

The Show Must Go On? Revisiting the Script of International Climate Cooperation Ten Years After Paris

*Florian Steig***, Eva Lövbrand**, Angela Oels**, Jonathan Barnes, Diana Eriksson Lagerqvist, Marie Fischer, Jennifer Gabrys, Aarti Gupta, Maarten Hajer, Phoebe Hamilton Jones, Maria Jernnäs, Cecilia Oliveira Jeroen Oomen, and Johannes Strippel*

Abstract

This special issue reflects on the state and direction of global climate governance ten years after the adoption of the Paris Agreement. Informed by Michel Foucault's political thought and the wider field of climate governmentality studies that his work has inspired, we trace the power/knowledge regimes, political rationalities, and many practical tools and techniques that make climate change thinkable and knowable as a political problem. In this introduction, we draw upon the contributions to this special issue to examine how the Paris climate regime reinvents itself to maintain legitimacy amid geopolitical rivalry, rising anti-climate populism, and accelerating climate crises. We identify four practices that work to stabilize this governmental regime by promising future improvements, governmentalizing new frontiers, normalizing overshoot and climate disaster, and funneling climate expertise. We conclude by reflecting on the role and responsibility of global environmental politics scholarship in upholding, resisting, or rewriting this script of international climate cooperation.

Keywords: Climate politics, Paris Agreement, governmentality, Foucault, discourse, overshoot

In a speech at the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2026, Canadian prime minister Mark Carney reflected on the recent rupture in the rules-based international order. Invoking the Czech dissident Václav Havel, Carney shared the parable of the shopkeeper who supported the communist regime by placing

* Corresponding author: florian.steig@ouce.ox.ac.uk

** Eva Lövbrand, Angela Oels, and Florian Steig are the guest editors of this special issue and the lead authors of this introduction. The text has developed in close dialogue with the contributors to this special issue and reflects important input offered by the full list of authors.

a sign in his shop window each morning. He concluded that “the system’s power comes not from its truth, but from everyone’s willingness to perform as if it were true, and its fragility comes from the same source. When even one person stops performing, when the greengrocer removes his sign, the illusion begins to crack” (World Economic Forum 2026). Carney’s speech went viral and highlights what poststructuralist scholars have long argued: social and political realities are not fixed but continuously and intersubjectively (re)produced through shared practices and expectations, often adhering to implicit scripts. In these scripts we can discern distinct problematizations and codes of conduct that govern what is possible to think, say, and do in given political settings—what Michel Foucault (1991a) once termed *governmentality*.

In this special issue, we use Carney’s poststructuralist insights as a starting point to reflect upon the state and direction of global climate governance ten years after the adoption of the Paris Agreement. Informed by Foucault’s political thought and the wider field of climate governmentality studies that his work has inspired (e.g., Lövbrand and Strippel 2011; Oels 2005; Steig and Oels 2025; Strippel and Bulkeley 2014), we ask in this introduction how the “script” of international climate cooperation (Aykut et al. 2022; Hajer and Oomen 2025; Oomen and Hajer, this issue) is discursively (re)produced, performed, and reconfigured at a time when the very foundation of “liberal environmentalism” (Bernstein 2001) is under threat by great power rivalry, rising anti-climate populism, and accelerating climate disasters. How can it be that the annual Conferences of the Parties (COPs) to the 1992 UNFCCC, serving as the Meetings of the Parties to the 2015 Paris Agreement, continue as normal when the world as we know it is coming undone? How can countries claim that “the Paris Agreement is working” (UNFCCC 2025a, section 1, para. 11) when their nationally determined contributions (NDCs) are clearly “off target” and leading us to a 2.8°C warmer world by the end of this century (UNEP 2025)?

To answer these questions, this issue brings together contributions from leading critical-interpretative scholars across political science, science and technology studies, sociology, and human geography. Rather than starting from an a priori assumption about what kind of problem climate change *is*, the articles included in this volume direct analytical attention to the power/knowledge regimes, political rationalities, and many practical tools and techniques that make climate change thinkable and knowable as a political problem. In line with an evolving global environmental politics (GEP) scholarship, we recognize that the construction of climate change as a field of intervention is a complex process that involves “multiple sites, manifold practices and myriad actors” (Paterson et al. 2026, 59). Although the political study of climate change was long centered around the “principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures” (Krasner 1983, 2) of the UNFCCC, it has over the past decades expanded into new social and political domains and today encompasses a transnational (Bulkeley et al. 2014) and polycentric (Jordan et al. 2018) regime complex (Keohane and Victor 2011) of actors, institutions, and practices.

