

11-2018

## What Happens Now? The U.S.'s Withdrawal from Paris Climate Agreement

Samantha Klann

*Grand Valley State University*, [klanns@mail.gvsu.edu](mailto:klanns@mail.gvsu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/honorsprojects>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

---

### ScholarWorks Citation

Klann, Samantha, "What Happens Now? The U.S.'s Withdrawal from Paris Climate Agreement" (2018).  
*Honors Projects*. 703.

<https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/honorsprojects/703>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Research and Creative Practice at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gvsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gvsu.edu).

What Happens Now?

The U.S.'s Withdrawal from Paris Climate Agreement

Samantha Klann

Grand Valley State University

HNR 499

### Abstract

This research paper investigates what possible consequences President Trump's removal of the United States from the Paris Climate Agreement could have on world leadership position, international (trade) relations, innovation, and overall economic development of the U.S. President Trump retracted the U.S. from the agreement in June 2017, and although the withdrawal takes years to officially be completed, it is possible to explore possible ramifications for the U.S.'s future (Friedman, 2017). This paper focuses on analyzing how this withdrawal could affect the U.S. world leadership position, international (trade) relations, and innovation, and the subsequent impact on the economic development of the U.S.

*Keywords:* Paris Climate Agreement, President Trump, economic development, President Macron, climate change, tariffs

## Introduction

Global warming: melting ice caps and unprecedented changes in climates across the globe fueled by the increasing levels of pollution filling the atmosphere. The degree of belief and causation of global warming varies by person, but overall, most world leaders and citizens agree it is a real phenomenon needing to be delayed, ultimately stopped, and its effects reversed. Scientists and leaders from around the world have convened over the past four decades at different meetings and conferences to create and agree on approaches and solutions, codified in various treaties. The most recent treaty to come out of a world conference on climate change is the Paris Climate Agreement.

The Paris Climate Agreement resulted from a COP-21 (Conference of the Parties) meeting which took place in Paris on December 12, 2015. The countries involved, which included France, China, Germany, and the United States to name a few, focused on setting goals, responsibilities, and duties for the participants of the treaty, and established the main goal of the agreement as limiting the increase of the Earth's temperature to 1.5° Celsius above pre-industrial levels (Blau, 2017). In order to achieve this goal, countries must report the steps they are taking to mitigate emissions, which directly impacts temperatures, i.e. helping to keep the Earth's temperature from rising above 1.5° Celsius. All participating countries committed to attaining their own individual goals, but in addition to the overall objective and their own, developed countries also possess "differentiated responsibilities" under the Agreement. This means that countries who are "developed" must help underdeveloped countries with their renewable energy projects, since those projects will take longer to happen without the assistance of richer countries. The differentiated responsibilities stem from the Agreement recognizing that

industrialized countries hold more accountability for the current status of the climate, and therefore possess more responsibility for resourcing attaining the goals of the Agreement.

### **Background**

The Paris Climate Agreement is not the first international agreement to try and address global warming and the changing climates of the world; striving to accomplish what multiple treaties and pacts have attempted over the past thirty years. However, the Paris Climate Treaty's foundations stem from those past agreements, and what makes it remarkable is that almost every country on the planet agreed to its terms of addressing CO<sub>2</sub> and other toxic gas emissions (Blau, 2017). Whereas past agreements had a more difficult time acquiring countries signatures or ratifications of agreements.

The First World Climate Conference took place in 1979, and the attendees were scientists who wanted to outline the responsibilities governments possess in order to help prevent climate change caused by humans. Although no pollution altering treaties were made at this first focused meeting, this conference initiated scientists and governments convening in order to address climate change; a crucial first step towards recognizing pollution as a problem internationally. Despite no treaty or agreement being created at this conference, it did advocate for governments across the world, "to foresee and prevent potential manmade changes in the climate that might be averse to humanity" (Blau, 2017). An appeal which could have initiated the conversation about climate change, and the role governments have in addressing it.

Almost a decade later, in 1990, the Second Climate Conference was held and the attendees focused on reviewing the first report generated by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC); an entity created almost ten years after the First World Climate Conference (Blau, 2017). The report led to statements about climate change and the risks it poses

to Earth, and a Ministerial Declaration was issued in response to the findings of the report.

Unfortunately, the Declaration did not receive a lot of support, and ultimately failed. However, the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was established two years later thanks to developments stemming from the Second Climate Conference discussions.

In 1992, two years after the Second Climate Conference, a United Nations General Assembly took place to negotiate another climate change treaty called the Rio Declaration, which was ratified by the United States in 1994. The main idea of the Rio Declaration was that by the year 2000, the more developed countries would commit to reducing gas emission levels to those measured in the 1990s and begin leading the world to reduced emission levels overall (Blau, 2017). Over a hundred-fifty countries signed the Rio Declaration, and while it too struggled to meet defined goals due to challenging implementation, it did become a guiding mechanism for what would be outlined in the Paris Climate Agreement. Aspects of the Rio Declaration can be found in the Paris Climate Agreement, particularly the “differentiated responsibilities” for developed countries.

In 1997, the work of the UNFCCC produced the Kyoto Protocol. Similar to other agreements, the Kyoto Protocol focused on limiting emissions by setting reduction targets (Blau, 2017). Despite the Protocol having multiple stages and specific reduction level goals, many international parties never agreed to the Protocol, later left it, or ultimately failed to take action to achieve their set goals. While to some the Kyoto Protocol was seen as a failure in impacting climate change and gas emissions, it did become another stepping stone for subsequent treaties regarding climate change. All the past conferences, documents, and treaties over the previous decades enabled the discussion about climate change to stay alive, and ultimately play a part in the creation of the Paris Climate Agreement.

On November 4, 2016 the Paris Climate Agreement came into effect with 55 countries ratifying or accepting it, including the United States. Many of the terms of the Agreement were created in the months previous to ratification during the G-20 Summit, at which both the U.S. and China declared their agreement with the Accord (Blau, 2017). After the Paris Climate Agreement's creation, all the countries in the world at least accepted or ratified it over the following year, with the exception of Syria and Nicaragua. However, a somewhat expected, but certainly not welcomed, turn of events happened on June 1, 2017, when the newly elected President Trump of the United States declared that the U.S. would leave the Agreement. As of that date, Syria and Nicaragua still had not ratified the Agreement, but by the end of 2017 both countries did; leaving the United States to be the sole country that rejected the Paris Climate Agreement (Friedman, 2017). A move which confused numerous world leaders and civilians across the world.

Why did President Trump choose to leave a worldwide climate change Agreement that previous leadership of the United States had so strongly supported? A decision which could possibly lead to harsh consequences for the United States? President Trump did communicate the rationales behind his decision; although many argue the logic behind them was faulty and perhaps misinformed. Schipani, Kiely, Robertson, and Farley reported on President Trump's stated logic and the counter arguments provided by multiple directors and expert organizations (2017).

The first reason President Trump argued for withdrawing from the Agreement involved the perceived increase in legal liability of the United States if the U.S. continued to be in the Agreement. President Trump even used the exact words "massive legal liability" to emphasize how he believed his actions would protect the country from such liabilities by leaving the

Agreement. Yet Michael Burger, an executive director of the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia University, explained to Schipani et al. how the U.S. could actually face more lawsuits by withdrawing. The absence of U.S. participation in the agreement opens the door to more lawsuits based on government *inaction*.

The second point President Trump argued, stemmed from his impression that China and India produce more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than the United States, and claimed the deal punishes the U.S. instead of those countries. Contrary to the president's argument though, the 2015 European Commission's Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research reported that indeed China produces the world's highest level of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (total kilotons), but the U.S. immediately follows, not India. Even more damning, the United States' *per capital* CO<sub>2</sub> emissions surpass the combined total of both China and India at 16.07 tons *per individual* compared to 7.73 and 1.87 tons per individual respectively. Hence, while the United States may not be the sole perpetrator of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, they certainly contribute a high amount and cannot ignore its contribution. The Paris Climate Agreement could be interpreted as a "punishment" by certain people thanks to certain requirements, but regardless, the U.S. wouldn't be undeserving of the claim of being a polluter.

A third reason President Trump insisted on for the withdrawal from the Agreement focuses on the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the United States, and how the country could lose \$3 trillion in GDP over the span of ten years through implementation of Agreement responsibilities. As Schipani et al. reported though, a few organizations predicted different numbers from those President Trump gave in his withdrawal speech. The Heritage Foundation estimated the \$3 trillion loss of GDP would actually be over 20 years thanks to the carbon tax rates. Resources for the Future reported that the economic costs of the carbon taxes would not be

as harsh as President Trump's stated amount, and that delaying the carbon tax could make matters worse for the future; the tax would have to be higher in the future to compensate for years of inaction and lack of enforcement. Other scenarios conducted by the National Economic Research Associates found that GDP would be affected differently depending on how the government acts. Therefore, President Trump did not make a false claim that the Paris Climate Agreement would cost the country money, but he liberally altered the timeline and presented limited scenarios.

President Trump's fourth rationale for the withdrawal comes from the idea that the \$3 billion pledge the United States made to the Green Climate Fund (a UNFCCC fund where industrialized nations contribute money to help developing countries fund their climate change projects) cannot be accounted for, and that nobody knows where the contributions go. President Trump believed that the money had been mindlessly donated. Yet, the money donated can be specifically tracked to 43 projects, all of which are allowing developing countries to experience improved ability to cope with climate change.

The fifth and final reason President Trump gave to exit the Paris Climate Agreement revolves around the current U.S. economy, arguing how "a million jobs" have been created since he took office, and that staying in the Paris Climate Agreement could hinder job growth and slow down the economy. As Schipani et al. reported, only 493,000 of those jobs were added since President Trump took office; he himself did not create a million jobs. In addition, Chief Economist at Moody's Analytics, Mark Zandi contended that the economy has been adding jobs for almost seven years since 2010. Thus, the economy has been strong since before President Trump took office, and there's no evidence to suggest U.S. participation in the Paris Climate Agreement would impede the steady growth the U.S. has experienced since 2010. As terms of

the Paris Climate Agreement are embedded in the strategies of the businesses in the United States, it's likely the opposite could take effect with these companies creating jobs to meet accord responsibilities. Therefore, President Trump has disrupted what previous administrations have tried to establish, and would be incredibly disruptive to businesses. President Trump's decision could potentially be a step backwards not only in climate protections, but employment levels as businesses struggle to adapt and modify their strategies.

The United States leaving the Paris Climate Agreement does not mean that the climate will go downhill instantaneously, but there are immediate consequences that could be very disruptive and dangerous to the U.S. Through withdrawing from the Agreement, President Trump essentially told the world and scientists that climate change is not an issue to be concerned about and, "we (the U.S.) are not with you (scientists and other countries)" in terms of aiding in the control of pollution to stop the world's temperature from rising. Despite the U.S.'s high contribution of greenhouse gases. What happens after that? How do scientists, entrepreneurs, foreign countries, and U.S. citizens respond to President Trump denying the importance of solving a raging issue in the world today and possibly creating negative global repercussions for the country?

The United States now stands alone as the sole country to not be a part of the Paris Climate Agreement, and in such an interconnected world which supports the Agreement, there's the possibility of multiple repercussions. President Trump's decision could potentially put U.S. world leadership status, international and trade relations, innovation capacity, and ultimately economic development of the United States at risk.

### **World Leadership**

A major concern of countries across the world has become climate change/global warming, and through the Paris Climate Agreement, progress towards both clean and renewable energy and technology has become a more united undertaking across the world. The countries who will be the leaders of the world will be the ones who develop more environmentally friendly technology and who push the world forward to a brighter, cleaner future. When the first Climate Conference transpired decades ago, the world leading economies were the countries innovating regardless of how environmentally friendly the product or service was. Times have since changed, and the necessity for an innovation to be green has begun to be more important; countries today have to embrace “green” if they want to be world leaders (Pencea, 2016). Thus, the United States ostracizing itself and telling the countries of the world it will not participate in climate management creates a vacuum for other countries to step forward and become the world leader(s). Who will become the world leader(s) is still to be determined, but through President Trump’s actions, the United States’ reign has essentially come to an end.

Surprisingly, under the newly elected leadership of President Emmanuel Macron, France has begun to emerge as a global leader in green technology and the fight against climate change, in addition to being overall more vocal about political matters the world faces. President Macron holds nothing back when attending international meetings and addressing issues he believes plague the world, particularly climate change and pollution. In an interview after Trump’s withdrawal, President Macron even stated, “I think the withdrawal, to be totally fair with you, created a huge momentum for me to create a counter-momentum,” (Glor, 2017). President Macron has expressed that he will not let Trump’s decision impact his desires to help the world reduce its greenhouse gas emissions. President Macron sincerely followed up and acted on his

words of a counter-move by recruiting American climate change scientists to France in order to work on climate change research and technology (Mufson, 2017). An action clearly demonstrating how President Macron truly did not let the decision of one man stop what he, and others around the world, determined needs attention and actions to fix.

Germany and its Chancellor Angela Merkel also pose as a potential leader of Europe and the world, but recently her leverage has diminished after other members of her party lost in the September 2017 elections (Noack & McAuley, 2018). This does not mean Germany will become passive or take a back seat in world politics, but instead may not be as aggressive of a leader.

Perhaps the country with the biggest potential to step up is not European, but Asian: China. China has experienced amazing growth since the 1950s after the founding of the People's Republic of China (Tomas Hirst, 2015). China is no longer the isolationist nation they once were, and have begun to create technologies comparable to other Western countries. For example, China just began testing a section of highway fitted with solar panels in the highway itself (Bradsher, 2018). This technology could be revolutionary if testing is successful and the solar panels are fully developed. The solar panel highways would be a revolutionary clean energy source that can be easily integrated into everyday infrastructure as it does not take up space or create a hindrance to a view. Additionally, solar highways could be just the starting point for China. Other innovative renewable energy sources or green technology could stem from the solar highways, allowing for China to emerge as a world leader in alternative sources of energy.

President Trump's moniker "America first," will not be synonymous with "world leader" if the United States continues on this path. A leader is someone who does not say how it is done, but instead sets an example for others to follow; a leading country does the same. The lack of focus on green technology from the U.S. plays a part in the alteration of the position of world

leadership and recent actions perhaps hints at who will potentially fill the void (Pencea & Bâlgar, 2016). Those countries who set global policy and evolve and invent clean technology will be leading the world forward, and in turn, will make themselves an overall leader of the world.

