, which he has reportedly survived (Wearden 2018). One of the German media, Spiegel Online summarized emphatically that the bank was facing an abyss after being a pillar of German banking and the personification of German values of safety and reliability for 146 years (Fichtner 2016). The bank will not regain these values by saving itself on its own, as it will not bridge the deficit in the light of its rather modest revenue. DB reported the pre-tax income of 1.3 billion euros for 2017 (Deutsche Bank 2018). Therefore, it must depend on government's aid, which paves a way for a recommendation that will force Trump back into the Paris deal.

Overall, DB may prove willing to force Trump to return to the Paris deal for three reasons, one being that it needs its reputation fixed by an environmental achievement. If reputation is one of the big issues eroding its reputation, as seen in its current strong commitment to the Paris deal, DB may choose to insist on Trump reversing the departure and emphasizing bank's role in the U-turn. Das (2016) reported DB to have been battling reputational troubles. According to Davies (2018), the reputation woe is truly important in that it is a factor that is holding back the efforts of the bank to rebuild its income. Deutsche Bank is still regarded by customers and regulators as risky and complex. What it means is that its

funding costs remain high, which makes it more expensive to do business therewith. The bank is made to be more conservative than rivals in the business it seeks to win (Davies 2018). Such reputation is often an outcome of penalties faced by charges and banks. Atkins and Schuetze (2014) reported that DB was facing fresh investigations into the possible manipulation of the 5.3 trillion-dollar-a-day foreign exchange market, which can cost it 1.4 to 2 billion euros. The bank has already had nothing to do but pay around 2.1 billion euros in fines in December 2014 (Atkins and Schuetze 2014). Fines cannot but pair the bank with negative associations that erode its image and consumer enthusiasm; therefore, the pressure on Trump scenario must interest DB as a means to rebuild the good name, thereby diverting the attention of regulators and investigators.

Second, there has been some bad blood between Deutsche Bank and Trump to driver it to take a tougher stance on the billionaire. According to Das (2016), the relations started with Trump getting the bankers charmed by flying them on his private Boeing 727. Then, the relations took a turn for the worse several years after, as the journalist described the relations between the two as having frayed following his housing bubble bursting. Owing to the lackluster sales of the building units, Trump did not manage to pay 334 million dollars he owed on the Chicago loan back in 2008. He went on to bring a lawsuit to the court against DB likening the economic crisis to a force majeure or an unforeseen development similar to a natural disaster or a war that he believed would allow him not to repay until after conditions get better. What Trump also did was assault the lending practices of the institution claiming that it was accountable for the financial crisis as a big bank. He sought an amazing 3 billion dollars in damages. DB responded by going for 40 million dollars of Trump's money they believed owed the institution, as the entrepreneur had previously made a personal guarantee to

pay this much in case he defaults on the loan. They accused him of a “cavalier history towards banks.” The parties reached a settlement in 2009, without the court being involved (Das 2016).

Given these conflicts, there may not much to keep the relationship alive other than the pragmatic US market penetration interest of Deutsch Bank, which should increase the odds of the recommendation of DB pressure on the billionaire. Third, there is a chance the bank stops short of giving a new loan due to it having already done so. The bank may freeze its loaning to the New York mogul pending Trump’s contribution to DB image cleaning through country’s return to Paris deal and the emphasis of bank’s role in what is a global point of concern. The shockwaves that the desertion sent across the world due to the environmental implications of Trumps’ earlier decision will only add to bank’s image of it convinces the US president through the loan leverage. Das (2016) stated that the giant investment-banking unit of DB ceased cooperating with Mr. Trump following a wicked legal spat despite another arm of the company continuing to loan the entrepreneur money.

6.10.3. Why DB Will Succeed

There is every reason to believe DB to succeed in offering Trump unfavorable terms if only to distance itself from the troubled borrower, which should make him align his business and views with bank environmental values based on Paris commitments if he does appreciate the institution as a source of its loans and appreciate he does. The logic behind this optimism is that the entrepreneur may have nowhere else to take a loan. Das (2016) suggested that Trump should always choose Deutsche Bank if a loan should be necessary. The bank has come to gain the status of one of the closest allies of Trump, as plenty of big banks keep avoiding him after having done extensive business with him in the 1980s and the 1990s. Morgan Stanley, J.P. Morgan Chase, and Citigroup Inc. are among the financial institutions that are loath to have

anything to do with the mogul despite Ivanka Trump who is in charge of family's real estate and other businesses suggesting otherwise and claiming as though the biggest banking institutions were soliciting the family constantly.

Why the banks tend to shun the entrepreneur is in part due to them being distraught over his business practices (Das 2016). Following a series of bankruptcies in his hotel and casino businesses in the 1990s, Trump found himself on the fringe of Wall Street in the status of an outsider, which left the German bank among the few main financial organizations that would want to offer a loan (Protest, Silver-Greenberg, and Drucker 2017). His having transitioned from real-estate projects that required funding is another potential reason why North American banks parted their ways with the entrepreneur. It so follows from the opinion of fund managers and bankers that the relationship between Trump and the Wall Street is lukewarm so much so that his White House bid did not gain much financial support in its time. Instead, as per the Center for Responsive Politics, the securities and investment sector, WS companies included, chose to donate around 19 million dollars to Clinton's company, as against 17 255 dollars collected by her Republican opponent.

Trump would much rather his business not depend on banks, yet it this financial autonomy would be but wishful thinking for want of cash to cover new business projects or repay debts although his family disagrees. Ivanka Trump's claim has it that the family needs not much financing, for they have a great amount of cash and a great balance sheet (Das 2016). Time was, Trump used to pay from his pocket for the property. In the 9 years that preceded his campaign, he invested 400 million in cash on the properties of his own in 14 transactions, without a loan being taken from a bank (O'Connell, Fahrenthold, and Gillum 2018). One can beg to differ, with the current situation in view. It would be strange if the family admitted low cash availability. They may be making an effort at maintaining the image of a self-sufficient

business empire, nay, convince partners and financial institutions of their viability and the ability to invest, pay on bill, and amortize temporary debts if it be needed.

For Trump to have 9 billion dollars' worth of assets is what follows from his declaration. This figure exceeds Forbes estimates that put his net holdings at 4.1 billion dollars (Costa and Gold 2015). If it be true that he has a double of what Forbes thinks he does. The problem is that assets are not necessarily liquid. Although estimated this high by family's finance aides, the assets would most likely not be sold for this amount if Trump were to need cash, as market juncture, holder's reputation, and other factors may be unfavorable at any given point. When it comes to cash, Costa and Gold (2015) were vague estimating it in very round numbers at hundreds of millions. Relative to his physical assets, the cash amount is not large enough to go into funding a new infrastructural project. Nguyen (2016) similarly doubted the cash possessions of Trump suggesting that he has less profit than suggested by his business income and that he had to sell a number of his assets, including up to 9 million dollars in individual securities and another 7 million in fund assets, in an attempt to cover the debt of his campaign.

This is to suggest that he does not have enough cash on hand to cover campaign costs outright and easily, which is very uncharacteristic of a man declaring himself worth 10 billion dollars. If he were as rich as suggested, he would not have sold the assets. Besides he has already been found dealing with debts by experts who believe them to stand at 315 to 500 million if not more (Nguyen 2016). Journalists even refer to the billionaire as none other than the "king of debt" who borrowed to build his business empire (O'Connell, Fahrenthold, and Gillum 2018). Others portrayed an even gloomier picture suggesting that Trump will have little extra cushion if any of his investments fail and that he is up for 110 228 in pension cash from

the Screen Actors Guild although it is unclear whether this is an overall amount of the yearly payout (Alesci and Frankel 2016).

Trump's debt may do much to discourage lenders. While still a candidate in 2016, Trump understated his debt by 500 million dollars. The amount tops out at 1 billion dollars (Tully 2016). It may be that his current troubled assets are not profitable absorbing his cash. Neate (2018) reported the reduction of Trump's wealth by 400 million dollars to 3.1 billion in 2017 alone, which sent him falling from the 544th richest to 766th richest. The reason for the drop is that he incurred losses at his gold courses, including Ayrshire-based Turnberry, for example, which forced the entrepreneur into pumping cash in a desire to keep them afloat. Turnberry debt to Trump doubled in 2016 to 17.6 million, turned out 63 million in 2017, and crawled up to 63 million in 2018 (Neate 2018). At least, that the wealth has fallen may be a signal to lenders that he does not misuse power to his own advantage or that he just is mismanaging his current business to a degree, which further erodes the lending confidence. Overall, the great debt figure and its public minimization may do Trump, the lender, no good favor, as this may point to a bad credit history as well as reveal the borrowers as untrustworthy if he downplays the amount of debt owed.