By attending to the multiple and often bewildering ways in which “climate governance is accomplished” (Bulkeley 2016, 3) after Paris, our volume contributes to the ongoing expansion of this journal’s core elements—“global, environment, and politics” (DeSombre 2026, 2). However, instead of thinking of this ever-expanding array of governmental sites and practices as “outside” or “beyond” the international climate regime (Okereke et al. 2009), we are interested in the political rationalities that hold them together and thereby help to “create a discursive field in which exercising of power is ‘rationalized’” (Lemke 2012, 81). For Foucault and his followers, political rationalities are not neutral knowledge that simply represents the governed reality; rather, knowledge is a constitutive element of government itself that specifies what and who is in need of government, who can govern, and what governing is all about (Gordon 1991, 3). Pinning down the rationalities at play in the exercise of climate governance is therefore a key task for governmentality scholars. It is a careful empirical exercise, we argue, that directs attention to the many small and often mundane devices of writing, listing, numbering, and computing that make climate change visible as a problem with a distinct set of properties and characteristics.

Several contributions to this volume approach UN climate summits as vibrant empirical sites for such studies of climate governmentality. Following long-standing critical-interpretivist GEP scholarship (Bäckstrand and Lövbrand 2006; Bernstein 2001; Campbell et al. 2014; Death 2010; Vanhala 2025), we here think of the annual climate COPs as exemplary events where political rationalities are (re)produced, enacted, and contested in front of global audiences. While these environmental megaevents offer a powerful theatrical stage on which multiple actors can perform the drama of global climate politics (Aykut et al. 2022), they also function as sites of governmentality that project certain fields of visibility, define and normalize standards of behavior, and produce distinct forms of subjectivity (Death 2010). Since the early 1990s, this dramaturgical regime has been animated by cosmopolitan ideas of a world community—a universal global “We”—bound together by a common ecological fate (Hamilton 2019; Randalls 2016; Steig, this issue). Although three decades of international climate cooperation have demonstrated the fragility of this “imagined community” (Anderson 2006), the Paris Agreement continues to invite a multiplicity of state and nonstate actors to “join hands” and “rally together” in defense of our One Earth and shared planetary future (Jernnäs and Lövbrand 2022).

In recent years, this “summit theatre” (Death 2011) has been challenged by populist uprising and growing party polarization on climate change (Fisher et al. 2023). Across the liberal democratic West, an anti-climate movement is pushing back against the costs of decarbonization and the reorganization of everyday infrastructures of energy, mobility, and food (Huber et al. 2021). As the Paris Agreement’s climate agenda moves from abstract targets into the material organization of social life, it is increasingly depicted as an elite intrusion into people’s private lives (Daggett 2018). At the same time, a growing radical

flank of the climate movement is openly accusing the institutions tasked with governing climate change of covering up their failures (Meyer 2024). Diverse youth groups and grassroots activists now insist on telling the truth about our unfolding climate crisis (Buhre 2025), and a new climate collapse movement is building self-organized structures for prepping in the face of impending doom (Cassegård and Thörn 2018). Russia's war on Ukraine and the recent US–Israeli attacks on Iran have further troubled the sense of “planetary togetherness” (Jasanoff 2001, 334) that underpins the annual climate COPs and given fossil fuel independence a new sense of urgency.

In the remainder of this introduction, we examine how the Paris climate regime is rationalized, performed, and reconfigured at this troubled political moment. We begin by placing the special issue in dialogue with two decades of climate governmentality studies and previous analyses of the political rationalities that hold the Paris Agreement together. Second, we draw on the contributions to this special issue to examine how the Paris climate regime reinvents itself to maintain legitimacy and rationalize failure to achieve self-set goals. We identify four practices that work to stabilize this governmental regime by *promising future improvements, governmentalizing new frontiers, normalizing overshoot and climate disaster, and funneling climate expertise*. We conclude by reflecting on the role and responsibility of GEP scholarship in upholding, resisting, or rewriting this liberal environmental script of international climate cooperation.