### **International (Trade) Relations**

Since the U.S. remains the only country to have officially rejected the Paris Climate Agreement, relations with other countries hold the potential to deteriorate. As a result, there could be negative impacts on trade relations between the United States and other countries; particularly relations with European countries who strongly support the Paris Climate Agreement. France for example, whose President Macron advocates heavily for climate control, and played a crucial role in championing and constructing the Accord. President Macron expressed his displeasure with President Trump's decision, and many other countries have conveyed similar feelings. After all, a top contributor of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions seems to be isolating itself and trying to ignore its involvement in climate change; not the best way to keep in good standing with other countries.

Perhaps if the United States barely contributed to the destruction of the ozone layer and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the atmosphere, the withdrawal wouldn't have the possibility to raise tensions among the United States and other countries. Yet, one-third of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions come from the United States, making it the second highest contributor behind China; who continues to move forward with the Agreement and renewable energy initiatives (Schipani et al, 2018). The United States heavily contributing to the emissions of greenhouse gases, but not wanting to take responsibility for it, is a factor for decreasing relations with other countries. It's as if the United States is a child who cannot admit that they did something wrong, and instead of trying to fix it, they avoid the problem and hope no one else notices. Well in this case, the other world leaders

noticed, and they may not simply let the United States continue to act as if they did not play a part in what has and is happening to Earth's climate.

Despite the other world leaders and countries disagreeing with President Trump's decision to leave the Agreement, they cannot easily punish the United States. Countries can rarely enforce accords and treaties with laws or force, but instead, they can utilize sanctions and tariffs; a tactic which focuses on hurting companies and individuals in a country, ultimately hurting the whole country. A tactic which other countries did not employ immediately after the discontinuation of the U.S.'s participation in the Paris Climate Agreement, but instead escalated tensions with other countries; possibly leading to dire consequences in the future.

What makes tariffs and trade wars a threat to the United States economy and economic wellbeing? The problem lies in that when a country imposes tariffs on another, it makes foreign products more expensive for consumers in the country to which they are being exported (Varathan & Guilford, 2018). In turn, this makes those foreign markets more difficult to capture, since it is more difficult to be competitively priced in the foreign market, i.e. having a higher price, but not being remarkably better than similar non-foreign products, limits the success of a product with (higher) tariffs on it. Perhaps back in the early 1900s when trade between countries was more limited and globalization was not a key economic driver, there would be no problem with a product being limited to a market or two. After all, that one product was probably the only one of its kind in the market. However, markets across the globe have become occupied by both domestic and foreign products, and it's no longer effortless to capture a market and succeed.

The United States would not be the only country where companies and individuals would feel the impacts of tariffs; just as U.S. exports would receive tariffs in other countries, foreign exports to the U.S. would as well. Overall, multiple economies could experience some

consequences from a trade war as their exports become less desirable in certain foreign markets; the U.S. would not exclusively take a hit.

History has shown how damaging a trade war can be. Some economists argue that the Great Depression was made worse by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930; an act which began a trade war between the United States and other countries. The tariffs hurt not only the United States, but others countries such as Canada, France, and England. In order to see if such arguments had basis, Crucini and Kahn (1996) conducted research and ran models which allowed them to conclude that tariffs did have an impact on the Great Depression, but limited in magnitude compared to the other factors in play. Despite the research, the model indicated that taken alone, the magnitude of tariffs imposed on certain American exports could induce a recession.

While any countries involved in trade wars would experience an impact on their economies, the United States could have a bigger disadvantage: other countries creating new deals with each other. In 2017, Japan and the European Union made a trade deal after the United States failed to work with Japan to create one with the U.S.; an arrangement which involves 40% of global trade and 30% of the global economy (Swanson, 2017). The European Union benefited from President Trump not being able to work with Japan to create a trade agreement, and it's an indication that countries will move forward without the United States. Hence, while those country's businesses (those affected by the tariffs) might experience less market share in the American market, they still have other global markets to target. A trade war has more potential to hurt the United States' economy than other countries involved if the U.S. continues to isolate itself while the other countries continue to strengthen their ties to each other.

The most inauspicious part about any trade war(s), and failing relations with other countries, is that they can involve countries who often can be considered “allies” or “friends.” In such an interconnected world, one country cannot thrive in isolation. Other world leaders have recognized the U.S. separating itself from its allies. In 2018, French Finance Minister Bruno Le Maire expressed such simply with, “What this G7 Summit is going to show is that the United States are alone against everyone and especially alone against their allies.” (Ljunggren & Rampton, 2018). As Minister Bruno Le Maire stated, the U.S. has begun to be seen as a lone wolf, and as trade tensions have begun to intensify, the U.S. could further worsen its relations with other countries; possibly affecting more than just exports and imports.

### **Innovation**

According to Atkinson (2014), “Nations around the world are establishing national innovation strategies, restructuring their tax and regulatory systems to become more competitive, expanding support for science and technology..., and taking myriad other pro-innovation steps.” The reason other countries have begun to take “pro-innovation steps” stems from the fact that the world has become globalized; giving rise to competition now stemming from all corners of the globe. As Atkinson expressed, the heightened importance of innovation requires their creators (companies or individuals) to receive support from the government in order for the innovations to possess higher chances of succeeding. Certain countries certainly do more for supporting innovation than others and thus allow both their citizens and country to thrive and develop. How dangerous is it then for the future of countries whose governments are not supportive of innovations?

Many countries and people around the world believe that green technology is the future: “With the growing public concern over environmental issues, how “green” a product is has

become a meaningful and relevant issue for consumers at both retail and corporate levels.”

(Wong, 2012) Those who are able to create products which capitalize on the demand for “greener,” will be the ones who capture markets and flourish. While those who remain stagnant and aimlessly continue to design the same products will be added to the list of companies that once were. Therein lies the problem for American companies now, because how will they be competitive if their country’s leader has expressed disinterest in climate change prevention? Many American companies are already developing green technologies, and they will not likely cease such activities, but how much harder does it become to keep up or surpass companies from countries that receive more support for innovation from their governments? Or sometimes even more regulations from their government, forcing them to become more environmentally friendly; indirectly forcing them to develop the next innovative break through? President Trump’s decision does not completely cease innovation and the development of green technology, but instead hinders the ability for American companies/individuals to be cutting edge and competitive in doing so as compared to foreigner entities.

Companies do help create new innovations, but perhaps the most crucial people for developing renewable energy technology and other developments regarding climate change are scientists. They solve problems and create solutions, but require significant funding and support in order to execute their ideas and research. Before the official withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Climate Agreement, President Trump had been discussing reducing the federal science budgets; spreading concern about the future of different science organizations and their work. Then came withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement, which furthered concerns scientists had about their research and futures. French President Macron seized on this

uncertainty by making a bold move to recruit scientists working on climate change research in the United States, to France.

President Macron, after President Trump's announcement to withdraw, delivered a message via his social media accounts to tell (American) scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs that France can be a "second homeland" for them. A homeland where they can come work to help make the "planet great again" with the help of research money; something exceedingly worrying American scientists after talks of decreased budgets and continuous rejections for grants (Mufson, 2017). Almost 2,000 people applied—a majority from the United States—with 18 receiving research grants worth \$70 million dollars for up to five years. Others became candidates for long-term climate change projects in France. More grants will be awarded in the future from both France and Germany; another move indicating world leadership and cooperation among other countries.

Although the numbers may appear small, President Macron's gesture and how American scientists responded, matters more than the total amount of applicants or those granted the money/positions. President Macron, contrary to President Trump, embraced scientists and those working on researching climate change; a message firmly delivered with his "recruitment program." In a time when American scientists pursuing climate related solutions essentially learned their president did not care about their work and feared elimination of funding for it, they received an opportunity to be welcomed and have guaranteed money for their research (Mufson, 2017). France and President Macron gained a reputation for being supportive of climate change scientists and researchers through this initiative. While some of the scientists recruited will still work partially in the United States, France created a more positive image for themselves compared to the United States in supporting scientists and their research. If anyone can choose

between a country which embraces their work, and one that does not, they are more likely to go to the welcoming county. A potential problem, because innovations and solutions to problems come from entrepreneurs and scientists who are highly skilled human capital. If they all move abroad, that can be detrimental to a country and its economy.

Countries desire for their human capital-such as scientists-to be highly skilled, because as Matovac, Bilas, and Franc explained, “Human capital is considered to be a crucial input for the development of new technologies and a necessary factor for their adoption and efficient use”, and thus, “Human capital is considered to be an important factor of economic growth and development, as well as one of the sources of competitive advantage” (2010). No human has more worth than other, but those who have better education and more skills do help an economy progress. History has shown that once societies develop to where the basic survival tasks are met, people can and will further their knowledge and other skills; that’s when inventions and discoveries are made to better the lives of society as a whole.

In order to discover new ways of completing a task, solving a problem, and inventing new technology, it’s an obligation to have people who can spend their time learning and using that knowledge. Therefore, in today’s world, necessary measures to ensure a good education system and support those who want to use their skills to the maximum must be taken; particularly by governments who control the education system and who can fund scientists and innovators. Matovac et al. (2010) stressed the importance of how governments who want their countries to succeed and develop will, “...create an environment favorable for human capital creation that will, in return, benefit both the country as a whole, and individuals. Otherwise, individuals will seek better opportunities elsewhere.” What can be said about the U.S. government and the country’s future as its citizens have begun to move elsewhere in order to

find “better opportunities?” The latest move of President Macron drawing scientists to France demonstrates that the U.S. government may have failed to create a country where individuals can be developed, be embraced, and help the country as a whole.

The United States has definitely received a high number of “better opportunity” seekers from other countries over the decades. Yet, as the education system begins to lag behind other countries and the government expresses less support for facts and scientific matters, will there be a “favorable environment” for innovators, scientists, and citizens in the future? President Trump’s recent actions of wanting to decrease funding for different scientific organizations and withdrawing from the Agreement expresses his lack of interest in the world’s most pressing issue and does not create high hopes for the immediate future regarding innovation and scientific research. Americans are now the ones leaving their home country for better opportunities available in other countries, and although the United States might have been a hub of innovation throughout its recent history, perhaps that era has begun to reach its conclusion.

### **Economic Development**

Economic development can be summed up as being the enhancement of the lives of citizens or the improvement of living standards in a country. Some standard economic development goals as outlined by the United Nations “Millennium Development Goals” of 2000 revolve around reducing poverty, having or improving education systems, more equality for all citizens, increased population health, and more international collaboration on overall world economic development (Todaro & Smith, 2012, pg. 24). The United Nation’s goals outline how a country can measure improvements in its standard of living and understand what issues they need to address in order to achieve economic development. A good position in world leadership, solid relations with other countries, and a high level of innovation are some characteristics a

country can possess in order to encourage economic development and help meet certain “Millennium Development Goals” of the United Nations. President Trump’s withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement has potentially endangered those individual characteristics of the United States, and thus risked the future economic development of the country.

World leadership position would not hurt the economic development of the U.S. directly, because it’s not an official standing, but a general consensus among countries as to who is leading the world forward. “World leadership” does not appear as a necessity for economic sustainability as identified by the United Nations. However, losing prominence in global decision making, and being minimized in the same could have significant indirect consequences. Ramifications of the withdrawal could have serious impact on U.S. economic development; if you’re not at the table making decisions your country will be left behind in technology, employment, and other economic indicators of success.

Prospective abysmal (trade) relations with other countries does not mean trade will cease between the U.S. and other countries, but more difficulties and limitations could arise. For example, President Trump’s recent actions to place tariffs targeting certain industries or products, and subsequent retaliation on certain goods from impacted countries have set the stage for escalation in trade tensions (Varathan & Guilford, 2018). If the escalation in tariffs continues, green technology or more environmentally friendly products will come under attack; negatively impacting the economic development and environmental sustainability of the country. Case in point is the tariff President Trump recently levied on imported solar panels, and despite his belief it would benefit the country, some argue otherwise. The Solar Energy Industries Association suspects that up to 260,000 American employees could lose their jobs, because the tariff has made solar panels more expensive and hence, less desirable (Lynch, 2018). If President

Trump imposes more tariffs on similar foreign renewable energy goods or green technology, more Americans are at risk of losing their jobs, and thus the U.S. adoption of alternative energy solutions will slow down as costs to adopt increase. A situation which would not help in reducing unemployment, poverty, or pollution levels; all of which would show how a country such as the U.S. would continue to develop.

The United Nations, as part of their Millennium Development Goals, outlined the importance of global partnerships for a country's economic development (Todaro & Smith, 2012, pg. 25). Thus, as problems are created together (greenhouse gases for instance), they can only be solved by working together. The Paris Climate Agreement exists as an example of recognizing the importance of collaboration in solving world problems. The United States, as previously mentioned, has become more isolated from allies and the rest of the world due to actions by the Trump Administration. Actions which demonstrate disregard for many issues the rest of the world is trying to solve. Since collaboration is viewed as essential for economic development, and the United States appears to be rejecting that fact, what happens to the U.S.? Collaboration offers a chance for a problem to be solved collectively, so that no one shares the burden alone and the best efforts can be made for all. If the U.S. stays on the sidelines, the U.S. could face a bigger burden battling climate issues alone in the future while other countries work and benefit together.

Innovation has a role in economic development, perhaps more than any other characteristic. Not only has it become critical for competitive edge, but it is the only way to create solutions to problems that plague a country including unemployment, poverty, and pollution. Stosic and Milutinovic (2014) argued, "Nowadays, it is clear that for economic development and for the accompanying environmental improvements, innovation becomes a

necessity, especially eco-innovation.” Supporting and encouraging (eco) innovation can lead to more environmentally friendly products/services, job creation, lower levels of poverty, solutions to world problems such as climate change, decreased levels of pollution, and increases in citizens’ health. Those outcomes would satisfy multiple goals of the U.N.’s “Millennium Development Goals,” and show improvements in the living standards of a country. Eco-innovation, and innovation in general, not only allow companies to be competitive, but also help with improving the environment and economic development in a country.

In a time where blue-collar workers may lose their job to a machine or obsolescence of the company they work for, pursuing eco-innovation could offer a solution: job creation (Saliba, 2016). Pursuing green technology, and expanding its presence in the economy, offers an opportunity for workers to move to an emerging and growing job sector. One where they would not have to be as weary about losing their job to a machine or company obsolescence. Workers would need assistance to make the transition and require new training, but creating these emerging, possibly more stable jobs would be more beneficial in the long-run. Instead of unemployment and poverty increasing as job sectors die out or become fully automated, they could instead decrease and improve the living standards of the U.S as more Americans would be able to have secure jobs and potentially move above the poverty line.