6.10.4. Why DB May Not Succeed in Getting Trump to Reconsider

While the chances of DB agreeing to influence the Paris decision seem sufficient, the effort may come to little for one major reason. Trump may know better than to back down while pressurized in the firm knowledge that Deutsche Bank needs him as much as he does it. As reported by, Levin (2017), US lawmakers are at a loss to understand why it is that the German bank kept loaning the billionaire money to the point of the accumulated debt rising to 340 million dollars. They have yet to understand why they lent at a time when none of financial

institutions wanted to do any business with the “serial bankruptcy declarer from Queens” who had defaulted on one loan and pressed charges against DB (Levin 2017). Truly, the bank has been there to offer a hand when this investment may not have paid off or when others walked out on the entrepreneur. Das (2016) have a summarizing insight into the scope of the partnership suggesting that the analysis of public records and competent individuals has caused a Wall Street Journal to maintain that Deutsche Bank has taken part in or led 2.5 billion dollars’ worth of loans to ventures affiliated with the current US president, which it has since 1998. The amount does not comprise an additional 1 billion dollars in loan commitments made by DB to the affiliated companies (Das 2016).

While American lawmakers are left guessing by this loaning behavior, Trump knows the reason is in DB depending on him in some ways as well. The reason DB is interested in relations with Trump continuing undeterred is that it has been enthusiastic about expanding in the United States through commercial-real-estate landing (Das 2016). Trump may be one of a few chances left for DB to retain presence in the US to have a platform from which to reclaim its lost clientele one the time is ripe for regaining what has been lost thus far. While in the US, the bank may arguably be on its last legs without Trump, himself a troubled entrepreneur in recent decades. Reuters Staff (2018) confirmed the shaky status of DB by referring to the evaluation of the US Federal Reserve claiming the US-based operations of DB to be in a troubled condition. As per the WSJ, the status is one of the lowest designations used by the Fed (Reuters Staff 2018). There should be no hoping to see businesses come get loans from Deutsche Bank in the US. This Trump knows and understands enough to stay immune from any pressure on the part of Deutsche Bank, which jeopardizes the Paris return ultimatum feasibility.

6.10.4. How to Increase the Willingness of DB Use of New Loan Rules and the Odds of Deutsche Bank Succeeding – Governmental Bail-out

Still, the bank must do more than push the president back to the climate deal by changing its loan terms to adjust them to entrepreneurs with a sustainable mindset since the current financial situation may be such that the bank may lapse into oblivion before starting to implement the recommendation. If the government fills the emptied coffers of Deutsche Bank, the institution may stand a better chance of convincing the US president to return the nation back to the environmental deal in part by making it self-sufficient again. Government's intervention is how to arrange for Deutsche Bank to commit itself to changing the stance of one of its biggest borrowers, the author of US exit from the Paris deal.

Germany will be better off giving DB capital support in the shape of bailout funds in exchange for the change of its corporate philosophy and lending behavior that will exclude environmentally unsustainable businesses and entities owned by entrepreneurs who contribute to climate change, such as Donald Trump. If Deutsche Bank does not change, the governmental support will convince it, as it has no way of finding investors or at least generate enough funds to pull the institution out of its current performance misery. According to Moshinsky (2017), shares in DB could be found crashing at a time when it announced it would solicit investors. The intended amount was reported in the region of 8 billion euros (Moshinsky 2017). A strategist claimed that it was only by the German government that DB could be saved (Clinch 2016). The expert was right to claim so.

The specified amount does not seem sufficient to rescue the lender. Anyway, the bank will be hard put to accumulate much funds from any source other the government. Bail-out is feasible due to the potential reluctance of DB internal creditors to perform recapitalization and

have a large share of debt owed them written off, which will by no means guarantees bank's monetary reanimation allowing it to return to full financial fitness. On the least negative side, creditors may not see much return on their investment. Oltermann and Treanor (2016) cited the view of a senior banker admitted that returns to investors were too low due to concerns about the amount of capital banks should hold and the rock-bottom interest rate. The low level of return makes banks not quite investable (Oltermann and Treanor 2016). There is more to what demotivates internal investors or creditors to recapitalize the DB, thereby giving the government the status of the only viable option of the German troubled institution, which increases the likelihood of it accepting government's demand of the loan rules change.

Barker (2013) admitted that some nations went concerned fearing lest a bail-in be what launches a bank run and leaves a zombie bank in its wake in lieu of a viable business entity. When handled poorly, a bank may become such (Barker 2013). The concern of investors over self-imposed bail-ins had been at its highest in the weeks that preceded the publication. It is the outcome of the collapse and bail-in of bank Banco Popular ranking the 6th biggest in Spain that experienced a major bank run on viability concerns, which drove the government and the European Central Bank to place it into resolution, with Santander buying it for 1 euro in the aftermath (Durden 2017). What bank run actually is, is the simultaneous withdrawal of money by a large share of depositors, which can push a bank out of business even if the institution was in a good condition prior to the capital drain (Gottfries 2013, 505).

The future of DB is already associated with that of Lehman Brothers in the sense that its collapse may trigger a global financial crisis (Stewart 2016). This dark-sky scenario serves both as a demotivator for internal creditors leaving the rescue in the hands of the government and a motivator for the authorities who must act to avoid the crisis of global proportions. Thus, there being negative precedents of bail-ins and the risk related to DB rescue for investors,

internal creditors may be unwilling to make further sacrifice to try to achieve what may not result in banking being saved. Such potential lack of internal creditors' enthusiasm increases the probability of DB accepting government's support along with the task to change the US Paris decision by Trump interested in continued loan funding from the German giant.

Still, this is not to claim that the government will rush to help, which will not occur until all manner of barriers have been cleared and at least the main ones remain to be identified. The bailout scenario is feasible given some changes, as there are obstacles that may be standing in the way of the bailout-based recommendation, including legal changes made by the government. As reported, EU reforms aimed at shifting bank distress resolution or rescue costs from taxpayers to creditors were reported stuck (Barker 2013). Still, no sooner had one year passed than the bail-in reforms gained the unanimous support of the EU governments, thereby placing the rescue burden formerly borne by taxpayers on investors (Brunsden and Barker 2016). The next discourager for the government is that Deutsche Bank is in an unacceptable bonus habit. DB distributed 2.3 billion euros in spite of having incurred losses in 2017 in a move that has tested institution's relations with the German public and politicians, of whom many disapprove the Anglo-Saxon style capitalism and high pay (Sims 2018). Furthermore, there are reported to be essential political hurdles to the bailout.

DB seems to be not the only one to need the funds. European banks need to receive bailout worth 166 billion dollars and that urgently (Valenzuela 2016). Truly, if the government of Germany does destroy all of its own rules against bailouts, there emerges a question of how it will be to refuse the plea of Italy whose banking system is in a far worse condition with nonperforming loans claimed to be in the region of 17%. Moreover, Portugal and Spain have very serious banking troubles to address. Germany stepping into Deutsche Bank can cause all

EU discipline to be lost (ETF Daily News 2016). Germany has already had its say on the bailout possibility offering its flat refusal (Reuters 2016).

It is unsurprising that Merkel rejected the idea, with the elections in the offing. ETF Daily News (2016) explained that German Chancellor Angela Merkel' credibility could be ruined in the event of the bailout due to her firm opposition to the rescue measure. Thus, the EU and Germany are the likeliest to require a bail-in rather than a bail-out involving large creditors and depositors who share in the pain (ETF Daily News 2016). Government's credibility may also suffer if it helps DB due to its poor record. The bank poured billions of dollars via its US branches for Sudan, Iran, and other sanctioned countries (Silver-Greenberg 2012). On the other hand, people will not resent since they keep cooperating with the bank as customers in part due to them remaining unaware of bank's inner workings and customers despite media coverage. The bailout measure is expected to help with the climate deal, yet the government will not be able to cite this motivation.