Two Decades of Climate Governmentality Studies

Over the past two decades, climate governmentality studies has gained ground as a field of research that seeks to understand how climate change is “rendered governable” (Bulkeley 2016; Lövbrand and Stripple 2011; Oels 2005; Stripple and Bulkeley 2014). Inspired by Michel Foucault's decentered and relational account of power, work in this field has attended to the different styles of thought and forms of knowledge, practical tools and techniques, expert calculations and vocabularies, that give climate governance form and effect. Although provisional and far from a unified theory, Foucault's work on governmentality has encouraged scholars to detach the term *government* from *state* and to see how “a whole variety of authorities govern in different sites, in relation to different objectives” (Rose et al. 2006, 85). The open definition of *government* as “the conduct of conduct” (Gordon 1991, 48) has invited novel perspectives on the forms and operations of power in global climate governance (Lövbrand and Stripple 2014; Steig and Oels 2025). Rather than approaching power as a zero-sum game within an a priori structural distribution, Foucauldian analytics of government direct attention to “how different locales are constituted as authoritative and powerful, how different agents are assembled with specific powers, and how different domains are constituted as governable and administrable” (Dean 2010, 40).

By beginning the study of climate governance from below, in the specific “dispositions, maneuvers, tactics, techniques, functionings” of power (Foucault 1991b, 26), governmentality studies often look for climate politics where we typically do not expect to find it—for example, in mundane bureaucratic practices (see Barnes, this issue; Lövbrand et al., this issue), in scientific documents such as the IPCC reports (see Oomen and Hajer, this issue), or in digital technologies to monitor and optimize the environment (see Gabrys and Hamilton Jones, this issue; Oliveira, this issue). As explained by Walters (2012, 57), studies of governmentality “do not presume to know in advance what actors are like, what kinds of actions and ends they are predisposed towards, what kind of stuff the political world is made out of, or what kind of dynamics animate its movement.” Governmentality is best understood as an “analytical toolbox” (Rose et al. 2006, 100) that allows us to study how the world is ontologized in the first place. This toolbox converges around an empirical interest in government as a practical activity that can be studied, historicized, and specified at the level of the rationalities, techniques, and subjectivities that underpin it and give it form and effect (Walters 2012, 2).

From work in this field emerge empirically dense analyses of how climate governance is accomplished in practical terms and “for whom, why, and, in the end, with what outcomes” (Fransen and Bulkeley 2024, 81). The UNFCCC has, in this Foucault-inspired literature, been characterized as a regime of biopower that extends the concern of government to the planetary and the very life support systems upon which human populations depend (Bäckstrand and Lövbrand 2006; Oels 2005; Rutherford 1999). Through a complex knowledge infrastructure of data collection stations, measurement techniques, and standardized metrics (Edwards 2010), climate change was made thinkable as a “system of systems” (Luke 1997, 79) in need of intergovernmental monitoring, management, and control (Corry 2024; Jasanoff 2004).

Since the adoption of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, this biopolitical administration of the Earth’s climate system has increasingly been accomplished by responsabilizing states, corporations, and individuals to become entrepreneurs of climate action (Oels 2005). The proliferation of carbon markets, product labeling, and footprinting schemes in the early 2000s has, in the Foucauldian literature, been interpreted as an articulation of a neoliberal form of climate rule that seeks to activate the “free” subject as an instrument in the achievement of governmental objectives (Bulkeley et al. 2016; Levenda 2019; Paterson and Strippel 2010). The Paris Agreement’s experimentation with catalytic and “nationally appropriate” forms of governing has further expanded and sedimented this neoliberal governmentality in policy and discourse. Through an ever-expanding array of benchmarks, performance indicators, and good practice guidance, the Paris Agreement seeks to enroll state and nonstate actors as free and responsible partners in “the global race to net-zero emissions” (Jernnäs 2024; Jernnäs and Lövbrand 2022). In view of a rapidly shrinking carbon

budget, actors of all kinds are now expected to “care for the low carbon self” and subordinate their desires to the common planetary good (Luke 2016).