A corollary effect result of moving to a greener and more environmentally friendly economy is improvement in citizens’ health levels. Lower levels of pollutants in the air and water improve the health of citizens, and for countries who have governments that pay for healthcare, better health of the citizens’ translates to cost savings. Governments could then redirect money towards education or infrastructure; further advancing the well-being of their country. The World Health Organization estimates that European economies lose \$1.6 trillion

USD a year because of diseases and deaths caused by air pollution; 10% of the European Union's GDP as of 2013 (Saliba, 2016). Trillions of dollars a year being spent on healthcare problems man created, and yet, President Trump argued going green would be what costs the U.S. trillions of dollars in GDP. All countries, including the United States, will have to spend more in the future on healthcare if pollution levels continue to escalate, and thus, increase the amount of money governments would have to pay due to more pollution related sicknesses and deaths. Undoubtedly, unregulated pollution does not help a country to be environmentally friendly or economically develop.

The amount of economic development a country experiences does not depend solely on world leadership position, (trade) relations, or innovation, but they do affect some factors that are crucial to economic development: poverty, unemployment, pollution, and overall population health levels. Hence why they are important to analyze when researching how President Trump withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement could affect the economic development of the United States. Particularly with innovation, and how it can play a key role in positively affecting multiple goals of economic development as outlined by the U.N. There's a cause and effect relationship at play, and the effect of President Trump's "cause" may have potentially risked the economic development in the United States.

### **Conclusion**

The future of the United States faces more potential challenges than before President Trump's withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement. Looking at world leadership position, (trade) relations with other countries, innovation capacity, and economic development does not predict the future of the U.S., but conveys plausible outcomes. This research and analysis paints

a more negative picture for the future, and in light of current world events, some of those potential future negative scenarios are presently looming.

Former President Obama expressed how the U.S. would have benefited from the Paris Climate Agreement, when he commented: “The nations that remain in the Paris Agreement will be the nations that reap the benefits in jobs and industries created,” (“Trump U.S.,” 2017). Now that the U.S. has left the Agreement, driving different consequences, what was said by President Obama could become reality. For example, highly skilled human capital is being lost to other countries, innovation and job creation could slow down, poverty and unemployment could increase, pollution will continue to rise if not regulated, and economic development of the U.S. is at risk of stagnating. A downward spiral for the country could have been started by President Trump’s termination of U.S. participation in the Paris Climate Agreement and subsequent actions.

All hope is not lost for the United States and climate change, because while President Trump may have withdrawn the U.S. from the Paris Climate Agreement, U.S. states, cities, businesses, and universities have independently pledged their support to the Paris Climate Agreement, and/or signed similar agreements promising advancing environmental standards. Recently states have begun to pass bills and policies to help reduce pollution and encourage green innovation. The states and other entities involved in the movement desire to continue working towards mitigating global warming effects and achieve the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement. (De Leon & Ranker, 2018) While it is meaningful that the whole country has not idly accepted President Trump’s decision, the actions of the states and universities are scattershot, and cannot compensate for whole country participation. Only so much can be done

by states, universities, and individuals when the federal government has encouraged a different mindset and response to both climate change and the Paris Climate Agreement.

While President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement may not seem important when the rest of the world has continued in support, as Begum and Egemen Sertyesilisik (2017) argued, "Politicians can encourage green economy and green growth mainly through: their commitment." President Trump sent a message that he does not believe controlling pollution levels and pursuing green technology is important when he rejected the Accord and did not make any moves to create a different agreement. Which gives reason as to why the decision matters; because it's discouraging the development of green technology and the possibility of moving forward to a green economy for the U.S.; a type of economy that would be more competitive and sustainable in the future. As a politician and president of a developed country, President Trump's decisions influence people and can sway them to think a certain way; such as climate change not being a problem. One would hope the importance of greenhouse gas emissions reduction has become recognized to a point where the U.S. will continue to innovate and work towards a cleaner future, but nothing can be guaranteed.

While this research indicates potential consequences for the United States, the withdrawal is relatively recent; it will take time to see what really happens. The future can be analyzed based on current and past events, but theory and reality can greatly vary. This paper should serve as a precaution to what could happen down the road for the United States, and leave room for further research on this significant and important topic.

## References

- Atkinson, R. (2014). ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A GLOBAL, INNOVATION-BASED ECONOMY. *PM.Public Management*, 96(10), 7-10.
- Blau J. (2017) The Long, Long Road to Paris. In: The Paris Agreement. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham
- Bradsher, K. (2018). Free Power From Freeways? China Is Testing Roads Paved With Solar Panels
- Crucini, M. J., & Kahn, J. (1996). Tariffs and aggregate economic activity: Lessons from the great depression. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 38(3), 427-467
- De Leon, K., & Ranker, K. (2018). A year after Trump exited the Paris Climate Accord, Here's how states are going even further. *CNBC*.
- Friedman, L. (2017). Syria joins Paris climate accord, leaving only the U.S. opposed: Science desk. *New York Times*
- Glor, J. (2017). *Emmanuel macron says it was aggressive for U.S. to decide to leave Paris climate accord*. New York: CQ Roll Call.
- Hargroves, K., & Smith, M. H. (2005). The natural advantage of nations: Business opportunities, innovation, and governance in the 21st century. London; Sterling, VA;: Earthscan.
- Hirst, T. (2015). A brief history of China's economic growth. *World Economic Forum*.
- Ljunggren, D., & Rampton, R. (2018). Trade war turns Canada's G7 summit into six-plus-Trump.
- Lynch, D. (2018). Trump imposes tariffs on solar panels and washing machines in first major trade action of 2018.

- Matovac, V. A., PhD. Bilas, V., PhD. & Franc, S., univ spec oec. (2010). UNDERSTANDING THE IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND LABOR MARKET COMPETITIVENESS IN THE EU CANDIDATE COUNTRIES AND SELECTED EU MEMBERS. *Ekonomiska Misao i Praksa*, 19(2), 359-382.
- Mufson, S. (2017). *Promising to 'Make our planet great again,' Macron lures 13 U.S. climate scientists to France*. Washington: WP Company LLC d/b/a The Washington Post
- Noack, R., & McAuley, J. (2018). *France's Macron visits China to talk fairer trade and the future*. Washington: WP Company LLC d/b/a The Washington Post.
- Pencea, S., & Bâlgar, A. (2016). China's transition to the innovation-driven economy: Stepping stones and road-blocks. *Global Economic Observer*, 4(1), 31-46
- Saliba P. (2017) Sustainable Economic Development: Green Economy and Green Growth. Analysing Economic Growth and Identifying Sensible Measures Addressing Socio and Environmental Concerns Whilst Promoting Green Growth.
- Schipani, V., Kiely, E., Robertson, L., & Farley, R. (2018). Fact-checking Trump's speech on Paris climate agreement.
- Sertyesilisik B., Sertyesilisik E. (2017) Ways of Fostering Green Economy and Green Growth. In: Leal Filho W., Pociovalisteanu DM., Al-Amin A. (eds) Sustainable Economic Development. World Sustainability Series. Springer, Cham
- Stosic, B., & Milutinovic, R. (2014). ECO-INNOVATION INFLUENCE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. Paper presented at the 268-275
- Swanson, A. (2017, Jul 07). Japan, European Union strike global trade deal. *Orlando Sentinel*
- Todaro, M., & Smith, S. (2012). Economic Development (11th ed., pp. 23-25). Boston: Pearson.
- Trump: U.S. will exit Paris climate accord. (2017, Jun 02). *Environment News Service*

Varathan, P., & Guilford, G. (2018). Higher prices, layoffs, and economic nosedives: What Trump's trade war could mean for you. *Quartz*.

Wong, S. K. (2012). The influence of green product competitiveness on the success of green product innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 15(4), 468-490.

**Research Bibliography #1**

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Citation:</b><br/>         Atkinson, R. (2014). ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A GLOBAL, INNOVATION-BASED ECONOMY. <i>PM.Public Management</i>, 96(10), 7-10.</p>  |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b> This source looks at economic development and how it has changed over the years and what that means for the present and future. It talks about how one cause for the change of economic development is more competition, and that the U.S. in particular faces more than before. Addresses how innovation can be the new advantage, and thus, the way to develop economically has changed. Those are all points that the paper is looking at and give evidence for.</p>  |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>         The U.S. faces more competition than before because of globalization, and price is no longer what competition is based on. A competitive advantage instead comes from innovation, and that will drive economic development more than before; therefore, it's important to drive innovation and entrepreneurship in the country or companies.</p>  |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The U.S. faces more competition than before, and slower economic development might be a consequence of such.</li> <li>❖ Companies can no longer compete on prices; especially U.S. companies that are already at a disadvantage compared to countries with cheaper labor.</li> <li>❖ Innovation has become the new competitive advantage, and companies/U.S. need to adjust to that change.</li> <li>❖ Washington (D.C) has to do its part too, states and individuals/companies cannot do everything to create a more favorable environment for innovation.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>“As a February 2012 Washington Post article noted, "Europe, as well as Asia and Latin America, is offering ever stronger competition to the United States, even in its strongest sectors, such as Internet technology, aerospace, and pharmaceuticals.”</p> <p>“As the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation has detailed in its report "Fifty Ways to Leave Your Competitiveness Woes Behind: A National Trade Sector Competitiveness Strategy," Washington can and should enact an array of policies so that the national economic development "tide" rises.”</p>                                       |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>“A major reason the "supply of economic development" has fallen is that the U.S. economy faces much more competition now.”</p>  |

“Now what matters are not just costs but factors like innovation, productivity, speed to market, and entrepreneurship.”

“This means that unless the federal government also acts and develops an effective national innovation and competitiveness strategy, all the state, regional, county, and city actions in the world will not be enough.”

**Strengths:**

- Author is credible.
- Concise, but informative.
- Gives background, and does not just jump into the main subject.
- Explains and gives examples of what it is being addressed.
- Does have sources to support points.

**Weaknesses:**

- Limited statistics.

**Connections:**

- ❖ Talks about the evolution of what companies compete on, and how important innovation has become. Mentioning that innovation has become the new competitive edge in the paper.
- ❖ Addresses economic development and what might be something hindering it in the U.S. Paper looks at both innovation and economic development to see if they connect/have a cause-effect relationship.
- ❖ Admits the federal government has to be involved, and that smaller entities cannot do it alone. Paper is focusing on how the decision of a president can alter what happens in the country.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ How much does innovation affect economic development?
- ❖ Will there be support for an argument that President Trump’s decision did affect the innovation level of the country?

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Blau J. (2017) The Long, Long Road to Paris. In: The Paris Agreement. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham</p>  |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b><br/>         Gives background information to what the Paris Climate Agreement is: the dates of it, history of how it came to be, what it is and the expectations, and the countries involved. Also gives the history of other agreements prior and how the Paris Climate Agreement was built off of some of their ideas. In order to understand the current agreement, some history of the more important past agreements need to be understood; especially ones that the Paris Climate Agreement builds off of.</p>   |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>         The article is informative and outlines the build up to the Paris Climate Agreement and what the countries involve want to happen in terms of helping to reduce climate change. What tasks should be undertaken and how the rising temperature of the earth needs to be reduced.</p>  |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Keep the temperature from rising above pre-industrial levels by 1.5-degree C.</li> <li>❖ Became a treaty on November 4 2016.</li> <li>❖ Developed countries help those developing with their renewable energy, and to help people who are more susceptible to the effects of climate change.</li> <li>❖ Countries are to report on their emissions and what they are doing to help limit the increase in the temperature.</li> <li>❖ Trump’s future with it, “country leaders as well as people themselves will turn against the United States if America backtracks.”</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>“Beginning in the late nineteenth century, scientists contended that emissions of greenhouse gases (water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone) could change the climate.”</p> <p>“Yet the global momentum was astonishing. States continued to ratify the Paris Agreement, even after October 5 when the requisite 55 were on board, exceeding the required number of ratifiers.”</p>   |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>Differentiated responsibilities–developed countries have to aid developing countries with their development of renewable energy/green technology.</p> <p>“A tension that pervaded these talks was that poor countries justifiability contended that they were the victims of CO2 emissions for nearly two centuries as rich countries</p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>industrialized and extracted and burned fossil fuels, but now were told that they needed to make expensive investments in wind, solar, and tidal, and nuclear power.”</p> <p>“-country leaders as well as people themselves will turn against the United States if America backtracks.”</p> <p>“There is, of course, apprehension around the world about what Donald Trump’s presidency will mean for US policies and practices regarding climate change, reliance on fossil fuel, and development of technologies that enhance renewable energy.”</p> |   |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informative</li> <li>• Not biased</li> <li>• Background of previous agreements and conferences.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a lot of statistics</li> <li>• Not too in depth</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Gives background information on the subject.</li> <li>❖ Outlines what the agreement is and what the goals of it are and the duties for countries involved.</li> <li>❖ Talks about the U.S. decision making process and entry into it.</li> <li>❖ Mentions President Trump’s possible decision and consequences in regards to relations with other countries.</li> </ul>   |   |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ How are certain people more at risk, and by how much?</li> <li>❖ Will the leaders turn now that the U.S. has decided to leave the agreement?</li> </ul>  |   |

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Bradsher, K. (2018). Free Power From Freeways? China Is Testing Roads Paved With Solar Panels</p>   |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b> It gives evidence to what other countries are doing to fight climate change and pollution levels. China is one country which has become prevalent in world affairs, and contends for world leadership. Looking at how they are trying to go green with a specific example offers support that they are actually going green and not just saying they are.</p>  |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>China has developed solar panels on are part of highways, and is just one example of them stepping up their game as an innovator and proving they are going to work on becoming more environmentally friendly. The solar panel highways could be used anywhere, and off the benefit of not being an eye sore or taking up too much space. If successful, it would benefit China who has a rapidly increasing demand for energy.</p>  |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ China is in the midst of testing solar panel highways.</li> <li>❖ China has already been producing solar panels for the world, and this is just one step further in the innovation process.</li> <li>❖ The roads would be beneficial for electricity, but also offer other advantages such as electrical heating, road signals on the panels, and lower maintenance costs.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>If it can pass this test, it can fit all conditions,” said Li Wu, the chairman of Shandong Pavenergy, the company that made the plastic-covered solar panels that carpet the road.</p>   |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>“Roads must be resurfaced every few years at great cost, so the installation of durable solar panels could reduce the price of maintenance.”</p> <p>“The experiment is the latest sign of China’s desire to innovate in, and dominate, the increasingly lucrative and strategically important market for renewable energy.”</p> <p>“Now, such roads are finally becoming viable. Prices have fallen drastically in recent years — thanks in large part to soaring Chinese production, a solar panel costs a tenth of what it did a decade ago.”</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informative and not biased.</li> <li>• Gives an example of China’s recent renewable energy development.</li> <li>• Talks about the importance of the innovation.</li> <li>• Mentions the amount of renewable energy products China now works on or supplies to the rest of the world.</li> <li>• Mentions what other countries have also done or attempted.</li> <li>• Addresses how the solar panels on a highway/road would work and the differences between them and regular asphalt.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not scholarly.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The paper will look at what other countries have done to try and promote renewable energy or green technology to try and uphold the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement. This article gives the example of China, who can be considered a contender for world leadership.</li> <li>❖ The article also briefly mentions some innovations other countries have been implementing or attempting. Other countries besides China are involved in the Paris Climate Agreement, and it’s important to see that they are also working on going green.</li> <li>❖ There are always some drawbacks of renewable energy technology, most often people say they’re an eyesore or take up too much space. The article addresses such and talks about how the solar panel highways do not have those disadvantages, and that’s a possible point to highlight in the paper when talking about how the highway solar panels are better than traditional solar panels.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ What other renewable energy technologies has China developed or working on?</li> <li>❖ Focus on France recruiting scientists or innovations?</li> </ul>  |  |