These obstacles are surmountable and one way to clear them is to provide DB with funds, without the German government being involved, which will save the trouble of getting minister convinced and allow avoiding a set of troubles linked to government involvement. To avoid the discipline breach and the need to add other struggling banks to the bail-out list, Paris nations richly represented by the EU can formulate it differently and allocate Paris funds to Deutsche Bank only for banks to donate money to the environmental deal pool. Still, the Paris funding pool is not close to holding as much as may be needed to bail the German giant out of trouble to make the Trump influence scenario feasible, as follows from the fund size data.

Fitch (2015) put fund pledges at 10 billion dollars. This notwithstanding, only 6 out of 10 billion were provided as of 2015 (Fitch 2015). Other sources are less optimistic suggesting

that the participating nations provided just one-tenth of the amount of 1 out of 10 billion dollars (Upton 2015). Whether the fund has 1 or 6 billion investable into the climate change mitigation cause, this falls short of what the bank needs to implement the recommendation forasmuch as the lender is believed to need 90 billion in fresh capital to mitigate nervous customers, based on the estimates of New York University's Volatility Institute (Keoun 2017). The amount required is too high and any investment banker will rule that raising 254% of market capitalization is overly optimistic (Rochford 2016). If this way fails, the government will need to act.

However, if the government does offer the bail-out in whatever form, whether directly or otherwise, people may not welcome it. The government rescue measure will be politically challenging since Germans are of the view that a bailout involves taxpayers' euros (The Real News Network 2018). To avoid this social backlash and reputational losses for the chancellor, the government will need to squeeze the help funds into the investment format rather than give them in the bailout form. Germany can inject money into the business of Deutsche Bank co-investors as if to invest into an enterprise that poses a strategic interest to Germany. This will allow the investor to orient the money towards bail-in or capitalization or the provision of capital for the bank. While this will allow retaining the reputation of the German chancellor and formally avoiding the bail-out that may necessitate the application of the measure to other European banks, journalists and regulators can identify the unconventional, disguised bail-out.

Alternatively, the government may try to create an environmental organization and introduce it into the creditors' circle of Deutsche Bank for it to capitalize the institution that will be required to give loans to green businesses or invest into sustainable production and other assets whose eco-friendliness will give them high liquidity. Even if the government is accused of the bailout efforts, it may counter allegations explaining that the taxpayers'

investment went into sustainable projects through bank loans to socially responsible green businesses and that contribute to social welfare and climate change mitigation.

When it comes to government's bailout intervention skepticism, Trump himself can pull some strings from the comfort of his office since, while a president, he may be at liberty to influence some institutions that take measures hurting foreign banks like DB through investor discouragement key to bank revival. Moshinsky (2016) stated that Deutsche Bank investors were in need of convincing that the structural issues were behind and that the US fine was but a temporary issue to invite funds (Moshinsky 2016). The fine estimated at 1,7 billion pounds and the demand to terminate 7 top executives were co-imposed US Department of Justice (Nadesan 84). Trump has already issued quite a fresh threat that he would exert his political influence over the Justice Department (Benen 2018). This claim may be a pressure tool since he who is about to influence the department does not voice the controversial and notorious intention that could cause great resonance. It is not done in politics to declare such plans and expect them to be a success. If it is a mere pressure, the president will not receive any real power in department to make it steer clear of sanctioning foreign banks like Deutsche Bank.

Furthermore, Trump may be alone in pressurizing domestic institutions out of getting DB fined. The reason is that, according to Nadesan (2016, 84), it is not only the Justice Department that was involve in fining. NY Financial Services Department, the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and even the UK Financial Conduct Authority all joined ranks (Nadesan 2016, 84). Even if influential due to the occupation of the political position at home, the UK is where Trump's reach ends. The president can also try manipulating its treasury officials into providing the troubled bank with a bailout, which they have been known to do. P. Martens and R. Martens (2016) suggested that the US had come to offer Deutsche Bank a

bailout in 2007-2010 crisis years. The amount was twice as big as the one obtained by US investment bank Lehman Brothers that went on to fail (P. Martens and R. Martens 2016).

The third option for Trump would be to overturn the bailout limitation currently in place. As appears, following the failure of Lehman Brothers, Congress made efforts to restrict future bailouts (Stewart 2016). None of the two options may help the US president, treasury officials may decline due to the very unlikely return chances or other concerns while Congress may refuse due to the presence of both parties and the reduction of Trump sympathizers in the Republican party that has never lent him full support, at least not in all questions, particularly delicate ones, such as bailout cap reversal. This may prompt Trump to force the aid through. Even so, the US system is that of checks and balances that does not allow abuse that could help prevent US institutions from challenging Deutsche Bank's viability through imposed financial penalties, which would make government's bailout and the subsequent imposition of the new loan conditions of DB irrelevant.

7. Conclusion

Thus, the first year of Trump's presidency witnessed many environmental decisions made, yet only one concerns the entire planet and it is the withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement despite the deal having multiple benefits, including the decrease of temperature, the reduction of the carbon footprint of individual nations, the mitigation of the impact of natural disasters, and the retention of coastline cities that may end up in water if no efforts are being made by the global community. The Paris deal is exactly the treaty to pool the resources and efforts of 196 nations who pledge money to help developing nations with economic transformation and vow to enforce domestic pollution cuts. Still, the deal may be eclipsed by the slow pace of pollution cuts, the lack of formulated progress auditing mechanisms, the

pledging uncertainty, the absence of top economies from the list of contributors, and the disproportion between funding by individual nations and their economy size. These and other push factors have been what have led to the US leader's disillusionment.

Since some nations have not provided a dollar to the climate funding pool means it is not obligatory, which corresponds with the lack of the mandatory tone of the Paris document and the absence of the respective provisions therein, which raises the logical questions of why Trump has actually pulled out. Reasons cannot be financial ones. The exit fraught with multiple reputational and economic consequences does not seem justified in the circumstances. Therefore, there are less public drivers of the exit decision that catch the attention of researchers, including the personal animosity of the president towards his predecessor, which leads him to use the Paris deal pullout as a means to crush his legacy. An even more bizarre motivation that smacks of a conspiracy theory but has evidence backing is the lobby of the deal exit by the petrochemical Koch family connected with administration officials and Republican senators.

This collusion will lead to adverse outcomes that include economy and security losses due to the forfeiture of its clout by the US, which gives the opportunity to China. If the US and other nations are to prevent domestic and international repercussions, they need to implement solutions, such as public protests, the maintenance of cooperation between the EU and US businesses, the continued compliance of American states with Paris rules and goals, the use of flattery appreciated by the US president, the involvement of president's family members acting as his trusted counselors and foreign officials who are on good terms with President Trump, the use of Fox News, and even the change of loaning rules in Deutsche Bank, the principal lender of Mr. Trump.

The easiest solution may be to wait until the reduction of the US influence following the Paris exit erodes the US geopolitical influence along with the ability of the US leader to embark on and keep the nation engaged in foreign conflicts to cater to arms producers. Naturally, all of these recommendations will not be viable if specific parties, such as financial institutions, are not motivated, which may require complicated procedures, such as state-funded bailout not welcomed much by taxpayers. The bank recommendation is not the only that may take quite an effort to come to fruition, as the environmental enlightenment of the president by his beloved Fox News requires the change of the chairman who micromanages the content so much so that he transformed the outlet into a source of environmental misinformation.

It may be hard to believe that an environmentally ignorant media mogul manages the news used by the president who shapes the environmental direction of the nation who can be a real difference maker in the climate change issue. It is also beyond comprehension why Trump dislikes the idea of helping poor nations cope with the transformation of their economies. Being a businessman with a record of unethical treatment of the labor, Trump opposes the climate deal not wanting to accept the great logic behind it that the rich must now pay for the poor nations to help them transform their economies and that it is the absolute must for developed nations to do so, as colonists swept through many leaving them lagging behind, which led them to practice whatever economic means would pull them out of stagnation, including pollution production. Therefore, former colonial era economic plunder obligates Paris developed nations to pay for the poor; however, this logic may be alien to the business mind of the president who if reports suggest right made business out of exploiting others, without having any scruples about such financial ascension means. Despite all criticism, never an irrational entrepreneur, Donald Trump will not be steering the country to the disaster pit, at least, not for a long period, and change the vector whether it be under the influence of flattery or economic prudence.

Maybe, there should be no panicking if Trump shows willingness to reenter, albeit on new terms that would probably require a smaller monetary contribution to the climate change cause. Maybe, his stout business grip, intuition, and touch may lead to some contribution rebates, yet such calculation may not come to much, as the EU is reported to have rejected the Agreement renegotiation that was to have cut down the financial size of the US participation. Besides, the amount of money each nation provides to the funding chest is nationally determined, which casts a big shade on the real rationales of the exit that cannot be financially motivated. These stealth motivations pushed the president towards the shortsighted decision.