Steig and Oels (2025) have coined the term *Paris cli-mentality* to denote this historically specific governmental regime, which combines the care of bio-power with activating elements of neoliberal government. In their review of 120 climate governmentality papers published since 2015, they demonstrate how the political rationalities that underpin the Paris Agreement have narrowed the solution space for climate action to incremental, technomanagerial interventions while obscuring structural drivers of the climate crisis (Steig and Oels 2025). In this special issue, we examine how this Paris cli-mentality is rationalized and sustained when confronted with temperature overshoot, political pushback, and accelerating climate impacts. Just as the rule-based international order referred to by Carney in his Davos speech requires constant discursive reproduction to prevail, we note that the voluntarism of the Paris era requires that state and nonstate actors continue to perform as responsible partners in pursuing the common ecological good.

Drawing on empirical insights from the contributions to this special issue, we here identify four stabilizing practices that keep the Paris cli-mentality and its underlying dramaturgical script intact. Whereas each practice illustrates how the Paris regime absorbs critique and renews its claim to authority, Foucault (1976, 95) reminds us that “where there is power, there is resistance.” In this spirit, and informed by participant observation at the thirtieth COP (COP30) in Belém in November 2025, we also point to small cracks in and resistances to the Paris cli-mentality that might reconfigure the drama of international climate cooperation in the years to come.

The Promise of Future Improvements

The Paris Agreement is known for its “pledge and review” system, which seeks to align the strategies and preferences of states through incremental action (Hale 2020). Rather than committing states to mandatory emission cuts, the Paris Agreement invites states to regularly submit updated NDCs and thereby ratchet up their climate ambition over time. Over the past years, numerous UNEP reports have problematized the gap between estimated global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions resulting from states’ NDCs and the emissions consistent with a 1.5°C and 2°C temperature pathway (e.g., UNEP 2025). Hence the “emissions gap” and the “ambition gap” have become part of the Paris Agreement’s standard terminology. While these demonstrated gaps highlight the “dangerous incrementalism of the Paris Agreement” (Allan 2019), they do not disqualify the Paris cli-mentality as such. Rather, gaps are central to the Paris Agreement’s catalytic logic (Hale 2020) and form a central “problematics of government” within which the exercise of power is rationalized (Rose and Miller 1992). Article 4.3 of the Paris Agreement establishes the NDC as a project of continuous improvement, and climate governance post-Paris therefore operates through

promises of enhanced future climate ambition and accelerated policy implementation.

Several contributions to this special issue draw attention to the wide range of tools, schemes, and strategies that underpin the Paris climate agreement's catalytic logic. Eva Lövbrand, Maria Jernnäs, and Aarti Gupta (this issue) examine the power that resides in the seemingly technical and mundane transparency provisions of the Paris Agreement. Through a close examination of the Enhanced Transparency Framework, they identify a power-knowledge regime that acts upon the agency of states and their capacity to measure the climate performance of themselves and others. Governing is here less about constraining states' freedom through emission targets and timetables and more about stimulating and nurturing a kind of responsabilized freedom. Similarly, Jonathan Barnes (this issue) demonstrates how the Paris Agreement's climate finance mechanisms have institutionalized a results-based management framework to channel funding to climate adaptation projects. He argues that the success of climate finance is evaluated based on money spent rather than material improvements to people's lives. The legitimacy of adaptation projects here stems from the *ex ante* measurement of anticipated project outcomes, which contains promises of future improvements once the money is allocated. By serving as placeholders of desired climate futures, these promises confer political authority to the Green Climate Fund despite uncertain outcomes in the present.

In the Paris era, climate governance relies on the narrative trope that success is around the corner despite demonstrated failure in the present. Through neoliberal technologies of activation and responsabilization, the promise of incremental improvement is still intact and appears to further reinforce the agreement's core logic. With (even) more transparency, accountability, partnering, and collaboration, states will eventually demonstrate that "the Paris Agreement is working" (UNFCCC 2025a, sec. 1, para. 11). Numerous Foucauldian scholars have paid close attention to the symbols, rituals, and discourses that allow this performance to go on (Aykut et al. 2021; Bäckstrand and Lövbrand 2019; Death 2010; Jernnäs and Lövbrand 2022). At a time when the objective of the UN climate regime is no longer the production of new legal norms but the alignment of state and nonstate actors' expectations on the prospect of a low-carbon future, the signals and momentum generated by the annual COPs are key (Aykut et al. 2021, 524). At the closing ceremony of COP30, UN climate change executive secretary Simon Stiell therefore insisted that "climate cooperation is alive and kicking, keeping humanity in the fight for a livable planet, with a firm resolve to keep 1.5C within reach" (UNFCCC 2025c).