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Crucini, M. J., &amp; Kahn, J. (1996). Tariffs and aggregate economic activity: Lessons from the great depression. <i>Journal of Monetary Economics</i>, 38(3), 427-467</p>   |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b><br/>         In the paper I talk about tariffs and how they can be detrimental to a country’s economy, and as historical proof, the Great Depression and the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act are a perfect example. This paper gives evidence for that fact, and also states what could happen in a modern day setting if those tariffs were enacted again. With the potential for trade wars, and addressing them in the paper, it’s important to have support that the tariffs would not be meaningless or hold no consequences in the future.</p> |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>         The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act did have an impact on the Great Depression and U.S. economy. In comparison to the Great Depression, the tariffs were limited in magnitude; however, they alone could be detrimental to international trade and economies involved.</p>  |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act impacted the Great Depression to a small degree when comparing the magnitude of impact, but similar tariffs could induce a recession themselves outside of the Great Depression.</li> <li>❖ Can tariffs be independently identified from other factors that might have influenced the Great Depression: bank system collapse, crop failure, rapid deflation?</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>“Although these last results suggest that tariffs account for less than 10 percent of Great Depression output variation, the impacts are small only in relation to the magnitude of that episode.”</p> <p>“The tariff increases were sufficiently persistent to generate capital decumulation. The tariff increases were themselves remarkable with average rates on dutiable imports in the U.S. rising from about 40 percent in the 1920s to about 60 percent in the early 1930s. Incorporating.”</p>  |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>“To put these results in perspective, suppose we had ignored our tariff measures and increased tariff levels in the model until we produced the 50 percent real decline observed in U.S. exports from 1929 to 1933. Our model would be capable of explaining one-third of the real decline in output over this period! “</p>  |

“Although the effects of the tariffs in the simulations appear small relative to the magnitude of the fluctuations experienced during the Great Depression, had such tariffs been introduced in any other time period they could have brought about a recession all by themselves (as indeed they may have in 1920-21).”

“However, other countries did not experience the magnitude of financial and other disturbances that the U.S. faced so their depressions would be less severe on this account.”

**Strengths:**

- Gives the history behind the act and what it leads to in terms of country tensions and increased tariffs.
- Research paper with models that can supported their findings.
- Considered other factors besides tariffs, and adjusted the models.

**Weaknesses:**

- Not the latest research.

**Connections:**

- ❖ I am looking at how tariffs could be damaging to the U.S., and it’s important to have an example of how hurtful tariffs can be on a country. The model and research done in the paper gives evidence for the argument that tariffs can be hurtful to an economy.
- ❖ The research shows that the tariffs had an impact worldwide, but each country was affected differently. Part of my paper addresses how the U.S. would not be the only country impacted by President Trump’s tariffs, and the paper mentions how other countries reacted and their own consequences.
- ❖ The model explores the effects of different kinds of goods and tariffs. I don’t think I’ll go that far with the tariff section, but I could mention how tariffs on certain goods or their duration could hurt the economy.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ If President Trump does continue to increase/add tariffs, will they possibly reach the level that could induce a recession alone?
- ❖ Would the situation be similar, when the U.S. has possibly isolated itself a bit more?

### Research Bibliography #5

---

**Citation:** De Leon, K., & Ranker, K. (2018). A year after Trump exited the Paris Climate Accord, Here's how states are going even further. *CNBC*

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

President Trump may have withdrawn the U.S. from the Paris Climate Agreement, but the whole country has not readily accepted his decision and multiple entities are doing their own part. The paper overall talks about how there are negative consequences for the U.S., but it's important to identify that they can be lessened by states, universities, and businesses pledging to the Paris Climate Agreement or similar ones themselves. The two senators' discussion points out the efforts taken by those entities, and it adds hope to the discussion about how the U.S. could experience more problems in the future thanks to President Trump's decision.

**Main argument:**

While President Trump removed the U.S. as a whole from the Paris Climate Agreement, states, universities, and cities have not idly sat by and accepted his date views on climate change being a hoax. They believe action has to be taken, so they themselves have created legislation/bills, set targets, and made moves to work on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and encouraging renewable energy.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ President Trump's decision to leave the Paris Climate Agreement and denounce climate change is viewed by numerous individuals and entities as a poor decision. Thus, states are still working to pass legislation that focuses on protecting the environment and reducing the impact of climate change.
- ❖ States have not only planned to battle climate change, but live in its effects since they realize that their future will entail a different environment.
- ❖ States and the other entities are determined to not let the U.S. fall behind everyone else even if the president thinks his decision benefits the country instead.

**Evidence:**

“This short-sighted decision was opposed by more than 550 state legislators from 45 states with a total population of over 298 million constituents.”

“At least eight states have introduced legislation to reach 100 percent renewable energy in the coming decades. Washington was one of these states to introduce a 100 percent renewable energy bill, mandating an ambitious goal that all of the state's electricity be generated carbon free by 2045.”

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

“Although the President has declared climate change a hoax and isolated America as the only federal government in the world not to embrace the Paris Agreement, states throughout the country continue to lead the way on climate.”

“States have taken action not only to address climate change but to prepare for a future of an altered environment.”

“President Trump might have elected to drop out of the Paris Agreement, but a year later, state legislators across the country stand united for climate action.”

**Strengths:**

- Commentary from two state senators who can accurately tell what their states have been doing in response to President Trump’s decision.
- Highlights what states have been doing specifically; mentions goals and timelines.
- Gives numbers on who has opposed President Trump’s decision.

**Weaknesses:**

- Biased to a degree.

**Connections:**

Research has shown that the U.S. can experience multiple difficulties in the future because of President Trump’s decision, and while they are not guaranteed, evidence suggests they can. However, the whole country not succumbing to President Trump’s mindset on climate change and the agreement allows for a bit of hope to be present. Thus, it’s necessary to say what might happen, but how the effects could be mitigated by the actions of states, universities, and companies in the country.

- ❖ Other sources have mentioned how the federal government needs to be more active and supportive of innovation and human capital development. This article talks about lower government levels doing their part, and attempting to compensate for the federal government. To what degree can the state governments do that, but it’s better than them doing nothing.
- ❖ Eco-innovation contributes to economic development according to other sources, and in this article when states talk about their legislation, they mention how certain legislation will help create jobs and do more than just help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This article supports information other sources outlined.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ What have companies and universities been doing?
- ❖ Look at President Trump’s reaction to the states opposing him. Could they change his mind?

### Research Bibliography #6

---

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Friedman, L. (2017). Syria joins Paris climate accord, leaving only the U.S. opposed: Science desk. <i>New York Times</i></p>  |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b> One of the problems with President Trump withdrawing the U.S. from the accord is that the U.S. has become the only country to not be a part of it. This article gives information on how the U.S. became the only country, and what it could mean for the U.S.</p>  |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>Both Syria and Nicaragua have signed the Paris Climate Agreement, and despite the U.S. originally being in it, now stands as the sole country to not be a part of the agreement. Syria still has to submit its targets for greenhouse gas emissions, but has shown some commitment to helping control pollution. The U.S. remaining as the sole outsider makes some think the U.S. may consider, but no information has been given on whether the U.S. will reconsider.</p>   |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Syria was the last country who did not sign the treaty in the first place, but now has, and leaves the U.S. as the only country to reject the agreement.</li> <li>❖ President Trump quit the agreement because he argued it would be bad for the economy of the U.S.</li> <li>❖ Nicaragua did not originally join the agreement, because it thought it did not do enough to protect smaller countries and actually reduce carbon emissions. They did sign though after realizing it was the best they could agree to at the moment.</li> <li>❖ The U.S. has not shown any signs of reconsidering or stating what would make them do such.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>“This is the very last country that actually announced, so everyone has joined and the U.S. is now so isolated,” said Safa Al Jayoussi, executive director of IndyAct.”</p> <p>“The U.S.’s stark isolation should give Trump reason to reconsider his ill-advised announcement and join the rest of the world in tackling climate change.”-Paula Caballero</p>  |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>“The move, which comes on the heels of Nicaragua signing the accord last month, will leave the United States as the only country that has rejected the global pact.”</p> <p>“Syria has not yet submitted targets for cutting greenhouse gases. Syria produces only a tiny fraction of global emissions, but every country that is party to the accord, including poverty-stricken and war-torn nations and tiny islands, has produced a plan for cutting carbon output.”</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>“A White House spokeswoman, Kelly Love, pointed reporters to a statement the administration made when Nicaragua joined the pact, noting there had been no change in the United States’ position.”</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outlines the situation clearly.</li> <li>• No bias.</li> <li>• Trusted source.</li> <li>• Quotes/support from relevant world organization members.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not scholarly.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Part of the paper looks at U.S. relations with other countries, and this article gives evidence that not being a part of the accord places the U.S. as an outsider. It’s not concrete evidence for worsened relations, but hints at the possibility.</li> <li>❖ When looking at the decision made by President Trump, it’s important to see if he would reconsider. The research would change if there was a possibility of the U.S. rejoining, but this article shows that no real reconsideration is happening.</li> <li>❖ Nicaragua did not believe the agreement was enough, and President Trump thinks the agreement is too much. It’s a contrast that could be drawn on, to show how some believe more in climate change than others.</li> <li>❖ The main reason Syria took longer to join the agreement is due to the civil war and unrest plaguing their country, but they did end up joining the agreement. Whether they are able to actually work on reducing emissions remains to be seen, but a war torn country has committed before President Trump. A possible fact to express in the paper, since it’s another example of President Trump not doing as much as he could.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Any evidence pointing towards what would make the U.S. reconsider?</li> <li>❖ Does being the outsider affect President Trump’s future decisions?</li> </ul>  |  |

**Citation:** Glor, J. (2017). *Emmanuel Macron says it was aggressive for U.S. to decide to leave Paris Climate Accord*. New York: CQ Roll Call.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

This source is actually an interview with French President Macron shortly after President Trump announced the U.S. leaving the Paris Climate Agreement. In the interview President Macron gives his reaction to the statement, and tells what he plans to do in response. President Macron played a major part in the creation of the agreement, and seeing his reaction could tell whether the U.S. will see increased tensions France or any repercussions; an important fact when discussing relations with other countries and world leadership status.

**Main argument:**

This interview includes points beyond President Trump's announcement of the U.S. leaving the Paris Climate Agreement. However, the interviewer asks what effect that decision had on President Macron; he states it creates more incentive for other countries to do more. He also states discusses President Trump's decision regarding Jerusalem and that too goes against other international decisions.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ President Macron does not see President Trump's decision as brave, and "extremely aggressive."
- ❖ Instead of President Macron being negatively affected by President Trump's decision, he believes it has created a "counter-momentum" and will help other countries and the private sector do more.
- ❖ President Macron would be willing to let the U.S. back into the agreement, but will not spend all his time trying to figure out what the country wants in order to get the U.S. to rejoin.
- ❖ President Macron believes the U.S. decided for the U.S. and he decided for France, but the U.S. goes against what the international community had decided on.

**Evidence:**

Emmanuel Macron: "I think the withdrawal, to be totally fair with you, created a huge momentum to me to create a counter-momentum."

Emmanuel Macron: "So withdraw of the U.S., which for me is a mistake, that equates an impulse for a lot of others to say, "Okay, we have to react and do something because it's impossible to leave this all to a-- a sort of dismantling of the Paris Agreement."

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

Emmanuel Macron: "I-- I told him, I-- I thought it was-- it was a mistake, and that such a unilateral decision is not compliant with our international discussions and our international rules and will not facilitate a peace process."