By withdrawing, Trump may demonstrate economic shortsightedness comparable with the North Korea disarmament agreement. Despite saving on contingent evacuation from Korea, the country assumes the burden of the economic help to the state that will be denuclearizing. In the case of the Paris deal, pulling out of the treaty allows saving on membership fees, yet environmental costs are likely to backfire. Still, US nonactivity does not mean the void will be there to affect the collective effort, as other nations step up. Besides, the US does not abandon the deal completely, any withdrawal will take years. Thus, if the rest of nations fill the funding void and the US dedicates its funds to domestic efforts, there will be no environmental fallout. What will be as a result of the exit will be the loss of the US influence. Overall, only time will tell whether President Trump find political will to return the nation to the climate deal that has undeniable utility. As the nation that derives its economic wealth from foreign influence, the US cannot forfeit it over the absence from the climate agreement. Although, for now it does not seem possible that the nation returns into the fold of nations fighting climate change. It might do so with the lapse of time, which may be in a number of years.

Bibliography

- AFP. "Trump and the Climate: We Won't Always Have Paris." *Eyewitness News*. n.d. Accessed June 15, 2018. <http://ewn.co.za/2017/06/02/trump-and-the-climate-we-won-t-always-have-paris>
- Agence France-Presse. "Deutsche Bank Pulls out of Coal Projects to Meet Paris Climate Pledge." *The Guardian*. February 1, 2017. Accessed July 4, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2017/feb/01/deutsche-bank-pulls-out-of-coal-projects-to-meet-paris-climate-pledge>
- Akhtar, Rais, and Palagiano, Cosimo. *Climate Change and Air Pollution: The Impact on Human Health in Developed and Developing Countries*. Springer. 2017. Accessed June 25, 2018.
- Alesci, Cristina, and Frankel, Laurie. "What We Know about Trump's Money." *CNN Money*. March 16, 2016. Accessed June 25, 2018. <http://money.cnn.com/2016/03/16/news/economy/donald-trump-income/index.html>
- Allison, George. "'The European Union Cannot Protect Europe by Itself' Says NATO Chief." *UK Defence Journal*. February 22, 2018. Accessed July 1, 2018. <https://ukdefencejournal.org.uk/european-union-cannot-protect-europe-says-nato-chief/>
- Andrews, Joseph. *Barack Obama and Leadership: 10 Reasons the 44th President Squandered Unprecedented Goodwill*. The USA: Jim Kochenburger. 2012.
- AOL.com. Editors. "Blow to Ivanka Trump? First Daughter Pressured President to not Withdraw from Paris Climate Accord." *AOL*. May 31, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.aol.com/article/news/2017/05/31/ivanka-trump-fail-paris-climate-deal/22119310/#>
- Arons, Steven, and Comfort, Nicholas. "Deutsche Bank Investors See no Silver Lining as Results Drop." *Bloomberg*. February 2, 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-02-02/deutsche-bank-revenue-at-seven-year-low-on-cryan-s-groundhog-day>
- Associated Press. "Ex-NYC Mayor Bloomberg: Richest Thing about Donald Trump IS His Hypocrisy." *Chicago Tribune*. July 27, 2016. Accessed June 25, 2018. www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-michael-bloomberg-hillary-clinton-donald-trump-20160727-story.html+&cd=7&hl=uk&ct=clnk&gl
- Associated Press. "Trump Declares Himself 'a Very Stable Genius' and 'like, really smart'." *Chicago Sun Times*. January 6, 2018. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://chicago.suntimes.com/news/trump-says-hes-like-really-smart-a-very-stable-genius/>

- Atkins, Thomas, and Schuetze, Arno. "Deutsche Bank Faces up to Long Battle to Restore Reputation." *Reuters*. January 29, 2014. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-deutschebank/deutsche-bank-faces-up-to-long-battle-to-restore-reputation-idUSBREA0S0XO20140129>
- Barker, Alex. "Cyprus Bailout Trauma Clouds EU Bank Bail-in Plans." *Financial Times*. May 12, 2013. Accessed June 20, 2018. <https://www.ft.com/content/901823ae-ba87-11e2-b7c3-00144feab7de>
- BBC. "Donald Trump: A List of Potential Conflicts of Interest." April 18, 2017. Accessed June 20, 2018. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38069298>
- Benen, Steve. "Trump Threatens to Exert Political Influence over the Justice Department." *MSNBC*. April 26, 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018. <http://www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow-show/trump-threatens-exert-political-influence-over-the-justice-department>
- Boffey, Daniel, Connolly, Kate, and Asthana, Anushka. "EU to Bypass Trump Administration after Paris Climate Agreement Pullout." *The Guardian*. June 2, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/jun/02/european-leaders-vow-to-keep-fighting-global-warming-despite-us-withdrawal>
- Brandweek. Adweek L.P. 1996. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://books.google.com/books?id=B2YiAQAAAMAJ&q=News+Corp.+chairman+Rupert+Murdoch+stepped+up+his+involvement+at+Fox,+not+only+micromanaging+the+TV+operation+but+aggressively+expanding&dq=News+Corp.+chairman+Rupert+Murdoch+stepped+up+his+involvement+at+Fox,+not+only+micromanaging+the+TV+operation+but+aggressively+expanding&hl=uk&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewiW4NiUs57cAhWDiSwKHScSDPYQ6AEILTAB>
- Brewster, Chris, Mayrhofer, Wolfgang, and Farndale, Elaine, eds. *Handbook of Research on Comparative Human Resource Management: Second Edition*. Edward Elgar Publishing. Accessed July 3, 2018.
- Brodwin, Erin. "Trump Is Dismantling Obama's Biggest Legacy – Here Are the Most Significant Changes He's Made." *Business Insider*. December 15, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2018. <http://www.businessinsider.com/environmental-rules-trump-reversing-2017-10>
- Brouchard, Rod, and Kline, Crystal. *Disaster Preparedness: A Living Free Guide*. The USA: Penguin. 2014.
- Brunsdon, Jim, and Barker, Alex. "Bank Turmoil: Are Europe's New Bail-in Rules to Blame?" *Financial Times*. February 11, 2016. Accessed July 2, 2018. <https://www.ft.com/content/8ad2ed98-d0a0-11e5-986a-62c79fcbcead>
- Bump, Philip. "Donald Trump Now Hates Michael Bloomberg because Bloomberg Was Mean to Him." *The Washington Post*. July 29, 2016. Accessed July 2, 2018.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/07/29/donald-trump-now-hates-michael-bloomberg-because-bloomberg-was-mean-to-him/>

- Bump, Philip. "Nine Reasons Trump's Withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement Doesn't Make Sense." *The Washington Post*. June 1, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/06/01/all-the-reasons-that-trumps-withdrawal-from-the-paris-climate-agreement-doesnt-make-sense/?utm_term=.fd213175ee14
- Cam, Deniz. "Why Ivanka Trumps Melania as a World's Most Powerful Woman." *Forbes*. November 1, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/denizcam/2017/11/01/why-ivanka-trumps-melania-as-a-worlds-most-powerful-woman/#a8a1e03732ec>
- Carroll, Cian. "Donald Trump at 2/1 to Win 2018 Nobel Peace Prize." *Ladbrokes*. March 9, 2018. Accessed July 9, 2018. <http://news.ladbrokes.com/politics/donald-trump-at-21-to-win-2018-nobel-peace-prize.html>
- Casella, Megan. "What the Paris Withdrawal Means for Trade." *Politico*. June 2, 2017. Accessed June 20, 2018. <https://www.politico.com/tipsheets/morning-trade/2017/06/02/what-the-paris-withdrawal-means-for-trade-220635>
- Chan, Gabriel. "Climate and Environmental Policy in Trump's First 100 Days: A Summary through a gender lens." *The Gender Policy Report*. May 19, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2018. <http://genderpolicyreport.umn.edu/climate-and-environmental-policy-in-trumps-first-100-days-a-summary-through-a-gender-lens/>
- Chemnick, Jean, and Lehmann, Evan. "Trump's Team Is Split over the Paris Agreement." *Scientific American*. April 18, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/trumps-team-is-split-over-the-paris-agreement/>
- Chew, Jonathan. "Here Are All the Brands that Have Cut Ties with Donald Trump." *Fortune*. July 2, 2015. Accessed July 13, 2018. <http://fortune.com/2015/07/02/donald-trump/>
- Cillizza, Chris. "Here's the Best Way to Change Donald Trump's Mind." *CNN Politics*. April 28, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/04/28/politics/trump-china-nafta/index.html>
- Cillizza, Chris. "Donald Trump Doesn't Think Much of Climate Change, in 20 Quotes." *CNN Politics*. August 8, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/08/08/politics/trump-global-warming/index.html>
- Clement, Scott, and Dennis, Brady. "Post-ABC Poll: Nearly 6 in 10 Oppose Trump Scrapping Paris Agreement." *The Washington Post*. June 5, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/06/05/post-abc-poll-nearly-6-in-10-oppose-trump-scrapping-paris-agreement/?utm_term=.2c5174711077