However, COP30 also demonstrated cracks in this promissory script. In the run-up to the conference, states showed a marked reluctance to comply with the procedural requirements of the Paris Agreement. Only sixty-four out of 196 states had submitted updated NDCs by the (already extended) September 2025 deadline (UNFCCC 2025b), challenging the slow grind of climate bureaucracy that the Paris Agreement's incremental approach seeks to institutionalize. On

November 15, 2025, thousands of protesters marched through the streets of Belém demanding recognition of Indigenous land rights, a phaseout of fossil fuels, and accountability from large polluters. The phaseout of fossil fuels has long been a taboo in climate policy discourse, and COP30 in Belém failed once more to make reference to a “road map” to transition away from fossil fuels, which was supported by eighty-two countries. Still, the Netherlands and Colombia hosted the first Transitioning Away from Fossil Fuels conference on April 24–29, 2026, in Santa Marta, Colombia, including a science preconference, and thereby sought to expand what is possible to say and do in the drama of international climate cooperation.

The Constant Governmentalization of New Domains

Over the past decades, climate change has emerged as a “frame of reference through which other policy issues and forms of global activism are mediated and hierarchized” (Aykut and Maertens 2022, 501; Hulme 2023). This “climatization” (Oels 2012) of social and political life rests upon a complex body of knowledge, techniques, and vocabularies (e.g., carbon metrics, integrated assessment models, satellites, and sensors) that constantly expands the grid of climate governance to new domains. We argue that these “[ever-]changing contours of climate politics” (Paterson et al. 2026) represent an important governmental technology through which the Paris climate regime reproduces its legitimacy. By identifying new fields of political intervention, an increasing number of objects (e.g., the ocean, the Arctic) are now translated into governmental problems that states can collectively address (Allan 2017). Through the constant expansion and reconfiguration of what counts as climate governance, new “solutions” (such as blue carbon or AI-based instruments) are surfaced, keeping the self-set climate goals in reach.

In their contribution to this special issue, Jennifer Gabrys and Phoebe Hamilton-Jones find that climate change in recent years has been made thinkable as a problem to which digital technologies are the answer—a condition they call “techno-climentality.” Technologies for environmental monitoring, optimization, automation, and transformation—from robotic tree planting to cloud seeding—constitute a growing area of eco-innovation and entrepreneurship that is currently reworking the sites, practices, and actors of climate governance. Marketed as efficacious and “hopeful” countermeasures in response to expected overshoot, digital technologies increasingly function as distributed mechanisms of power (Steig et al. 2025) that make environments governable through expert-driven infrastructures, metrics, and AI-driven analytics (Gabrys 2016; Gabrys and Hamilton Jones, this issue; Kloppenburg et al. 2022). In this rationality, monitoring and optimization of ever-increasing sites and variables, rather than the transformation of socioeconomic systems, emerge as the central problem of governing.

Cecilia Oliveira (this issue) illustrates how these technical ways of knowing and seeing climate change have turned the Amazon into a “transterritorial space of governmentality” defined by its global and planetary utility. Just as biodiversity governance (Fransen and Bulkeley 2024) and the “blue economy” (Choi 2017) discursively transform marshes, mangroves, and seagrasses into nature-based solutions and marketable carbon sinks, the Amazon forest is today governmentalized as a new frontier of climate-political intervention. Through diplomatic practices, finance flows, and knowledge infrastructures, the Amazon is rendered amenable for global climate governance frameworks, often sidelining local knowledges and realities.

While this climatization (Oels 2012) of the Amazon, the ocean, and similar territories inflicts new subject positions on, for example, forest communities and “vulnerable” populations (Mills-Novoa et al. 2020; Müller 2017), it is often resisted on the local level (Collins 2019; Kaika 2017; Mills-Novoa and Mikulewicz 2025). The digital infrastructures and devices that underpin the Paris cli-mentality may favor measurable and technocratic forms of intervention but can also be repurposed and transformed to validate local (forest) knowledge and enhance (forest) livelihoods (Gabrys and Hamilton Jones, this issue).