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Emmanuel Macron: “The U.S. did sign the Paris Agreement. It's extremely aggressive to decide on its own just to leave and no way to push the others to renegotiate because one decided to leave the floor. I'm sorry to say that. It doesn't fly.”</p> <p>E.P: “I think the withdrawal, to be totally fair with you, created a huge momentum to me to create a counter-momentum.”</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An interview with one of the founders and champions of the Paris Climate Agreement.</li> <li>• President Macron gives his reasons and does not simply say how he feels about decisions made</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions were not open ended, but President Macron did give detailed responses.</li> <li>• A short interview</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ President Macron mentioned how a counter movement could have been created from President Trump’s decision, and it’s interesting to think of how the U.S. could have spurred more innovation or action by other countries. Since innovation is a factor being looked at, it’s an interesting point made by President Macron to mention how the U.S. could have accidentally placed a fire under other countries/companies to do more in terms of fighting pollution and climate change.</li> <li>❖ The paper looks at how tensions have increased between the U.S. and multiple countries because President Trump’s withdrawal decision, and this interview with a champion of the agreement expresses how he is not too happy with the decision and President Trump.</li> <li>❖ The interview addresses other decisions President Trump has made without consulting other countries, or ignoring previously made decisions. Once again, this plays into showing how the U.S. has isolated itself and increased tensions with other countries.</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Do other countries see President Trump’s decision as an opportunity to create a “counter-momentum?”</li> <li>❖ Does President Macron have any certain ideas in mind for his “counter-momentum?”</li> </ul>  |   |

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Hargroves, K., &amp; Smith, M. H. (2005). <i>The natural advantage of nations: Business opportunities, innovation, and governance in the 21st century.</i> London;Sterling, VA;: Earthscan.</p>   |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b><br/>         This book encompasses multiple aspects being discussed in the paper: competitive advantages over time, innovation, and the relationship between environmental sustainability importance and economic growth. The paper focuses on those topics, and the book offers a connection between them.</p>  |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>         The protection of the environment or environmental sustainability do not mean that the economy will suffer, or vice versa. However, there does not have to be a conflict of interests when trying to protect the environment and help the economy develop.</p>  |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Protecting the environment can lead to economic development and vice-versa.</li> <li>❖ Innovation has become more important for a company to have a competitive advantage, and that being green can be the innovative attribute.</li> <li>❖ Developed countries cannot achieve the living standards of developed Western countries without some help since old ways of economic development are not enough anymore.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>“Professor Michael Porter showed, in <i>The Competitive Advantage of Nations</i>, that globalization, the shortening timeframe of technical innovation and the rise of the multinational corporation mean the ability to innovate processes in advance one’s competitors is the key to increasing productivity gains and competitive advantage today.” (pg 14).</p> <p>“In addition, Porter and van der Linde demonstrated that firms can achieve further competitive advantage through great resource productivity, the eco-design of products (Reducing process costs) and the production of ‘clean’ and ‘green’ goods and services (product differentiation). (pg. 15).</p> |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>“Albert Weale in the publication <i>News Politics of Pollution</i> where Weale stated that “Instead of seeing environment protection as a burden upon the economy, the ecological modernist sees it as potential source of growth.” (pg 10)</p> <p>“This new paradigm is bringing environmental improvement and competitiveness together.” (pg. 11).</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>“Rather, they are those firms which constantly innovate to become the best in the world.” (pg. 14).</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A book which builds upon past research done by other economists.</li> <li>• Supports points made with examples or quotes from other credible sources</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The book is not the most recent</li> <li>• Certain chapters are not relevant to project</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ When talking about economic development and how it can be affected by President Trump’s recent decision to leave the Paris Climate Agreement, it’s important to consider the relationship between the two (economic development and environment protection). This book focuses on that connection, and offers evidence for the relationship not being a trade-off situation.</li> <li>❖ The book also focuses on how the competitive advantage of a company has changed, and now relies more on an innovative edge. In the innovation section, I might talk about how U.S. companies will be at a disadvantage if they are not able to compete on innovation.</li> <li>❖ When companies can focus on their going green as an innovative edge, both economic development and the environment benefit. This could be a potential angle to work with in the economic development section since I’ll be looking at tying innovation to it.</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Obtain <i>Competitive Advantage</i> by Michael Porter.</li> <li>❖ Another more recent source on environmental protection and economic development since this one is not the most recent.</li> </ul>  |   |



**Research Bibliography #9**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Hirst, T. (2015). A brief history of China’s economic growth. <i>World Economic Forum</i>.</p>   |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b><br/>         In the world leadership section of the paper, what countries could fill the void as the U.S. disappears from the top and China is a contender. This source outlines how China has been developing over the years since they opened up their borders and began interacting with the world. As the U.S. appears to be closing its border, this could show that China could replace the U.S. as they continue to grow and become more developed.</p>  |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>         China has experienced high growth over the past couple of decades since they loosened their isolationist policies. Part of it comes from the fact that they are playing catch up to other economics, but China can be expected to continue growing; potentially at a slower pace though.</p>   |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ China has grown over the past couple of decades because they opened their borders and allowed for themselves to be involved in global trade.</li> <li>❖ China’s high rate of growth partially comes from the fact that they are playing catch up to other countries; whereas other countries have reached a steady growth rate.</li> <li>❖ Since China has begun to reach a point where the factors that influenced the high growth rates are slowing down and decreasing, China will have to figure out other ways to create growth.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>According to the authors, the Third Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee of the Communist Party in December 1978 was the defining moment in shifting the country from its unsteady early economic trajectory on to a more sustainable path.</p> <p>While the average growth rate of real GDP between 1978-2012 has been an impressive 9.4%, that figure could decline to between 7-8% between 2012-2024 in the authors’ base case.</p>   |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>“China’s meteoric rise over the past half century is one of the most striking examples of the impact of opening an economy up to global markets.”</p> <p>“Also, the catch-up process that has delivered significant productivity growth in the country is also likely to slow as Chinese industry gets closer to the technological</p>   |

sophistication of its Western counterparts, while the initial gains of adding hundreds of millions of workers to the global labour supply are also quickly fading.”

Achieving this, however, will require further reforms to release Chinese consumers’ spending power and build the foundations of a more balanced economy.

**Strengths:**

- Informative and not argumentative.
- Uses reliable sources to support points made about China and its growth.

**Weaknesses:**

- Short article.
- Focuses mostly only policies changes and briefly mentions other factors that could be addressed with more depth.

**Connections:**

- ❖ When looking at China being a potential candidate, it’s necessary to see if they could do it. They are still developing, as pointed out by this article, so can they become a world leader if they are still at that stage. Since the article talks about them catching up to western countries, it’s possible that China could emerge as global leader.
- ❖ Another source addressed innovation in China and the technologies that they are developing, so when this article mentions how they’re getting closer to western country technological levels, it’s backing for China being more innovative and competitive. They have reached a point where their technology is not far behind the U.S.’s or other developed countries.
- ❖ The article mentions how China has experience economic growth partially because they began to open their border and interact with other countries. When looking at how the U.S. has begun to become an isolationist nation, China exists as an example of how that can be dangerous for a country. Being more involved in global trade allows for high growth, and the U.S. could be limiting their potential to experience economic growth.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ U.S. economy slowing down?
- ❖ China in a position to lead the world?



### Research Bibliography #10

---

**Citation:** Ljunggren, D., & Rampton, R. (2018). Trade war turns Canada's G7 summit into six-plus-Trump.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

One section of the paper focuses on (trade) relations with other countries and the U.S., in particular, how they have been affected by President Trump's decision to leave the Paris Climate Agreement. This article discusses how the G7 will show that the U.S. has become isolated and is not much of an ally anymore. An important fact to note when discussing U.S. relations with other countries possibly deteriorating.

**Main argument:**

The G7 could be more difficult and tension filled before as the U.S. and the other countries have had increased tensions thanks to recent tariffs enacted by President Trump. It's uncertain what the summit will entail, and it's possible for it to go south very quickly.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ The U.S. has begun to isolate itself from its allies thanks to recent decisions by President Trump.
- ❖ Some countries are more optimistic about the outcome of the G7 Summit and relations with the U.S. overall compared to others.
- ❖ They (the countries and officials involved) aren't even sure if the integrity of the summit itself can be upheld.
- ❖ The nuclear deal with Iran and meeting with North Korea are impacting the U.S.'s relations with other countries

**Evidence:**

"What this G7 is going to show is that the United States are alone against everyone and especially alone against their allies," French Finance Minister Bruno Le Maire told reporters on Friday before a meeting of his counterparts in British Columbia.

"Trump's disdain for diplomatic niceties and his "America first" policies have created a rift with countries whose alliance with the United States dates to the Cold War with the Soviet Union."

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

"Trump has infuriated Canada and European Union members of the G7 by imposing tariffs on steel and aluminum and pulling out of a deal to monitor Iran's nuclear activities."

“Is it more challenging this time than before? Yes, but everyone is showing up,” said the official, who requested anonymity given the sensitivity of the situation.”-Spokesman for Trudeau

“While the most likely scenario was that the leaders gloss over their differences, he added, “there is the real possibility of a more open rupture.”

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stays on point about the G7 Summit and how the U.S. and other countries feel about each other at the moment.</li> <li>• A recent article</li> <li>• Has quotes from multiple aids to governmental officials</li> </ul> | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

**Connections:**

- ❖ The article has quotes directly from other foreign aids and government officials, all expressing how they and their countries feel about the U.S. currently. Strong evidence for how the U.S. is not necessarily considered an ally anymore to certain countries.
- ❖ When the paper talks about some factors that have affected worsening relations, this article mentions tariffs being a key factor to such. I wouldn't be saying worsened relations without giving a reason why.
- ❖ Tariffs are not the only reason relations with the U.S. and other countries are worsening, the Iran Nuclear Deal and talk with North Korea play a part. It's possible to mention that relations with certain countries are worsening, but perhaps some are bettering? It's a possible angle to take.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ How bad is it that the U.S. is against its own allies?
- ❖ Worsening relations with PM Trudeau?
- ❖ Tariffs enacted.
- ❖ Certain countries actually improving relations?



### Research Bibliography #11

---

**Citation:** Lynch, D. (2018). Trump imposes tariffs on solar panels and washing machines in first major trade action of 2018.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

President Trump decided to place tariffs on solar panels and washing machines, any imported ones regardless of origin country. The article mentions how this does impact relations with other countries, but more importantly, how Americans could be at risk of losing their jobs. A potential point in the paper may be how going green can have other benefits, such as job creation, besides reduced pollution levels. The article tells the story of how limiting the renewable technology in a country can affect employment levels.

**Main argument:**

President Trump's recent tariffs could hurt the U.S. economy and perhaps more than he intended, since over 200,000 jobs could be at risk. Plus, it could hinder the growth of renewable energy sources in the U.S. since a high percentage of U.S. solar panels are imported. Overall President Trump's decision was not well informed or made to benefit the country as a whole.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ The solar panel tariffs could impact their consumption in the U.S. if they become more expensive, and lower the renewable energy use of Americans.
- ❖ The tariffs making solar panels more expensive and decreasing their consumption could lead to Americans losing their jobs.
- ❖ Multiple people believe that President Trump's decision was made for certain groups of people, and not the country as a whole. Overall, a poor decision though.
- ❖ President Trump has been encouraging and safeguarding more companies more than previous administrations since it discouraged globalization.

**Evidence:**

The Suniva-SolarWorld request for protection was opposed by much of the domestic U.S. solar industry. Tariffs make solar panels more expensive, and thus discourage their use, according to the Solar Energy Industries Association.

The trade association said the tariffs would cause 23,000 installers, engineers and project managers to lose their jobs this year as billions of dollars in planned investment evaporates. Up to one third of the 260,000 Americans currently employed in the industry are at risk because of the tariffs over the longer term, the group said.

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

Safe guarding-protecting domestic countries from foreign competitors.

“There’s a real chance that this opens the floodgates,” said Chad Bown, a trade expert at the Peterson Institute for International Economics.

“It boggles my mind that this president — any president, really — would voluntarily choose to damage one of the fastest-growing segments of our economy,” said Tony Clifford, chief development officer for Standard Solar in Rockville, Maryland.

“Environmentalists also bemoaned the decision, which they described as a setback for the further development of renewable energy.”

**Strengths:**

- Has statistics present to back-up arguments.
- Quotes from credible professionals.
- Gives a bit of background and some potential future scenarios.
- Does offer both sides of argument.

**Weaknesses:**

- Possibly a bit biased.

**Connections:**

- ❖ Solar panels are a renewable energy source and could help reduce pollution and create jobs, and this plays into the idea that there are more benefits to going green besides lowering greenhouse gas emissions. Gives a real example that has impacted the U.S.
- ❖ Relations between the countries were not directly addressed in the article, but it is possible this would play into how other countries feel about the United States now. Gives example of how certain foreign companies may have more challenges with the U.S. now.
- ❖ The decision was made to “benefit the economy as a whole,” but appears as if it was mostly for certain groups of people or companies. When discussing President Trump’s decision for leaving the accord, perhaps consider who it benefited more than the overall country. President Trump had his reasons, but it’s possible there’s a more focused group of people benefiting.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ Fit solar panels in the paper as an example of renewable energy being beneficial for job creation?
- ❖ Tariffs/safe guarding limiting and can be a sign of not wanting to globalize?
- ❖ Specific group that benefits from Paris Climate Agreement withdrawal?



### Research Bibliography #12

---

**Citation:** Matovac, V. A., PhD., Bilas, V., PhD., & Franc, S., univ spec oec. (2010). UNDERSTANDING THE IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND LABOR MARKET COMPETITIVENESS IN THE EU CANDIDATE COUNTRIES AND SELECTED EU MEMBERS. *Ekonomiska Misao i Praksa*, 19(2), 359-382.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

In the innovation section of the paper, I want to add why it's important for a country to have highly skilled human capital when talking about how France has recruited American scientists. It's a source that can say why it matters, and also how it can affect innovation/competitiveness.

**Main argument:**

Human capital matters in a country, because it offers the ability for a country to develop new technology and efficiently use them to a better degree. It's also important for human capital to be cultivated and nurtured by education, mostly through government investment. Otherwise people will move elsewhere they can receive better opportunities.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ People move where the opportunities are best, and people are more likely to move today and in the future as some societies are becoming more ideal (good wages, safe, good education system) and others are not.
- ❖ Human capital matters, because it is most often what creates innovations and new technology. Economic growth and lower unemployment happen when human capital receives development through education.
- ❖ It's high quality human capital, well-educated beings, who offer the highest return on education investment.
- ❖ Governments need to invest in education in order to develop their human capital, and make it so a country can grow and develop. Otherwise high levels of low skilled human capital will be replaced by machines, and ultimately, not have many opportunities afterwards for a job.
- ❖ There are not only benefits of human capital in terms of wealth, but social factors such as lower unemployment.

**Evidence:**

"The new growth theory has stressed the existence of strong externalities related to human capital and education, showing that the social return to human capital exceeds the private return."<sup>3</sup>

"As a reaction, rich, more developed countries can either shield themselves from globalization, which would be negative for prosperity, cut the wages of less qualified workers, accept higher unemployment, or they can raise the skills of their workers."<sup>4</sup>

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>Human capital-it can be defined as the abilities, knowledge and skills embodied in people and acquired through education, training and experience</p> <p>“Thus, governments should create an environment favorable for human capital creation that will, in return, benefit both the country as a whole, and its individuals. Otherwise, individuals will seek better opportunities elsewhere.”</p> <p>“Lagging behind in the development process of the educational system and insufficient investments in the creation of human capital could slow down the achievement of long-term sustainable development.”</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scholarly article</li> <li>• Lots of evidence and statistics</li> <li>• Informative and no bias</li> <li>• Addresses multiple topics/points in paper</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• European examples</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ One section in my paper is on how President Macron has recruited American scientists, and I wanted to show why that matters and how it can be bad for America. This article addresses why human capital is important, particularly highly skilled human capital such as scientists.</li> <li>❖ When talking about how President Macron recruited American scientists, it’s similar to how the paper states people will go where the better opportunities are. If highly skilled Americans start leaving the country, that’s somewhat opposite to what normally occurs. It could be a turning point to mention.</li> <li>❖ One of the points in innovation will be that an environment for it to flourish has to be established, and education can be an important part of that. Highly skilled human capital develops a lot of new technology, but they need to have the chance to receive an education; that’s an idea to possibly mention</li> <li>❖ A potential topic in economic development will focus on how low skilled workers are being replaced by machines and job sectors dying. This paper can support the idea that it’s important to invest in people, and there are benefits to do such.</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ U.S. based example?</li> <li>❖ Social benefits to human capital? Mitigate automation effects.</li> </ul>   |   |



### Research Bibliography #13

---

**Citation:** Mufson, S. (2017). *Promising to 'Make our planet great again,' Macron lures 13 U.S. climate scientists to France*. Washington: WP Company LLC d/b/a The Washington Post

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

The paper is looking at how the President Trump withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement affects the U.S. in multiple, and one way, as presented in this article, is losing scientists to other countries. President Macron's recruitment draws scientists to his country, and that affects innovation and economic development at a potentially high degree. It's also a counter move by President Macron, and speaks to world relations and how the U.S. has dug itself into a bit of a hole with people looking for better opportunities elsewhere. The article entails a situation which can offer a lot to the paper.