- “Climate Change Map: Much of Coastal U.S. under Water by 2100, Estimates Show.” *Sun Sentinel*. May 31, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. www.sun-sentinel.com/news/sfl-climate-change-map-20170531-htmlstory.html+&cd=4&hl=uk&ct=clnk&gl
- Clinch, Matt. “Deutsche Bank Can Only Be Saved by the German Government, strategist Says.” *CNBC*. September 29, 2016. Accessed July 6, 2018. <https://www.cnbc.com/2016/09/29/german-government-can-only-save-deutsche-bank-now-strategist-says.html>
- Cockburn, Harry. “Michael Bloomberg ‘to Write \$4,5 Million Cheque to Cover US Commitment to Paris Climate Agreement’.” *Independent*. April 23, 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/michael-bloomberg-paris-climate-agreement-cheque-donald-trump-a8317391.html>
- Cohen, Eliot A. “How Trump Is Ending the American Era.” *The Atlantic*. October 2017. Accessed July 2, 2018. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/10/is-trump-ending-the-american-era/537888/>
- Collins, Alan. *Contemporary Security Studies*. The UK: Oxford University Press. 2016.
- Collins Cobuild Advanced Dictionary of English*. Indonesia: PT Gramedia Printing. 2016.
- Cook, Phil. “SWIFT Exclusion of Russia and Its Consequences: Economists’ Predictions.” *Euro Maidan Press*. January 31, 2015. Accessed July 2, 2018. <http://euromaidanpress.com/2015/01/31/swift-exclusion-of-russia-and-its-consequences-economists-predictions/>
- Costa, Robert, and Gold, Matea. “Donald Trump Will Declare \$9 Billion in Assets as HE Reveals 2016 Plans.” *The Washington Post*. Accessed June 25, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/exclusive-trump-will-declare-9-billion-net-worth-as-he-reveals-2016-plans/2015/06/15/a00e74c0-137c-11e5-9ddc-e3353542100c_story.html
- CREW. “Profiting from the Presidency.” n.d. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.citizensforethics.org/profitfromthepresidency/>
- D’Angelo, Chris. “Big Business Blasts Donald Trump’s Decision to Exit Paris Climate Accord.” *Huff Post*. June 2, 2017. Accessed July 4, 2018. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/big-business-condemn-trump-paris-exit_us_5930b320e4b0c242ca228df6
- Dangremond, Sam. “How Much Is Vladimir Putin Actually Worth?” *Town & Country Magazine*. January 16, 2018. Accessed July 4, 2018. <https://www.townandcountrymag.com/society/money-and-power/a14480615/vladimir-putin-net-worth/>
- Das, Anupreeta. “When Donald Trump Needs a Loan, He Chooses Deutsche Bank.” *The Wall Street Journal*. March 20, 2016. Accessed June 25, 2018.

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/when-donald-trump-needs-a-loan-he-chooses-deutsche-bank-1458379806>

Davies, Paul J. "Deutsche Bank Is Stuck with Its Poor Reputation." *The Wall Street Journal*. February 2, 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/deutsche-bank-is-stuck-with-its-poor-reputation-1517579380>

De Haldevang, Max. "Europe May no Longer Be Able to Rely on the US for Defense against Russia. Here Are Its Options." *Quartz*. June 3, 2017. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://qz.com/993926/merkel-wants-europe-to-start-fending-for-itself-without-the-us-heres-what-that-looks-like/>

Deutsche Bank. "Deutsche Bank Reports Pre-Tax Profit of 1.3 Billion Euros and Net Loss of 0.5 Billion Euros for 2017." February 2, 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018. https://www.db.com/newsroom_news/2018/deutsche-bank-reports-pre-tax-profit-of-1-3-billion-euros-and-net-loss-of-0-5-billion-euros-for-2017-en-11482.htm

Deutsche Bank. "More Shareholders." 2014. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://annualreport.deutsche-bank.com/2014/ar/stakeholders/investing-in-deutsche-bank/shareholder-structure.html>

Dolan, Laura, and Schneider, Jessica. "The Small Business Owners Trump Never Paid in Full." *CNN Politics*. September 14, 2016. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/09/13/politics/trump-small-business-owners/index.html>

Driessen, Paul. "Don't Blame Climate Change: Hurricanes Have Always Been and Will Always Be with Us." *Fox News*. September 16, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2017/09/16/dont-blame-climate-change-hurricanes-have-always-been-and-will-always-be-with-us.html>

Durden, Tyler. "In Historic 'Self Bail-in' A German Bank Just Canceled Interest Payments on Two Bonds." *Zero Hedge*. June, 20, 2017. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2017-06-20/historic-self-bail-german-bank-cancels-interest-payments-two-bonds>

"Economy & Trade." Office of the United States Trade Representative. n.d. Accessed July 2, 2018. <https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/economy-trade>

Entous, Adam, and Osnos, Evan. "Jared Kushner Is China's Trump Card." *The New Yorker*. January 29, 2018. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/01/29/jared-kushner-is-chinas-trump-card>

ETF Daily News. "Here's what a Bailout of Deutsche Bank Might Look Like." October 4, 2016. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://etfdailynews.com/2016/10/04/heres-what-a-bailout-of-deutsche-bank-might-look-like/>

- Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Homeowner's Guide to Retrofitting: Six Ways to Protect Your Home from Flooding*. Government Printing Office. 2016. Accessed July 9, 2018.
- Fichtner, Ulrich. "How a Pillar of German Banking Lost Its Way." *Spiegel Online*. October 28, 2016. Accessed June 25, 2018. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/business/the-story-of-the-self-destruction-of-deutsche-bank-a-1118157.html>
- Fitch, Chris. "Green Climate Fund Is Go." *Geographical*. May 22, 2015. Accessed July 6, 2018. <http://geographical.co.uk/geopolitics/geopolitics/item/1052-green-climate-fund-is-go>
- Gee, Alastair. "Democratic Senators Scrutinize Koch Brothers 'Infiltration' of Trump Team." *The Guardian*. April 26, 2018. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/apr/26/koch-brothers-trump-administration-resumes-democrats>
- Glum, Julia. "Donald Trump Doesn't Read, so why Did He Just Recommend a Fox Host's Book on Andrew Jackson?" *Newsweek*. December 7, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <http://www.newsweek.com/trump-andrew-jackson-book-doesnt-read-740800>
- Goldenberg, Suzanne, Vidal, John, Taylor, Lenore, Vaughan, Adam, and Harvey, Fiona. "Paris Climate Deal: Nearly 200 Nations Sign in End of Fossil Fuel Era." *The Guardian*. December 12, 2015. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/dec/12/paris-climate-deal-200-nations-sign-finish-fossil-fuel-era>
- Goodman, Joshua. "US Official: Trump Pressed Aides about Venezuela Invasion." *Business Insider*. July 4, 2018. Accessed July 5, 2018. <http://www.businessinsider.com/ap-us-official-trump-pressed-aides-about-venezuela-invasion-2018-7?r=UK&IR=T>
- Gosden, Emily. "Paris Climate Change Agreement: The Deal at a Glance." *The Telegraph*. December 12, 2015. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/paris-climate-change-conference/12047233/Paris-climate-change-agreement-at-a-glance.html>
- Gottfries, Nils. *Macroeconomics*. Macmillan International Higher Education. 2013. Accessed July 6, 2018.
- Graham, Luke. "Here Are the Most Controversial Nobel Prize-Winners Ever." *CNBC*. October 13, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.cnbc.com/2016/10/13/here-are-the-most-controversial-noble-prize-winners-ever.html#slide=2>
- Green, Morris. "Donald Trump: Museveni Belongs in Prison, not State House, Ugandans Are Cowards." *Politica*. February 22, 2016. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.politics.co.ke/politics/donald-trump-museveni-belongs-prison-not-state-house-ugandans-cowards/>