The Normalization of Overshoot and Climate Disaster

Since the adoption of the Paris Agreement, limiting global warming to 1.5°C has been the biopolitical baseline for global climate governance. However, with an unabated rise in global GHG emissions, the expectation of temporary temperature “overshoot” (Malm and Carton 2024) is now gaining traction in climate science and policy discourse. At COP30 in Belém, parties reiterated their “resolve to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C, to limit both the magnitude and the duration of any temperature overshoot” in the Global Mutirão decision (UNFCCC 2025a, sec. 1, para. 7). From a governmentality perspective, overshoot can be understood as a discursive adaptation that allows the dramaturgical script of the Paris climate regime to maintain legitimacy in view of a rapidly shrinking global carbon budget. Rather than signaling the end of the Paris cli-mentality, overshoot thus appears as part of its ongoing reconfiguration.

Numerous studies of climate governmentality have pointed to a gradual normalization of overshoot and adverse climate impacts through the concept of “resilience” (e.g., De Roeck 2019; Jackson 2024; Methmann and Oels 2015). In its dominant articulation, resilience operates as a neoliberal governmentality that responsabilizes substate and nonstate actors to prepare for and live with unfolding climate disasters (Methmann and Oels 2015) and reframes vulnerability as “an opportunity to transform and adapt” (Joseph 2021, 63; see also Remling 2018). The resilience discourse contains powerful truth claims about the (un)inhabitability of certain regions, typically in the Global South (Weatherill 2023). Moreover, it renders other climate risks manageable by

“empowering” actors with the necessary skills, infrastructure, and dispositions to adapt (Jackson 2024; Jackson et al. 2023; Steig and Oels 2025; Tschakert and Wheatley 2025).

Florian Steig (this issue) demonstrates how this political rationality features in the emerging global politics of sea level rise adaptation. He examines the ways of seeing and knowing, discursive frames, and dramaturgical practices through which sea level rise is constituted as an object of global governance that can be tackled through multilevel cooperation. Steig illustrates how transnational actor coalitions turn coastal vulnerability into a biophysical rather than an inherently political and social condition, thereby undermining the potential of global adaptation efforts to achieve transformative change. Through technical assessments of “viability” and economic cost–benefit analyses, interventions like managed retreat are rationalized and depoliticized (Steig, this issue).

Similar rationalities are also visible in the governance of climate-induced loss and damage (L&D). Fischer and Oels (this issue) explore how the newly established Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage seeks to empower recipients to become resilient and to attract further payments, especially from the private sector. Given the shortage of money, Fischer and Oels find that the fund governs by negotiating what it means to be “particularly vulnerable” and where the border to expected “uninhabitability” lies. What began in 1992 as a crusade to hold historic emitters in the Global North liable for climate-induced losses and damages has over the past ten years of negotiation resulted in “an empty bucket” that deflects cries for climate justice. Rather than challenging or breaking the script of international climate cooperation, L&D has been absorbed by it and become part of its ongoing reconfiguration.

Efforts by the Global South to resist the “organized irresponsibility” (Steig and Oels 2025) institutionalized through the Paris Agreement were visible at COP30 in Belém. A case in point are the negotiations on the Third Review of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM), where language on scaling up finance for L&D was pushed by the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean, in collaboration with Vanuatu. The normalization of overshoot and climate disaster was also challenged by efforts to welcome the latest Advisory Opinion on Climate Change by the International Court of Justice in the preamble to the Third Review of the WIM. This crack in the script of international climate cooperation opens the possibility for future liability and reparations/compensation for climate harm (International Court of Justice 2025). At the same time, it suggests that the Paris Agreement is turning into a governmental regime increasingly tasked with managing unavowed catastrophe.