**Main argument:**

The article is more informative than argumentative and reports on how President Macron recruited American scientists to France after President Trump had announced the U.S. leaving the Paris Climate Agreement. The article talks about the grants and what the applicants and wins saw in applying and going to France.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ President Macron made his move against President Trump's decision to leave the accord by recruiting scientists, particularly Americans, to come to France and do their research there with lots of funding.
- ❖ A reason many of the scientists took the opportunity revolves around the political climate of the U.S., and how funding continues to decrease or has become more difficult to obtain. Whereas France offers an abundance of funding to them at the moment.
- ❖ Some members of the scientific community view Americans scientists as moving to France to do their research as concerning.
- ❖ Climate change solutions and protection cannot be held on the shoulders of one country, but should be a world wide effort.

**Evidence:**

Two years after the Paris climate accord was adopted, the French government is unveiling a list of 18 "laureates" — 13 of them working in the United States — who have won a "Make Our Planet Great Again" competition for \$70 million of research grants awarded for as long as five years.

The French government's offer attracted 1,822 applications, nearly two-thirds of them from the United States. France's research ministry pruned that to 450 "high-quality" candidates for long-term projects. A second round of grants will be awarded in the partnership with Germany.

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

Derry is the director of the National Science Foundation office for nine critical zone observatories. It is unclear how they will be funded beyond mid-2018. “That’s a big concern for all of us, as the infrastructure, both hardware and human, can’t just be shut down and turned on again,” he said. People working on the projects “are quite naturally looking elsewhere for work.”

Christine McEntee, executive director of the American Geophysical Union, said, “While we need scientists from around the globe and in different locations working collaboratively to solve the most critical challenges facing our world — including climate change — the news of some U.S. scientists choosing to move to France to conduct their research is troubling.”

“What stands out in the motivations is that many mentioned that it is currently very difficult to conduct innovative scientific research in the U.S. with the planned government cuts and general political climate, especially the politicization of climate research,” Le Quéré said of the people who applied for grants. She said France could provide “a much more fertile environment to conduct innovative research, and consequently take international scientific leadership.”

**Strengths:**

- Informative article, not persuasive or strongly focusing on a viewpoint
- Gives numbers on funding provided by France, those who applied, and those who accepted.
- Lots of quotes from multiple scientists that express their reasons for leaving America and how others people about the recruitment done by President Macron

**Weaknesses:**

- Focusing on the U.S. viewpoint, and not seeing how other countries or French scientists feel about the program

**Connections:**

- ❖ President Macron in another article mentioned a “counter momentum” created by President Trump’s withdrawal decision, and this can be used as an example of such. He’s “stealing” American scientists who want a more politically stable and supportive environment to work in.
- ❖ Scientists can help with innovations, and when talking about how the U.S. could be affected by the decision in terms of innovation, this exists as a consequence. The U.S. is losing people who contribute to innovations.
- ❖ France has been thought of as a potential world leader, and President Macron being aggressive with his decisions such as recruiting American scientists after President Trump’s announcement, exists as an example. This can be an indication of France stepping further into the shoes of a leading country.
- ❖ President Macron also making the decision, because of President Trump’s decision could also indicate increased tensions between the countries. When

discussing world relations in the paper, it's important to note President Macron's actions.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ Do French scientists want Americans to move to their country and work with them?
  - ❖ Value of scientists?
-

### Research Bibliography #14

---

**Citation:** Noack, R., & McAuley, J. (2018). France's Macron visits china to talk fairer trade and the future. Washington: WP Company LLC d/b/a The Washington Post.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

Research has showed that the U.S. has begun to damage trade relations with other countries, and are other countries doing the same or working together more? This article focuses on a trade deal between France and China to allow for easier trade between the countries; while also trying to establish a more reciprocal relationship. This article also talks about Europe, or in particular, President Macron stepping up as a world leader. All information which can be used when talking about (trade) relations with other countries and world leadership.

**Main argument:**

China and the European Union relations have been improving over the years, and President Macron wants to further develop the relations between the two entities. However, he wants China to make some changes so that the relationship is mutually beneficial between all the countries, and not favoring China more.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ China and the European Union have become closer trade partners over the years, and President Macron wants to expand the relationship. It's another example of him taking the lead in European affairs, and perhaps in world affairs.
- ❖ President Macron has involved himself in multiple world affairs: the Paris Climate Agreement, Jerusalem as Israel's capital, and the disputes in the Middle East.
- ❖ Germany could have been a leader of Europe, if their Chancellor Angela Merkel did not lose influence in Germany as a result of her party not overwhelmingly winning in the September elections.
- ❖ Trade relations are not the only deal China and France could be improving, since President Xi Jinping mentioned a "France-Chinese year of ecological" transition during 2018 and 2019.

**Evidence:**

"Macron's mission in China doesn't necessarily revolve around only making friends. The French president is seeking cooperation on some major initiatives that would expand European-Chinese trade ties, including infrastructure projects such as the Silk Road route between the two partners."

"In November, for instance, he stepped into a dispute among Saudi Arabia, Lebanon and Iran, urging Riyadh to release Prime Minister Saad Hariri and allow him to fly to Paris. In December, he vocally opposed Trump's decision to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to move the American Embassy there. He then hosted a major climate summit

in Paris, assembling world leaders and philanthropists to continue the fight against climate change after the United States withdrew from the 2015 Paris accord.”

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

“The almost inevitable repositioning was sped up by the victory of Trump in the 2016 election and his subsequent attacks on U.S. allies in Europe over trade practices, defense spending and immigration policies, among other areas.”

"Europe is back" is not necessarily a quote that anyone would have expected to attribute to a French leader earlier this year, when E.U.-skepticism defined many of the politicians competing for the French presidency.”

“With Merkel's influence fading, Macron has sought to insert himself — and France — into the void that Merkel has left, as Europe's chief interlocutor on the world stage.”

**Strengths:**

- Outlines specific points about France, China, and Germany.
- Expresses how France has become more of a leader in Europe and world affairs with real examples.
- Mentions how China has committed, but still has to prove its acting on it.

**Weaknesses:**

- Short, briefly touches on the topic.

**Connections:**

- ❖ While the U.S. has been increasing trade tensions with other countries, this France/European Union and China trade talk proves how other countries are trying to create better relations with each other. The article admits China has issues to address, but instead of retaliating, France has decided to try and work with China.
- ❖ World leadership has become questionable, in terms of who will lead since the U.S. has begun to focus more on itself. This source specifically outlines how President Macron has become a leader in Europe and in the world.
- ❖ Other articles have mentioned how China has begun to go green with the innovations and technology they have been developing to reduce greenhouse gas emission in their country. While this paper questions China’s commitment, other sources outline the steps they have taken; year of the “France-Chinese” partnership.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ Will President Macron be able to step up as a world leader?
- ❖ Have other countries begun making deals with each other without the U.S.?

### Research Bibliography #15

---

**Citation:** Pencea, S., & Bâlgar, A. (2016). China's transition to the innovation-driven economy: Stepping stones and road-blocks. *Global Economic Observer*, 4(1), 31-46

**Reason for including this source in your work:** One section of the paper looks at world leadership position, and since the U.S. can potentially be “stepping down,” it’s interesting to see who could take the lead. China has been a country people have been watching, and this article looks at how China has been developing and growing. It’s a source which offers a bit of insight into whether or not China could be a world leader.

**Main argument:**

China has a history of leading the world, and they could become a leader in innovation today. China has had to adjust its strategy and make sure that it does not get stuck in the “middle income” trap though; one strategy being to invest in education and human capital. However, China has to be careful though or it could easily find itself stagnating.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ China has potential to become a leading innovator, but will only do so if it can strategically avoid the “middle-income” trap.
- ❖ China has been encouraging R&D and investing in education to help itself develop and grow without getting stuck.
- ❖ China has experienced a lot of internal growth, and companies have started to look outward to actually invest in other places. Contrary to recent years where foreign countries were investing in China.
- ❖ China has to move carefully or it could end up stuck in the middle, and not be the powerhouse it has the potential to become.

**Evidence:**

It was only after 1978, when following a bold investment-led and open-to-the-world strategy designed by Deng Xiaoping, that Chinese economy has visibly changed course and managed, in only three decades, an amazing come-back: it achieved large-scale industrialization, urbanization and modernization, growing yearly by an average rate of almost 10% and becoming the second largest economy in the world (2010) behind the USA;

It has focused more intensively on increasing the number of researchers. Consequently, according to Chinese statistics, in 2014, the number of researchers reached a total of 3,600,000, placing China first in the world in this respect (Song, 2015).

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

Middle-income trap-where countries end up having middle-income status, and being in limbo between low and high income countries. Hurts ability to compete, because too

developed for low income countries, but not enough to compete against high income countries.

“So far, results are quite impressive, and leading innovation indicators show that gaps are quickly bridged and China is approaching parity with the West.”

“China is rapidly advancing on the technological ladder changing its position in the global production chains and taking over increasingly superior technologically activities, with higher complexity, knowledge and highly-skilled workforce content.”

By founding colleges, universities, research centres and other academic and R&D institutions, China has developed the robust physical infrastructure necessary to enhance knowledge in different technological and non-technological fields of study.

**Strengths:**

- Scholarly
- Focuses on one particular country
- Explains situation and why it matters
- Statistics and facts to support argument/information
- Outlines good and bad situations
- Recent article

**Weaknesses:**

- 

**Connections:**

- ❖ China has been identified as a potential leader instead of the U.S., and this article looks at why that’s a possibility in the future. The U.S. could be lacking in investment for innovations now, but China seems to be experiencing the opposite.
- ❖ Places importance on education and investing in its own people, and when talking about the importance of human capital, China can serve as an example of how it can help a country grow.
- ❖ Talking about the middle income trap, is it possible to move backwards into it? If the U.S. experiences a decline in investment for education and innovation, there’s a chance the U.S. could even experience what’s threatening China. Moving to a position where they can’t compete with the best, but are too good for those just starting out; when discussing the future of the U.S. and scientists leaving to other countries, that’s an interesting point to mention.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ Chinese example of innovation?
- ❖ Who is stuck in the middle income trap?
- ❖ Competition for U.S. and other countries.



**Research Bibliography #16**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Saliba P. (2017) Sustainable Economic Development: Green Economy and Green Growth. Analysing Economic Growth and Identifying Sensible Measures Addressing Socio and Environmental Concerns Whilst Promoting Green Growth. In: Leal Filho W., Pociovalisteanu DM., Al-Amin A. (eds) Sustainable Economic Development. World Sustainability Series. Springer, Cham</p>   |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b></p>   |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>Climate change is more than just the climate changing and it being hotter or colder in countries, because it also impacts health, resources, poverty, and social exclusion. The amount of air pollution causes a high number of health problems alone, and there’s numerous benefits of trying to control climate change and pollution. However, a lot has to be done in order to help</p>  |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Climate change has more implications for society than just pollution; it also affects economic, health, social, and environmental sustainability of a country.</li> <li>❖ Dealing with climate change and other problems in a country do not have to be treated as completely separate matters, but can be addressed together. Trying to control climate change and reduce pollution will help with other issues in a country.</li> <li>❖ Government(s) cannot sit idly by, but have to be proactive and be “role-models” for addressing environmental problems. They need to encourage more environmentally friendly policies and financially support those types of projects.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>“Air pollution alone, “the single biggest environment risk”, costs European economies 1.6 US\$ trillion a year in diseases and deaths, a 2010 study reveals, representing almost 10 % of the GDP of the whole European Union in 2013...curbing the health effects of air pollution pays dividends...“we not only save more lives but also achieve results that are worth astounding amounts of money.” (WHO)</p> <p>“If the global community collectively is prepared to step up to the challenge of achieving the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals), then there’s a chance of achieving sustainable development—and with it better prospects for people and our planet.” (Helen Clark) (UNDP 2015).</p>                             |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>Green- <i>Green</i> is becoming synonymous with environmental friendliness and a catalyst agent for meaningful efforts to address environmental concerns and deficits.</p>   |

“Nature on the other hand seems to have absorbed all this unwarranted stress for ages...but now is coming round with a vengeance. Rise in global atmospheric temperatures, extreme stormy weather, thawing of glaciers, unpredictable avalanches and tsunamis, rise in the sea level, drought risk, encroaching desertification—all experienced these last years—are witness to this alarming phenomenon...”

“On a global perspective, diversification of the world’s economies to embrace innovation, green economy and an ingrained social conscience is the way forward...in other words, harmonizing economic growth with environmental and social objectives.”

“In terms of financing such measures, governments have to manage their country’s finances judiciously, identifying priority areas for expenditure, investing money on sensible projects to stimulate the economy and which yield return benefiting citizens at large, combating tax evasion and promoting incentives and implementing measures amenable to the upholding of the environment.”

**Strengths:**

- Sources for certain points and arguments, but not an over-abundance.
- Statistics to prove different points.
- Gives examples for certain points, and not all hypothetical.

**Weaknesses:**

- There’s a bit of separation between the first two parts of the source.
- Focuses on a specific case, while addressing the grand scheme of climate change.