- Greenpeace*. “10 Things You Want to Ask about Trump’s Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement.” June 2, 2017. Accessed July 3, 2018.
<https://medium.com/greenpeace/trump-abandons-the-paris-climate-agreement-how-bad-is-that-39dde516f2d1>
- Grunstein, Judah. “Why Emmanuel Macron Dissed Donald Trump and Now Is Dining with Him.” *Politico Magazine*. July 10, 2017. Accessed July 11, 2018.
<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/07/12/emmanuel-macron-dissed-now-dining-with-donald-trump-215361>
- Hansler, Jennifer. “5 Major Changes to US Environmental Policy in 2017.” *CNN Politics*. July 13, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018.
<https://edition.cnn.com/2017/12/30/politics/environmental-policy-moments-2017/index.html>
- Hell, Irene. “165 States Queue up to Sign UN Climate Deal.” *Deutsche Welle*. April 21, 2016. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://www.dw.com/en/165-states-queue-up-to-sign-un-climate-deal/a-19201814>
- Horowitz, Julia. “These American Companies Could Be Hurt by Trump’s Tariffs.” *CNN Money*. March 9, 2018. Accessed July 9, 2018.
<https://money.cnn.com/2018/03/08/news/companies/companies-steel-aluminum-tariffs-list/index.html>
- Hugger, Justin. “NATO Can’t Protect Baltics from Russia, Says US General.” *Telegraph*. June 23, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018.
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/06/23/nato-cant-protect-baltics-from-russia-says-us-general/>
- Inhofe, James M. et al. to the Honorable Donald J. Trump. May 25, 2017. Accessed June 14, 2018. Accessed June 15, 2018.
<https://www.inhofe.senate.gov/download/?id=E1E34574-5655-42AA-92E8-0D23DC8C33BA&download=1>
- Janda, Kenneth, Berry, Jeffrey M., Goldman, Jerry, Schildkraut, Deborah, and Manna, Paul. *The Challenge of Democracy: American Government in Global Politics*. The USA: Cengage Learning. 2017. Accessed July 19, 2018.
- Kaufman, Alexander C. “The Mercers, Trump’s Billionaire Megadonors, Ramp up Climate Change Denial Funding.” *Huff Post*. January 25, 2018. Accessed July 10, 2018.
https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/mercers-climate-denial_us_5a6a4661e4b06e253265e832
- Kelly, Nora. “Ted Cruz IS Ready for 2020.” *The Atlantic*. July 6, 2016. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/cruz-2020-president/490187/>
- Keoun, Bradley. “German’s deutsche Bank Gets Bailout Roadmap from Tiny Italian Lender.” *The Street*. January 3, 2017. Accessed July 5, 2018.

<https://www.thestreet.com/story/13939700/1/germany-s-deutsche-bank-gets-bailout-roadmap-from-tiny-italian-lender.html>

Kirsch, Noah. "Billionaire out, Billionaire in: Bloomberg Pledges \$15M to Climate as Trump Ditches Paris Deal." *Forbes*, June 1, 2017. Accessed July 5, 2018.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/noahkirsch/2017/06/01/billionaire-out-billionaire-in-bloomberg-pledges-15m-to-climate-as-trump-ditches-paris-deal/#6939c0f04bda>

Kumar, Anita. "Foreign Governments Are Finding Ways to Do Favors for Trump's Business." *McClatchy DC Bureau*. January 2, 2018. Accessed July 5, 2018.

<https://www.mcclatchydc.com/news/nation-world/article192131074.html>

Kwong, Jessica. "Trump Does not Like to Read and Kips Written Intelligence Report, Unlike Past Presidents." *Newsweek*. February 9, 2018. Accessed July 10, 2018.

<http://www.newsweek.com/trump-doesnt-read-and-skips-written-intelligence-report-unlike-past-presidents-802455>

Levin, Bess. "Sorry, Democrats: Deutsche Bank Isn't Giving up Trump." *Vanity Fair*. June 9, 2017. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/06/donald-trump-detusche-bank-russia>

Lewis, J.P., and Everitt, Joanna, eds. *The Blueprint: Conservative Parties and Their Impact on Canadian Politics*. Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Liptak, Kevin. "Trump's North Korean Gamble Ends with 'Special Bond' with Kim." *CNN Politics*. June 12, 2018. Accessed July 5, 2018.

<https://edition.cnn.com/2018/06/11/politics/trump-kim-summit-singapore/index.html>

Loesche, Dyfed. "Paris Climate Agreement Comes into Effect." *Statista*. November 4, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.statista.com/chart/6572/paris-climate-agreement-comes-into-effect/>

Luce, Edward. "Tickling Trump: world Leaders Use Flattery to Influence America." *Financial Times*. May 4, 2018. Accessed July 2, 2018.

<https://www.ft.com/content/e88668da-4f8c-11e8-9471-a083af05aea7>

MacFarlane, Alec. "Chinese Firm Becomes Deutsche Bank's Biggest Shareholder." *CNN Money*. May 3, 2017. Accessed July 3, 2018.

<http://money.cnn.com/2017/05/03/investing/china-hna-deutsche-bank/index.html>

MacKinnon, Mark. "Pandas Heading to Toronto, Oiling the Wheels of Canada-China Relations." *The Globe and Mail*. February 1, 2012. Accessed July 2, 2018.

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/pandas-heading-to-toronto-oiling-the-wheels-of-canada-china-relations/article542877/>

Maguire, Robert. "Audit Shows NRA Spending Surged \$100 Million Amidst pro-Trump Push in 2016." *OpenSecrets.org*. November 15, 2017. Accessed July 3, 2018.

<https://www.opensecrets.org/news/2017/11/audit-shows-nra-spending-surged-100-million-amidst-pro-trump-push-in-2016/>

- Mann, Jatinder, ed. *Citizenship in Transnational Perspective: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand*. Springer, 2017.
- Mann, Windsor. "Flattery is Donald Trump's Cocaine – He's Addicted to It." *USA Today*. June 15, 2017. Accessed July 5, 2018.
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2017/06/15/donald-trumps-me-first-agenda-more-apparent-day-windsor-mann-column/102867060/>
- Martens, Pam, and Martens, Russ. "Germany's Deutsche Bank, Again in Trouble, Received a U.S. Bailout Twice as Big as Lehman Brothers." *Wall Street on Parade*. October 3, 2016. Accessed July 6, 2018. <http://wallstreetonparade.com/2016/10/germanys-deutsche-bank-again-in-trouble-received-a-u-s-bailout-twice-as-big-as-lehman-brothers/>
- McBride, James. "The Consequences of Leaving the Paris Agreement." The Council on Foreign Relations. June 1, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2018.
<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/consequences-leaving-paris-agreement>
- McCarthy, Tom. "The Republicans who Urged Trump to Pull out of Paris Deal Are Big Oil Darlings." *The Guardian*. June 1, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2018.
<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jun/01/republican-senators-paris-climate-deal-energy-donations>
- Mills, Curt. "Governors Vow to Support Climate Deal." *U.S. News*. June 2, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.usnews.com/news/national-news/articles/2017-06-02/governors-vow-to-support-paris-climate-accord-despite-withdrawal>
- Millstein, Seth. "Will Trump Win the Nobel Peace Prize? Betting Companies Just Upped His Chances." *Bustle*. 2018. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.bustle.com/p/will-trump-win-the-nobel-peace-prize-betting-companies-just-upped-his-chances-9375929>
- Moore, Malcolm. "China's Human Rights Situation 'Worst in Decades.'" *The Telegraph*. March 2, 2014. Accessed July 2, 2018.
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/10670520/Chinas-human-rights-situation-worst-in-decades.html>
- Moshinsky, Ben. "Deutsche Bank Still Needs to Convince Regulators and Investors Its Problems Aren't Contagious" *Nordic Business Insider*. October 27, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://nordic.businessinsider.com/deutsche-bank-bank-of-england-exposure-info-request-db-results-2016-10>
- Moshinsky, Ben. "Shares in Deutsche Bank Are Crashing after the Bank Said It Would Tap Investors for €8 Billion." *Business Insider*. March 6, 2017. Accessed July 5, 2018.
<http://uk.businessinsider.com/deutsche-bank-is-raising-8-billion-in-capital-2017-3>
- Nadesan, Majia. *Crisis Communication, Liberal Democracy, and Ecological Sustainability: The Threat of Financial and Energy Complexes in the Twenty-First Century*. The USA: Lexington Books. 2016.