Diana Eriksson Lagerqvist and Johannes Stripple (this issue) explore the emerging power–knowledge configurations of living with and administering disaster. Rather than treating overshoot and climate disaster as singular future-breaking events, they understand “climate apocalypse” as a slow-moving and uneven biopolitical formation that manages how life should be organized,

whose lives are to be protected or exposed, and what kinds of subjects are called upon to live through the crisis. Eriksson Lagerqvist and Strippel identify three strategies of living through ecological breakdown: *avoidance* through withdrawal, enclosure, and insulation; *preparation* through alternative infrastructures and practices of readiness; and *endurance* through persistence, care, and grief amid collapse.

The Funneling of Climate Expertise

Climate governmentality studies is a field of inquiry concerned with how we *think* about governing. As such, it directs attention to the often taken-for-granted systems of thought and knowledge that define what kind of political problem climate change is and what expert techniques, devices, and practices are deemed necessary for its solution. In their contribution to this special issue, Jeroen Oomen and Maarten Hajer critically ask what forms of knowledge uphold the Paris Agreement and its neoliberal modes of governing. In line with long-standing critical scholarship (Castree et al. 2014; Lövbrand et al. 2015; Swyngedouw 2010), they identify a “script” that projects highly ritualized ways of thinking, knowing, and acting upon the climate science–policy interface. This script allows only a narrow range of expertise to speak authoritatively about climate change—namely, climate sciences and economics—and polices the adherence of others. Hence the power–knowledge regime of the Paris Agreement, institutionalized through the script of the science–policy interface, defines what constitutes successful climate governance and what it means to avert climate catastrophe. As a result, the imagined “corridor” for decision-making, its space for politics and future sociopolitical and economic configurations, is highly restricted (Beck and Oomen 2021; Hajer and Oomen 2025; Kanitkar et al. 2024).

As Oomen and Hajer (this issue) outline, the legitimacy of the Paris climate regime relies on the speculative promise that it can still deliver—that it is “only” five minutes to midnight. Central to this promise is the inclusion of negative emissions technologies (NETs) in the IPCC’s scenarios. Although NETs remain highly speculative, they render the Paris Agreement’s 1.5°C temperature target “feasible” even when global GHG emissions show no sign of peaking (Beck and Mahony 2018; Low and Boettcher 2020; van Beek et al. 2022). In line with previous techno-optimist narratives, mitigation is thus rendered a matter of innovation and human ingenuity, and the achievement of climate goals a matter of time. Importantly, these imaginaries and future promises are coproduced by dominant environmental sciences. Norms of “neutrality” and “policy relevance” foster research in line “with the dominant frames and assumptions of . . . policy actors” (Turnhout 2024, 3) and thereby privilege the status quo.

In recent years, however, more and more greengrocers have removed their signs from the window. Critical social scientists have stopped pretending that climate change can be “fixed” within hegemonic power–knowledge

configurations (Nightingale et al. 2020; Stoddard et al. 2021) and now insist that dominant forms of climate science function as “an obstacle for transformative change” (Turnhout 2024, 2). Within the climate science community, an increasing number of experts are openly speaking of the Paris Agreement’s 1.5°C target as “a fairy tale” (Bart van den Hurk) and calling large-scale carbon dioxide removal “a fantasy” (Fatih Birol). With the renewed withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement and the IPCC process, the institutional underpinnings of the science–policy script are also changing. Since January 2025, the US federal Environmental Protection Agency has seen a layoff of more than 25 percent of its staff (Kozlov et al. 2026), the prestigious US Global Change Research program has been terminated (Igini 2026), and the National Science Foundation is no longer funding grant proposals with “climate change” in the abstract or title.

As a reaction, the Brazilian presidency framed COP30 in Belém as “the COP of truth” and requested the setup of the first ever Planetary Science Pavilion in the history of UN Climate Change Conferences. While this Brazilian initiative illustrates how the script of international climate cooperation continues to be enacted and performed, it also points to cracks and ongoing reconfigurations of the science–policy interface on climate change.

Looking Ahead

In this introduction we have asked how it is possible that the thirtieth UN Climate Change Conference in Belém in November 2025 went down as another “routine” COP amid international conflicts, rising climate populism, and official recognition of likely overshoot. Informed by the contributions to this special issue, we identified four stabilizing practices that keep the “Paris mentality” and its underlying script of international climate cooperation intact by promising future improvements, expanding its fields of intervention, normalizing overshoot and climate disaster, and funneling climate expertise. Like Canadian prime minister Mark Carney, we contend that the power and persistence of this governmental script comes not from its truth but from everyone’s willingness to perform as if it were true. When enough actors stop performing, the script begins to unravel.