**Connections:**

- ❖ Outlines multiple benefits of trying to move towards a more environmentally friendly society, and that there are benefits beyond cleaner air or water. Since I’m looking at what could be consequences of leaving the Paris Climate Agreement beyond simply not participating in the agreement, this gives a bit of insight to how poverty and health might be influenced.
- ❖ Talks about working with other countries when working on cleaner technology and energy sources, and that the benefits will be great. One of the points of the paper is international relations and why they are important to have, and how damaging it can be to not be working with other countries. This point gives some evidence for the argument, and can be a bigger point to stress.
- ❖ This source also stresses the importance of government’s role in going green, and mentions them as a “role-model.” When looking at a governmental decision, it is important to see if the decision actually matters. This source supports the argument that President Trump’s decision matters and cannot be considered frivolous.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ What will the U.S. lose now that it has possibly ostracized itself a bit from the other countries?
  - ❖ I need to look at more sources which talk about how going green can go beyond cleaner air and water.
  - ❖ Need to look at other countries leaders and what they are doing to encourage green technology beyond the Paris Climate Agreement.
-

**Research Bibliography #17**

**Citation:** Schipani, V., Kiely, E., Robertson, L., & Farley, R. (2018). Fact-checking Trump’s speech on Paris climate agreement. *USA Today*.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**  
The article focuses on the consequences of President Trump’s withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement, but background information has to be given; including his reasons for why. This article outline President Trump’s decision making process for leaving the agreement, and also has evidence to support whether or not his decisions were well founded and he presented accurate information. It’s important to see what he said, and whether the benefits he gave out way the possible cons the research done in the paper will entail.

**Main argument:**  
President Trump’s five reasons he gave for his decision to leave the Paris Climate Agreement are outlined, and the authors investigate whether or not the facts given were accurate.

- Important ideas:**
- ❖ President Trump outlined 5 reasons for his decision: legal liability increase, punishment for the U.S., negative economic impact, and misuse of money contributed by the U.S., and decrease in job creation.
  - ❖ Some of President Trump’s decisions were not as accurate or true as made them out to be. The consequences: increased legal liability of the U.S., unfair “punishment” for the U.S., misuse of money, and lower job creation as outlined by President Trump were false. Evidence supports the opposite of what he said.
  - ❖ Legal liability would increase by not being in the agreement, the U.S. has largely contributed to greenhouse gas emissions and should be “punished, the money donate for the fund can be accounted for, and job creation has been steady since 2010 and would not be that affected by participation in the accord.
  - ❖ Economic impact was not a lie, and other scholars and organizations found that GDP would be impacted. However, President Trump gave an incorrect timeline and only mentioned one scenario out of multiple.

**Evidence:**

Michael Burger, executive director of the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia University, told us Trump is wrong. He said the U.S. actually may be more exposed to lawsuits if it withdraws from the agreement.

According to the European Commission’s Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research, in 2015 China came in first for total kilotons of carbon dioxide emitted. The U.S., the European Union and India trailed China in that order. Per capita, however, the U.S. pumped out more CO2 than China and India combined in 2015. On average, each individual living in the United States contributed 16.07 tons to the country’s total. But

each individual living in China and India contributed 7.73 and 1.87 tons on average, respectively.

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

Green Climate Fund-a United Nations program that uses funds collected from industrialized countries and other sources to back climate mitigation and adaptation projects in developing countries.

“That analysis concluded that “the size of the 2025 carbon taxes and their corresponding economic costs are modest.” And the researchers said that “the cost of delaying the implementation of a carbon tax is high.” Delaying implementation of the agreement would raise the cost of a carbon tax needed to meet the 2025 emissions target.”- Resources for the Future

“So the actual cost to the economy depends on how the U.S. would go about meeting its target emissions reduction. Trump’s claim that the cost “at this time would be close to \$3 trillion in lost GDP” leaves out the fact that it’s an estimate for the year 2040 and that another scenario in that same study estimated a much lower impact”

“So far, this fund has supported 43 projects that help developing countries mitigate and adapt to climate change, such as projects to improve their renewable energy sectors. That’s contrary to Trump’s claim that “nobody even knows where the money [in the Green Climate Fund] is going to.”

**Strengths:**

- Lots of sources and quotes with in the articles from trusted organizations or relevant professionals.
- Statistics where needed to back-up argument about a point.
- Does outline each decision and delve into how it was true and/or false.

**Weaknesses:**

- Not scholarly.
- A slight bias.

**Connections:**

- ❖ When the paper focuses on how President Trump’s decision impacts the U.S., it’s necessary to understand why he may have made such a move. This article outlines the thought process behind the decision making, and allows the paper to explain why the decision was made even if all these bad ramifications could happen.
- ❖ The authors of the paper break down the reason President Trump gave, and them evaluate them to see if what he said is true or not. When looking at the rationales, it’s necessary to know whether or not they are valid or flawed; it gives evidence that the decision started on shaky ground and was not made on sound reasoning.

- ❖ President Trump mentioned how GDP could be lost by participating in the agreement, and the authors outline how that could be true. However, the costs could be worse in the future and in the economic development section, that's a possible argument for why the U.S. could be more negatively affected by the withdrawal. In the long run, it could cost more to the country's GDP.
- ❖ When addressing the point that job creation would slow down by being in the agreement, and then the article explaining how that may not true, could be used in the economic development section of the paper. Evidence points that the opposite is true, and another points that the exit from the agreement was not a beneficial decision for the country.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ When the reasons for leaving the Paris Agreement are not accurate or completely false, does that worsen the degree of how the U.S. will be impacted?
  - ❖ Long run affects, and cost the country more?
-

### Research Bibliography #18

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Sertyesilisik B., Sertyesilisik E. (2017) Ways of Fostering Green Economy and Green Growth. In: Leal Filho W., Pociovalisteanu DM., Al-Amin A. (eds) Sustainable Economic Development. World Sustainability Series. Springer, Cham</p>   |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b><br/>Talks about the importance of going green and what it can do for other problems, as well as importance of it for the future. Helps out with the innovation and economic development sections of the paper.</p>  |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>Climate change is real and something needs to be done about it, and one is if the economy is sustainable; which only happens if caters to what everyone needs now and in the future. Politicians and policies are key to helping out with going green and making decisions which help spur green innovations. Green technology push will help create a new sector in the economy and create new jobs which are being lost to the changes of automation and other factors.</p>   |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Politicians and policies are important in helping to move towards more green technology and innovations.</li> <li>❖ Green technology will help create a new sector for people who are losing jobs thanks to the changes in the world.</li> <li>❖ Green technology also helps with other problems a country faces, such as poverty and unemployment, food shortages, and energy.</li> <li>❖ Needs to be a collaborative effort and not just one country trying to fix the climate problems.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>There is need for international collaboration among both developing and developed countries for fostering green economy and sustainability as “<i>no nation can secure its future alone, but together we can—in a global partnership for SD... (UBCED 1992)...</i>” (Mehmet 1995: 11).</p> <p>Green innovation can “... <i>encourage business solutions and entrepreneurial ideas for tackling environmental challenges.</i>” (OECD 2009). “<i>Innovation in green technology ... can lead to a ‘technological revolution’ (Tran 2012: 132) which can be a solution to global warming.</i>” (Li et al. 2013: 1529).</p> |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>Sustainable economy- “caters all human needs and accepts the limitations imposed by the need to sustain the environment’s ability to meet present and future needs.”</p>   |

Green GDP- *“is an attempt by economists to measure the growth of an economy compared to the harm production does to the environment. This is done by subtracting the costs of environmental and ecological damage done in a specific period of time from the gross domestic product from that some time.”*

“The economy needs to be sustainable. An economy is sustainable only if it simultaneously caters all human needs and accepts the limitations imposed by the need to sustain the environment’s ability to meet present and future needs.”

“Politicians can encourage green economy and green growth mainly through: their commitment; green GDP; EID (eco-industrial development) policies; green technology policies fostering innovation in green technology; international collaboration in combating climate change; policy instruments (i.e. carbon taxes; carbon-motivated border tax adjustments; virtual water) as explained in the following paragraphs.”

“Government action can encourage innovation through empowering people to innovate; unleashing innovation in firms; creating and applying knowledge; applying innovation to address global and social challenges; and improving the governance of policies for innovation (OECD 2010).”

- Strengths:**
- Lots of support for points/plenty of sources.
  - Outlines different points and focuses on one at a time.
  - Looks at multiple factors that can encourage green economies and green growth.

- Weaknesses:**
- Perhaps too many sources, not a lot of own deductions.

- Connections:**
- ❖ The paper looks at what can encourage a green economy and green growth, and since my paper is looking at what can help an economy grow or stagnate, this gives some insight into those factors.
  - ❖ How the government can influence innovation/green technology by either encouraging people to do such or not. When looking at how President Trump’s decision influences innovation, it’s another source of support for the argument that President Trump’s decision matters.
  - ❖ Addresses how entrepreneurs play a role in “fostering green economy,” and since entrepreneurship might be addressed in the paper, this offers some information on the importance of entrepreneurs.

- Questions/Concerns:**
- ❖ Do entrepreneurs and companies face the same consequences after President Trump’s withdrawal?
  - ❖ What can be said about how other world leaders have influenced innovation and green technology in their countries?

### Research Bibliography #19

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Stosic, B., &amp; Milutinovic, R. (2014). ECO-INNOVATION INFLUENCE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. Paper presented at the 268-275</p>  |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b> Innovation is a section of the paper, and looks at how President Trump's decision has impacted innovation. Why does it matter if innovation is affected though? This source offers evidence as to why innovation matters and how it can be impactful on economic development, and as the paper looks at each aspect individually, and in connection to economic development, this paper exists as a source for importance alone and in connection to each other.</p>   |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>The world has experienced a shift in what makes a company competitive, and it is no longer lower prices, but innovation. As the world focuses more on climate change and protection, eco-innovation in particular has become a focus. It presents an opportunity for economic development and growth while catering to concerns about the environment.</p>   |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Eco-innovation has become a new pathway for innovation and protecting both the Earth while also helping economies, countries, and citizens be better off as well.</li> <li>❖ Eco-innovation can be defined in multiple ways, but overall it's about helping the environment while also being competitive. Part of being competitive comes from being more environmentally conscious, as the world begins to see pollution and climate change as a problem.</li> <li>❖ Eco-innovation can help with economic development, since it helps create a better and more sustainable world for people to live in.</li> <li>❖ Eco-innovation also helps with employment by encouraging start-ups since people can find an environmental issue and try to solve it by creating a product or service.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Eco-innovation may contribute to the renewal of the whole innovation system, considering social, ecological and economic aspects. The survival of the economic system depends on its aptitude to create and maintain sustainable economic processes (Carrillo-Hermosilla, del Rio González and Könnölä, 2009).</p>   |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>Eco-innovation-innovations that have a remarkable impact on quality of life and environmental protection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental technologies</li> <li>2. Organizational innovation for the environment</li> </ol>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>3. Product and service innovation</p> <p>4. Green system innovations</p>   |   |
| <p>“Nowadays, it is clear that for economic development and for the accompanying environmental improvements, innovation become a necessity, especially eco-innovation.”</p> <p>“Lately, European Union has been suggesting a lot of programmes which support ecoinnovation and proposes a lot of tools for assessing and illustrating eco-innovation performance. “</p> <p>“Eco-innovation has become burning issue that attracts the attention of decision-makers in today's business world, due to its contribution to economic development, improvement of environmental protection and employment.”</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not biased, informational.</li> <li>• A recent source.</li> <li>• Stays on the main topic and does not stray off.</li> <li>• Gives a real life example with the European Union.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just gives a simple overview of the subjects, and does not delve deeply into the topic.</li> <li>• Not a lot of statistics.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The paper will look at how innovation could be affected individually by President Trump’s decision, but also look at how innovation being affected will result in ramifications for economic development. This article serves as a starting point for the relationship, and offers some insight into how they are connected.</li> <li>❖ The article mentions that people creating solutions/start-ups helps create economic development, and when thinking of how scientists are leaving for France, there could be a connection to be made there. Scientists help create solutions, and losing them could impact innovation levels and economic development.</li> <li>❖ Eco-innovation has become more popular because people have begun to value protecting the environment more than before. President Trump expressed that he does not care for the environment and working to battle climate change, and if people’s attitudes change in the U.S., could innovation be affected. Either innovation decreases because they’re not trying to find solutions for environmental problems, or they create innovations which contribute to climate change?</li> <li>❖</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ How do the other aspects address impact economic development?</li> <li>❖ Connect eco-innovations into the paper more specifically?</li> <li>❖ Attitude towards innovation going to change?</li> </ul>  |   |



**Research Bibliography #20**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Swanson, A. (2017, Jul 07). Japan, European union strike global trade deal. <i>Orlando Sentinel</i></p>  |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b><br/>         One section of the paper is (trade) relations with other countries, and current events between the U.S. and other countries involve tariffs and trade wars. Some officials who commented on the tariffs and trade wars mentioned how the U.S. has become isolated and increased tensions with allies, and this article proves that other countries are not experiencing the same situation with other countries; the others are moving forward together.</p>   |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>         The U.S. and Japan could not strike a trade deal together, and instead, made a new agreement with the European Union. The move was not coincidental, but instead a response to both President Trump and Great Britain.</p>   |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ President Trump attacked certain countries about their trade practices with the U.S. and left trade agreements that had been in the works. Thus, other countries responded by making deals with other countries in a small act of revenge.</li> <li>❖ Japan and the European Union made a trade deal which encompasses a large percent of the global economy, population, and global trade. Freer trade between the two entities can possibly hurt U.S. exports competitiveness in those markets.</li> <li>❖ Other world leaders see the U.S. acting in an isolationist manner and do not think it will benefit them or the world; more cons than benefits.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>“...the broad strokes of a trade deal that will cover nearly 30 percent of the global economy, 10 percent of the world's population and 40 percent of global trade.”<br/>         The deal will be a heavy blow to American producers of these goods, by making U.S.-made goods relatively more expensive and less competitive in the major markets of Japan and Europe.</p>  |
| <p><b>Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:</b></p> <p>“Jean-Claude Juncker, the president of the European Commission, said the deal "shows that closing ourselves off from the world is not good for business, nor for the global economy, nor for workers. As far as we are concerned, there is no protection in protectionism.”</p> <p>Shinzo Abe, the prime minister of Japan, greeted the announcement as "the birth of the world's largest free advanced industrialized economic zone.”</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>“On Thursday, Abe said that he would continue to push ahead with TPP negotiations without the United States in meetings with the remaining countries next week...”</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informative article some statistics and quotes from multiple people involved.</li> <li>• Gave background on the situation and highlighted the main points.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not give specific numbers for how the U.S. be hurt, more speculation.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ I am looking at how (trade) relations have deteriorated thanks to the Paris Climate Agreement, and although not much evidence exists to support a direct relationship, this article shows that tensions have increased. Is it because of tariffs alone? Or that President Trump began to isolate himself and the U.S. back when he took the U.S. out of a worldwide agreement?</li> <li>❖ Since the article mentions how U.S. companies could lose out in E.U. and Japanese markets thanks to the deal, how does that affect U.S. trade? Trade plays a big part in whether or not a country can grow and develop, and if the U.S. loses the ability to effectively export, there could be problems with economic development, innovation, and world leadership.</li> <li>❖ There’s been evidence to show that many countries consider the U.S. becoming an isolationist, and this source supports that idea. The paper may mention the dangers of isolationism and its effect since this and other sources have mentioned the U.S. acting in such a way.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Other deals other countries have made with each other?</li> <li>❖ Results from the agreement?</li> <li>❖ Connection to Paris Climate Agreement?</li> </ul>   |  |



**Research Bibliography #21**

**Citation:** Todaro, M., & Smith, S. (2012). Economic Development (11th ed., pp. 23-25). Boston: Pearson.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**  
Economic development is the overall factor being analyzed in the paper, will it be affected by President Trump’s decision? This source outlines what economic development can be defined as and some goals that have been set by the U.N., so that there’s a way to measure if economic development will be positively or negatively affected. It’s a way to compare if the potential affects to economic development will accomplish the goals or not.