- Neate, Rupert. "Donald Trump's wealth Has Fallen for Second Year Running – Forbes." *The Guardian*. March 6, 2018. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/mar/06/donald-trump-fortune-fallen-forbes-worth-amazon-jeff-bezos>
- Ng, Andy H., Hynie, Michaela, and Ng, Andy H. "Naïve Dialectism and Indecisiveness." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (2015). Accessed July 3, 2018. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0022022115613861>
- Nguyen, Tina. "Is Donald Trump not Really a Billionaire?" *Vanity Fair*. May 31, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2016/05/donald-trump-net-worth>
- Nowell, Gregory Patrick. *Mercantile States and the World Oil Cartel, 1900-1939*. The USA: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Nuccitelli, Dana. "Rupert Murdoch Doesn't Understand Climate Change Basic, and That's the Problem." *The Guardian*. July 14, 2014. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-percent/2014/jul/14/rupert-murdoch-doesnt-understand-climate-basics>
- O'Connell, Jonathan, Fahrenthold, David A., and Gillum, Jack. "As the 'King of Debt,' Trump Borrowed to Build His Empire. Then He Spent Hundreds of Millions in Cash." *Chicago Tribune*. May 5, 2018. Accessed July 5, 2018. www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-trump-real-estate-spending-20180505-story.html+&cd=6&hl=uk&ct=clnk&gl
- Oltermann, Philip, and Treanor, Jill. "Europe's Banks 'not Investable' Says Top Banker amid Deutsche Bank Crisis." *The Guardian*. September 28, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2016/sep/28/deutsche-bank-john-cryan-denies-asking-german-government-help>
- Oppenheim, Maya. "Al Gore: Voting Trump out in 2020 Could Save Paris Climate Agreement." *Independent*. November 12, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/al-gore-donald-trump-vote-out-save-paris-climate-agreement-2020-a8050791.html>
- Parsnow, Luke. "Fox News' Influence on Trump Is Alarming." *Syracuse New Times*. January 8, 2018. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.syracusenewtimes.com/fox-news-influence-trump-alarming/>
- Peker, Emre. "Trump Administration Seeks to Avoid Withdrawal from Paris Climate Accord." *The Wall Street Journal*. September 17, 2017. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-administration-wont-withdraw-from-paris-climate-deal-1505593922>
- Perkins, Tony. "The Numbers that Prove how Much the Mainstream Media Hate Trump." *The Daily Signal*. December 14, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2017/12/14/this-numbers-that-prove-how-much-the-mainstream-media-hates-trump/>

- Peterson, Hayley, and Taylor, Kate. "Here Are All the Companies that Have Cut Ties with the Trump Family." *Business Insider*. February 7, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <http://www.businessinsider.com/companies-cut-ties-with-trump-2017-2>
- Phillips, Amber. "Want to Change Trump's Mind on Policy? Be the Last One who Talks to Him." *The Washington Post*. April 28, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/04/14/want-to-change-trumps-mind-on-policy-be-the-last-one-who-talks-to-him/?utm_term=.15febad7a013
- Pope, Carl. "Trump's Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement Actually Does Us a Favor." *Huff Post*. June 2, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2018. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/trumps-withdrawal_us_5931a35fe4b0649fff21189b
- Protest, Ben, Silver-Greenberg, Jessica, and Drucker, Jesse. "Big German Bank, Key to Trump's Finances, Faces New Scrutiny." *The New York Times*. July 19, 2017. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/19/business/big-german-bank-key-to-trumps-finances-faces-new-scrutiny.html>
- Reilly, Steve. "USA TODAY Exclusive: Hundreds Allege Donald Trump Doesn't Pay His Bills." *USA Today*. n.d. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/06/09/donald-trump-unpaid-bills-republican-president-laswuits/85297274/>
- Reuters. "German Says no Bailouts for Deutsche Bank or Any Other Struggling Lenders." *Fortune*. September 29, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018. <http://fortune.com/2016/09/29/deutsche-bank-germany-bailout/>
- Reuters Staff. "Deutsche Bank's US Ops Deemed 'Troubled' by Fed a Year Ago: WSJ." *Reuters*. May 31, 2018. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-deutsche-bank-fed-assessment/deutsche-banks-u-s-operations-deemed-troubled-by-fed-a-year-ago-wsj-idUSKCN1IW1R4>
- Robinson, Melia. "7 Major US Cities Could Be Underwater within 80 Years – Here Are the Disturbing 'after' Images." *Business Insider*. July 18, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <http://www.businessinsider.com/us-cities-underwater-in-the-future-2017-7>
- Rochford, Jonathan. "Opinion: Deutsche Bank Needs a Bail-in – Here's how It Could Be Done." *Market Watch*. October 4, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018. <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/deutsche-bank-needs-a-bail-in-heres-how-it-could-be-done-2016-10-04>
- Rosenfeld, Everett. "Trump Is Reportedly Beginning His Days Later to Accommodate TV and Twitter Time." *CNBC*. January 7, 2018. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.cnn.com/2018/01/07/donald-trump-starts-later-so-he-has-tv-and-twitter-time-in-morning-report.html>
- Rushe, Dominic. "Elon Musk and Disney Boss Quit Trump's Business Panel over Paris Pullout." *The Guardian*. June 2, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018.

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/jun/02/elon-musk-and-disney-boss-quit-trumps-business-panel-over-paris-pullout>

Sabur, Rozina. "Donald Trump Says 'Everyone' Thinks He Should Get Nobel Peace Prize – but He Just Wants 'Victory for the World.'" *The Telegraph*. May 9, 2018. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/05/09/donald-trump-says-everyone-thinks-should-get-nobel-peace-prize/>

Scribner, Todd, and Chapman, Roger. "Wall Street Journal, The." In *Culture Wars: An Encyclopedia of Issues, Viewpoints, and Voices*, edited by Roger Chapman and James Ciment, 697. Routledge. 2015. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://books.google.com/books?id=XO9nBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA697&dq=Rupert+murdoch+is+owner+of+Fox+news&hl=uk&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi4z5OVsZ7cAhUEF5QKHVPBAnsQ6AEISTAE#v=onepage&q=Rupert%20murdoch%20is%20owner%20of%20Fox%20news&f=true>

Shakya, Clare, and Abeysinghe, Achala C. "US Paris Withdrawal: Where Now for Climate Action?" International Institute for Environment and Development. June 14, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2018. <https://www.iied.org/us-paris-withdrawal-where-now-for-climate-action>

Siddiqui, Sabrina, and Gambino, Lauren. "Obama Condemns Trump for 'Rejecting the Future' by Exiting Paris Deal." *The Guardian*. June 1, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/jun/01/obama-condemns-trump-paris-climate-agreement>

Sieck, Winston. "Do You Struggle with Indecisiveness? Maybe It's in Your Culture." *Global Cognition*. April 1, 2018. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://www.globalcognition.org/decisive-or-indecisive-its-cultural/>

Silver-Greenberg, Jessica. "Deutsche Bank's Business with Sanctioned Nations under Scrutiny." *The New York Times*. August 17, 2012. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/18/business/deutsche-banks-business-with-sanctioned-nations-under-scrutiny.html?mtrref=www.google.com&gwh=91144B262DA2B1EADB34123F2F753E2E&gwt=pay>

Sims, Tom. "Deutsche Bank Boosts Bonuses to 2,3 billion Euros despite Bigger 2017 Loss." *Reuters*. March 16, 2016. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-deutsche-bank-results/deutsche-bank-boosts-bonuses-to-2-3-billion-euros-despite-bigger-2017-loss-idUKKCN1GS0XE>

Smith, David. "'Idiot': Murdoch Mocked Trump after Phone Call on Immigration, Book Claims." *The Guardian*. January 3, 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jan/03/rupert-murdoch-trump-idiot-phone-call-immigration>

- Statista. "Credit exposure at Deutsche Bank in 2017, by industry sector (in billion euros)." *Statista*. 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018.
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/253611/deutsche-bank-loan-volume-by-sector/>
- Sterman, John. "The Paris Climate Agreement: Deliverance or Disappointment?" *Huff Post*. December 15, 2016. Accessed June 15, 2018.
https://www.huffingtonpost.com/alliance-for-research-on-corporate-sustainability-/the-paris-climate-agreement_b_8812466.html
- Stewart, James B. "Deutsche Bank as Next Lehman Brothers: Far-Fetched but not Unthinkable." *The New York Times*. October 6, 2016. Accessed July 5, 2018.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/business/deutsche-bank-as-next-lehman-brothers-far-fetched-but-not-unthinkable.html>
- Stibbe, Arran. *Eco-linguistics: Language, Ecology, and the Stories We Live by*. Routledge. 2015.
- Stone, Jon. "US Elections: Here Are the British Politicians who Have Backed Donald Trump." *Independent*. November 8, 2016. Accessed July 10, 2018.
<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/us-elections-donald-trump-british-politicians-support-ian-duncan-smith-nigel-farage-a7404311.html>
- Stossel, John. "John Stossel: Of Course, Climate Change Is Real! Climate Changes – It Always Has and Always Will." *Fox News*. September 13, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2017/09/13/john-stossel-course-climate-change-is-real-climate-changes-it-always-has-and-always-will.html>
- Streck, Charlotte, Keenlyside, Paul, von Unger, Moritz. "The Paris Agreement: A New Beginning." *Journal for European Environmental & Planning Law* 13 (2016). Accessed June 15, 2018.
<https://climatefocus.com/sites/default/files/The%20Paris%20Agreement%20A%20New%20Beginning.pdf>
- Strom, Robert G. *Hot House: Global Climate Change and the Human Condition*. The USA: Springer Science & Business Media. 2007. Accessed July 10, 2018.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=veEhR1dmEvAC&pg=PA79&dq=extremely+hot+in+medieval&hl=uk&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjQ7ofhop7cAhXBXSwwKHbrbDcIQ6AEILzAB#v=onepage&q=extremely%20hot%20in%20medieval&f=false>
- Taylor, Adam. "Ugandan President Says He Loves Trump: 'He Talks to Africans Frankly'." *The Washington Post*. January 23, 2018. Accessed July 10, 2018.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2018/01/23/ugandan-president-says-he-loves-trump-he-talks-to-africans-frankly/>
- Tay, Moses L.H. *End Time Scenario: The Picture Is Getting Clearer*. Singapore: Partridge Publishing, 2015.

The Associated Press. "Trump Resisting Pressure from Europe, Ivanka, and the Pope on Climate Agreement." *Fortune*. May 31, 2017. Accessed July 10, 2018. <http://fortune.com/2017/05/31/paris-agreement-donald-trump/>

The Middle East Media Research Institute. "Columnist Martynov: Russia Plays the Superpower, but with Its Puny GDP It Cannot Afford a War with the West." February 19, 2018. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://www.memri.org/reports/columnist-martynov-russia-plays-superpower-its-puny-gdp-it-cannot-afford-war-west>

The Real News Network. "Deutsche Bank Is Failing, Bail-out Inevitable." May 31, 2018. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://therealnews.com/stories/deutsche-bank-is-failing-bail-out-inevitable>

"These Senators Are Complicit in US Withdrawal of Paris Agreement." *Indivisible*. n.d. Accessed June 15, 2018. <https://www.indivisible.org/resource/senators-complicit-withdrawal-paris-agreement/>

The UN. *Country classification*. 2014. Accessed July 3, 2018. http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf

"The World's Top 10 Largest Economies." *Focus Economics*. December 29, 2017. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://www.focus-economics.com/blog/the-largest-economies-in-the-world>

Timmons, Heather. "Wealthy Muslims Helped Donald Trump Build His Empire." *Quartz*. December 7, 2015. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://qz.com/568178/donald-trump-owes-much-of-his-fortune-to-wea/>

Trechsel, Heinz R., and Bomberg, Mark. *Moisture Control in buildings: Key Factor in Mold Prevention*. ASTM International. 2009.

Trump, Donald. Statement by President Trump on the Paris Climate Accord. White House. 2018. Accessed June 15, 2018. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-accord/>

Tully, Shawn. "Donald Trump Is Understating His Debt by \$500 Million." *Fortune*. March 23, 2016. Accessed July 3, 2018. <http://fortune.com/2016/03/23/donald-trump-debt/>

United Nations. *Adoption of the Paris Agreement*. 2015. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/l09r01.pdf>

"United States – Exports of Goods and Services (% of GDP)." *Trading Economics*. 2018. Accessed July 2, 2018. <https://tradingeconomics.com/united-states/exports-of-goods-and-services-percent-of-gdp-wb-data.html>

Upton, John. "The \$100 Billion Climate Question." *Climate Central*. November 23, 2015. Accessed July 3, 2018. <http://www.climatecentral.org/news/the-100-billion-climate-question-19726>

- Valenzuela, Joel. "Deutsche Bank: EU Banks Need \$166 Billion Bailout." *Coin Telegraph*. July 12, 2016. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://cointelegraph.com/news/deutsche-bank-eu-banks-need-166-billion-bailout>
- Von Drehle, David. "Trump Does not Seem to Like Being President. So why not Quit?" *The Washington Post*. Accessed July 10, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trump-doesnt-seem-to-like-being-president-so-why-not-quit/2017/08/18/83c2e38e-842a-11e7-902a-2a9f2d808496_story.html?utm_term=.ef71ec72d8eb
- Washington Post. "Most of Trump's Merchandising Empire Has Faded." *Los Angeles Times*. April 20, 2018. Accessed July 9, 2018. <http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-donald-trump-brand-20180420-story.html>
- Wearden, Graeme. "Deutsche Bank to Slash More than 7,000 Jobs; Chairman Survives Revolt – as It Happened." *The Guardian*. May 24, 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/business/live/2018/may/24/deutsche-bank-slash-7000-jobs-city-markets-ftse-sterling-business-live?page=with:block-5b066597e4b0a1f834771d54>
- Wemple, Erik. "Oh, Great: Rupert Murdoch Will Have More Time to Spend on Fox News." *The Washington Post*. December 14, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/erik-wemple/wp/2017/12/14/oh-great-rupert-murdoch-will-have-more-time-to-spend-on-fox-news/?utm_term=.0edc14007a7e
- Wilson, Bruce. *Disarming the Culture War: How the Silent Majority Can Break the Stalemate*. The USA: iUniverse. 2005.
- Wilson, Harry L. "Gun Lobby." In *Guns in American Society: An Encyclopedia of History, Politics, Culture, and the Law*, edited by Gregg Lee Carter, 350-351. The USA: ABC-CLIO.
- Wilson, John K. *President Trump Unveiled: Exposing the Bigoted Billionaire*. The UK: OR Books. 2017.
- Wilts, Alexandra. "Majority of Americans in Every US State Supports Paris Climate Deal Trump Is Poised to Withdraw from." *Independent*. May 31, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-paris-climate-deal-agreement-poll-support-popularity-americans-states-a7765626.html>
- Worley, Will. "Washington's Elite Brand Ivanka Trump and Jared Kushner 'Irrelevant' and Say Their Days in White House Are Numbered." *Independent*. August 28, 2017. Accessed July 9, 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/washington-elite-ivanka-trump-jared-kushner-irrelevant-white-house-a7916376.html>
- Wright, Lynn Donelson, and Nichols, C. Reid. *Tomorrow's Coasts: Complex and Impermanent*. Springer. 2018.

Yates, Jacques Frank, Ji, Li-Jun, Oka, Takashi, Lee, Ju-Whei, Shinotsuka, Hiromi, and Sieck, Winston R. "Indecisiveness and Culture: Incidence, Values, and Thoroughness." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 41, no. 3 (2010): 428-444. Accessed July 2, 2018.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247724216_Indecisiveness_and_Culture_Incidence_Values_and_Thoroughness

Zenko, Micah. "The President Promised to Deliver Peace. But in His First Year, He Expanded Every War He Inherited." *Foreign Policy*. December 29, 2017. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/12/29/how-donald-trump-learned-to-love-war-in-2017/>

Zhang, Hai-Bin, Dai, Han-Cheng, Lai, Hua-Xia, and Wang, Wen-Tao. "US Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement: Reasons, Impacts, and China's Response." *Advances in Climate Change Research* 8, no. 4 (2017): 3-29. Accessed June 15, 2018. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1674927817301028>