**Main argument:**  
Establishing cohesive goals and uniting efforts to encourage development with the Millennium Development Goals helps focus efforts and set targets, so that bigger issues can be directly addressed with better results.

- Important ideas:**
- ❖ The goals are able to better focus what needs to be achieved for a country to become developed, and sets a more direct direction of what needs to be addressed.
  - ❖ There are differences between what regions are reaching the goals and which ones are not.
  - ❖ The goals are not perfect, and they have received criticisms on how they were not ambitious enough or had a short timeline.

**Evidence:**  
“The MDGS have provided a unified focus in the development community unlike anything that preceded them.” Pg.23

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**  
  
Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)-A set of eight goals adopted by the United Nations in 2000; to eradicate poverty and hunger; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality, improve maternal health; combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability; and develop a global partnership for development. –Pg. 23  
  
“The goal of ensuring environmental sustainability is essential for securing an escape from poverty.” Pg-24  
  
“Finally, the governments and citizens of the rich countries need to play their part in pursuit of the goal of “global partnership for development.”Pg. 25

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>“The MDGS were developed in consultation with the developing countries, to ensure that they addressed their most pressing problems.” Pg. 25</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A list of economic goals outlined by the United Nations that can be utilized as a way of measuring economic development.</li> <li>• The United Nations created the goals, so they’re not just for a specific country or only agreed upon by a few nations.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The goals are for more underdeveloped countries than the U.S. The goals are relevant, but the targets for them are a bit more extreme for the U.S.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Connections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Although the U.S. is not so underdeveloped that it has extreme issues to overcome compared to other countries, these goals allow for a sense of what economic development entails. It’s important when mentioning how economic development is impacted, how it’s being measured in a sense. No other sources specifically mentioned goals, but instead what economic development entailed or how other factors played into it.</li> <li>❖ Other sources mentioned how the world has to come together to fight climate change and other uses, but the U.S. has shown that they rather not participate in collectively with others. The goals here though stress the importance of “global partnership,” and it is evidence that world cooperation matters.</li> <li>❖ The importance of protecting the environment and how it can positively affect poverty and other problems in a country has been addressed in other sources. They were mentioning it as a bonus to pursuing green technology, but in this instance, it’s specifically outlined as a way for a country to develop. Reducing other problems in a country by trying to protect the environment should not be the benefit of going green, but direct result of a country realizing the benefits of moving towards preserving the environment.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Questions/Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Could the future of the U.S. become altered to where the goals would be more aligned with the development state of the U.S.?</li> </ul>  |  |



### Research Bibliography #22

---

**Citation:** Trump: U.S. will exit Paris climate accord. (2017, Jun 02). *Environment News Service*

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

This article talks about President Trump's withdrawal reasons in short, and instead focuses more on the world's reaction. It has comments from multiple political and organizational leaders who express how they will continue forward regardless of the U.S. or address how the U.S. could face some challenges. It's an opportunity to understand how multiple view the decision and what could happen to the U.S.; not the consequences based on theory.

**Main argument:**

President Trump did not make his decision to leave the Paris Climate Agreement without giving any reasons, but numerous high profile leaders or officials found the decision poorly made. They view it as a disadvantage to the U.S. and partially world efforts to fight climate change, but regardless expect the other countries to move forward with the agreement.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ President Trump believed his decision to leave the Paris Climate Agreement would save the U.S. from taking an economic hit, but others view it as him protecting his billionaire friends.
- ❖ Former President Obama commented that the agreement could have benefited the U.S. with job creation, and could have been a leader in setting an example for reducing carbon emissions.
- ❖ The United Nations was not happy that the U.S. had left the agreement, but commented that they would not negotiate with only one party. They did admit they had hope for the U.S. states and other entities will uphold the agreement in a sense by continuing to move towards a greener future.
- ❖ Al Gore contributed his opinion on the matter and argued that the country is already going green and President Trump cannot stop the movement. However, Natural Resources Defense Council President Rhea Suh thought that President Trump's decision ruined the U.S.'s international reputation and could have put millions of American jobs at risk.
- ❖ CEO of Conversation International commented about the U.S.'s forgoing its seat in the international community, and puts the U.S. against its allies when everyone should be coming together.

**Evidence:**

“UN Environment chief Erik Solheim condemned Trump's decision. “The science on climate change is perfectly clear: we need more action, not less,” Solheim said. “This a global challenge. Every nation has a responsibility to act and to act now.”

“The U.S. decision to leave Paris in no way brings an end to this unstoppable effort. China, India, the European Union and others are already showing strong leadership,” Solheim said. “

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

“The nations that remain in the Paris Agreement will be the nations that reap the benefits in jobs and industries created. I believe the United States of America should be at the front of the pack,” said Obama.”

“Many analysts predict that the United States will fall behind renewable energy market leaders such as the European Union and China as they move towards a clean energy economy”.

“Trump has made it abundantly clear that his primary focus is enriching his fellow billionaires, so it is no surprise that he is withdrawing from an agreement that is hitting the poorest first and worst globally with extreme weather events, crop failure, and diseases,” said Daphne Wysham, director of the Climate Justice Program at the Center for Sustainable Economy in Portland, Oregon.

**Strengths:**

- Gives insight into how different people think about the decision; gives their predictions for the future.
- The comments are all from relevant world or organizational leaders, and not random people who may not fully understand the impacts.
- Does not solely focus on one person.
- Mentions who President Trump might have really made the agreement for.

**Weaknesses:**

- Mostly reactions from different people on President Trump’s decision.
- Possible bias, showing negative reactions more than positive.

**Connections:**

- ❖ Most of the research done has focused on theory or what has happened with other countries. This source just offers a chance to see what well informed and educated people believed would happen to the United States, and if the decision was a smart move by President Trump.
- ❖ One source talked about President Trump’s reasons for his decision and explored them to see if the facts were accurate or not. They did find out what facts were false or imprecise. However, they did not say who could have benefited from the decision instead. This source contends who the real benefactors may have been.
- ❖ One of the people who commented on President Trump’s decision mentioned specifically that the economic security of the U.S. could be endangered. Former President Obama mentioned the loss of job creation and other benefits. All those

consequences play into economic development, and can serve as support for the relationship between the withdrawal and economic development of the U.S.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ Did anyone believe the decision was the right move?
  - ❖ Where the “billionaire friends” the real benefactors?
-

### Research Bibliography #23

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Citation:</b> Varathan, P., &amp; Guilford, G. (2018). Higher prices, layoffs, and economic nosedives: What Trump's trade war could mean for you. <i>Quartz</i>.</p>  |
| <p><b>Reason for including this source in your work:</b> Part of the paper focuses on (trade) relations with other countries degrading possibly stemming from President Trump's decision to leave the Paris Climate Agreement. This article talks about the recent tariffs placed on certain goods imported to the U.S. and how trade wars are becoming more plausible as countries retaliate. Looking at these recent developments, it's possible the tensions stem from the U.S. becoming more isolated from its normal allies and trading partners. The Paris Climate Agreement could have been the start of the U.S. moving towards a more isolationist nation, so this article can possibly demonstrate that development.</p>  |
| <p><b>Main argument:</b><br/>President Trump recently placed tariffs on steel and aluminum imports into the U.S., and despite his belief it's beneficial to the country, that may not be the case. American steel and aluminum producers are happy about the decision and will benefit from their prices being more competitive to foreign companies. However, consumers could lose out and the tariffs could spur more tariffs from the U.S. or other countries in retaliation.</p>  |
| <p><b>Important ideas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Steel and aluminum tariffs benefit American producers, but hurt consumers since they now have to purchase more expensive options compared to before.</li> <li>❖ There's multiple possibilities with how people could react, because it could end up making other goods cheaper in order to compensate for the lack of demand they will receive if they have to adjust their prices to compensate for an overabundance of steel if they stop importing to the U.S.</li> <li>❖ How the tariff works would not create jobs, but instead decrease them by putting multiple producers out of business; wealth distribution would be limited.</li> <li>❖ The tariffs will impact allies more than other countries, and it could lead a harsh reaction from those countries; European countries have already threatened tariffs on American imports they receive.</li> <li>❖ The tariffs and potential trade war could not only impact the U.S., but the whole world since countries have become so connected in trade. It's a potential recipe for disaster.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Trump's tariff is good news for US steel and aluminum producers. A tax on imports makes the domestic equivalent relatively cheaper. But it's bad news for anyone who consumes steel or aluminum, since it makes those metals more expensive. That's just one of the ways that everyday Americans may lose out as a result of Trump's proposed trade action, which poses a threat to the very people whose economic interests</p>   |

he claims to champion. And if he succeeds in launching his longed-for trade war, the entire global economy will suffer as a result

The EU has mulled striking back with trade sanctions on US agriculture, as well as on symbolic products like Harley-Davidson motorcycles, Kentucky bourbon, and bluejeans. Canada, too, has threatened “responsive measures.”

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

“On their own, the steel and aluminum tariffs are unlikely to dent global trade much. But if US trade barriers set off a chain reaction of nationalistic protections, the consequences could be dire.”

“That means the new trade barriers will have a relatively minimal impact on China. Instead, they’ll hurt some of the US’s biggest allies and trade partners.”

“His proposed steel and aluminum tariffs won’t make US steel and aluminum makers more competitive. Their advantage will come purely from subsidies. As a result, some foreign steel and aluminum firms will go bankrupt; others will be forced to lay off workers.”

“History suggests there are even worse potential consequences. It was, after all, a trade war between the US and European nations that helped mire the world economy in the Great Depression.”

**Strengths:**

- Goes in depth on why the tariffs would be bad for the U.S. and the world.
- Includes outside sources, data, and information to support argument.
- Draws upon past examples to use as a reference for why the tariffs could be and the consequences.
- Does not say everything will go bad, but gives multiple scenarios and possibilities.

**Weaknesses:**

- Does favor looking at the negative side of the argument, even if both sides are discussed.

**Connections:**

- ❖ The U.S. has worsened trade relations with other countries, and what does that mean for the country? Research has shown that the U.S. has begun to isolate itself, and these recent tariffs seem to be a major turning point for the U.S. and the world. These tariffs threaten the economic security of the U.S., and that would hurt economic development to a large degree.
- ❖ Other sources have mentioned tariffs, but have not delved deeply into what the effects would be and how they could hurt the U.S. This article goes more in depth and allows for the effect of tariffs to be better understood.

- ❖ The U.S. has enforced tariffs before, but rarely on allies. Therefore, the potential effects are harder to measure, but the article mentions how the Great Depression was made worse by trade wars between the U.S. and allies.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ Tariffs making the Great Depression worse?
- ❖ Other countries benefit or suffer from the decision? (Lower prices for excess goods).

### Research Bibliography #24

---

**Citation:** Wong, S. K. (2012). The influence of green product competitiveness on the success of green product innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 15*(4), 468-490.

**Reason for including this source in your work:**

Other sources have talked about green innovation and how it's becoming the new competitive edge, but this article goes deeper in to the relationship and explores what's more successful, and actually uses models to support its argument. Since the source goes more in depth and uses a model, it offers more concrete evidence for the section in the paper addressing how important innovation and eco-innovation are.

**Main argument:**

Green innovation has become important for a company to pursue to have a competitive edge, but it's necessary to see if the green innovations are successful and what makes them succeed.

**Important ideas:**

- ❖ Green innovation has become the competitive edge for companies, because consumer attitudes have shifted and growing concern for the environment has become what more consumers look at when buying a product.
- ❖ Green innovation can come from either a response to an environmental requirement or demand for more green technology. Otherwise they might be developed for proactive reasons, such as cost efficiency or higher profit desires.
- ❖ A company developing green technology does not only benefit the environment, but offers the company large financial gains; there are multiple benefits to going green.
- ❖ "Green" makes a product have a competitive advantage, and having that type of competitive advantage plays into what makes a product successful and last in the long-run.

**Evidence:**

Studies have found that to embark on green innovation early enables a firm to gain first-mover advantage ([56] Porter and van der Linde, 1995).

The results showed that the case for pursuing green innovation was well justified by its capacity to meet environmental requirements and generate financial benefits at the same time.

**Notable quotes, terms, and concepts:**

Green innovation- initiated to meet the green requirements of a regulatory body or the green concerns of the target customers

“With the growing public concern over environmental issues, how "green" is a product has become a meaningful and relevant issue for consumers at both retail and corporate levels.”

“This study revealed that green innovations enhance a company's competitive advantage which, in turn, contributes to green product success.”

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiates between regular innovation and green innovation.</li> <li>• Focuses on not just a green innovation being produced, but its success.</li> <li>• Uses a model to look at the relationship between green innovation and their success.</li> <li>• Looks at what promotes green innovation.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model uses small sample size.</li> <li>• Looks at the situation from a business perspective only, and not (direct) benefits to a country.</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

**Connections:**

- ❖ Other sources have mentioned how innovation and green innovation have become the new competitive advantage for a company, but did not look at the relationship between green innovation and their success. This article addresses the relationship and uses a model to show how green innovation, competitive advantage, and success are all related.
- ❖ Competitive advantage has become a topic in the innovation section of the paper, because it means American companies will lose to foreign competitors. These source discusses directly how not having the competitive advantage will lead to companies/products facing more difficulties and having shorter life spans.
- ❖ President Trump mentioned the Paris Climate Agreement would affect GDP, but the source here states that green innovation, if done managed properly, can lead to major success. The article may be referring to a company, but when companies do well, it helps the country to do such as well.

**Questions/Concerns:**

- ❖ A study with a bigger sample size?
- ❖ Connection to economic development?