To scholars who have long pointed to the limitations of (neo)liberal environmentalism, this troubled moment in the history of global climate politics may appear as a window of opportunity. The decentralized, voluntary, and incremental modes of governing that underpin the Paris climate regime have been useful for high emitters, allowing them to deflect responsibility and to delay the societal transformation that structural decarbonization entails (Bulkeley et al. 2016; Steig and Oels 2025). Although the liberal environmental rationalities that underpin the annual climate COPs have been criticized for fostering “collaborative management of sustained unsustainability” (Blühdorn and Deflorian 2019), they should not be interpreted as a mere deception or

manipulation by powerful elites. As outlined in this special issue, UN climate summitry is better understood as a form of exemplary politics performed and enacted by state and nonstate actors to cope with the seemingly irresolvable dilemmas of international climate cooperation. This summit theater has been challenged by developing countries and climate justice activists for many years. As highlighted by Colombia in the Mutirão negotiations in Belém on November 13, 2025, the COP process has for long kept the Global South in a “toxic relationship.” While Canada urged parties to “avoid divorce,” Colombia insisted that a breakup is necessary to enable a just, equitable, and orderly transition away from fossil fuels.

Is it therefore, as Carney suggests in his Davos speech, “time for companies and countries to put their signs down” (World Economic Forum 2026) and stop performing the (neo)liberal script of international climate cooperation? Is this a moment of possibility to alter and expand the solution space for global climate governance? While moments of rupture may give way to new political imaginaries and practices, they also carry risks, as competing political projects seek to redefine the terms on which climate futures are governed. If the institutions, discourses, and subject positions that have long structured climate governance lose some of their stabilizing force, what forms of politics might emerge in their place? Will an unraveling of the script undo the progress made by three decades of international climate cooperation? How can the script be rewritten without abandoning the project of climate multilateralism and evidence-based policymaking altogether?

To us, questions of this sort form a pressing research agenda for GEP scholarship in the years to come. We agree with Paterson et al. (2026) that the shifting sites, dynamics, relations, and forms of climate politics call for adaptive, improvisational, and experimental forms of future research. In this special issue, we propose that Foucault’s analytical toolbox is well suited to contribute to such an agenda. Rather than offering a theory in the strong sense of the term, climate governmentality studies invite close empirical attention to dominant (but always mutable) ways of thinking, knowing, and acting that give climate governance form and effect. We recognize the power of such governmental scripts to act upon our own academic practices and to shape what we (can) say and do. Rather than thinking about critical research as transcendent, we are well aware that our own knowledge is deeply enmeshed in the construction and framing of the very problems that global climate governance seeks to resolve. How we as GEP scholars come to understand and act upon ourselves within established regimes of authority and knowledge will thus affect how climate change is (re)configured as a political problem in the years to come.

In this volume, we seek to open such problem descriptions to critical scrutiny by interrogating “how they came about, how power operates through them, and, ultimately, how they could be different” (Bäckstrand and Lövbrand 2019, 522). By attending to subtle shifts, failures, and resistances in the rationalities, technologies, and strategies of climate governance after Paris, we aim to

challenge the inevitability of established systems of governance and put them to the test of our troubled political present. When we as GEP scholars come to understand how the script of international climate cooperation is discursively (re)produced, rationalized, performed, and resisted, we can also contribute to its rewriting.

Florian Steig is a doctoral researcher at the School of Geography and the Environment, University of Oxford. His research focuses on the actor networks and discourses that underpin the emerging global politics of sea level rise adaptation. His wider research interests include international climate politics and the interface of digitalization and sustainability. His recent coauthored publications include "Governing the Climate in the Paris Era: Organized Irresponsibility, Technocratic Climate Futures, and Normalized Disasters," *WIREs Climate Change* 16 (2), and "Sustainability Powered by Digitalization? (Re-)politicizing the Debate," *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy* 21 (1).

Eva Lövbrand is a professor in environmental change at the Department of Thematic Studies, Linköping University, Sweden. Her research examines the ideas, knowledge systems, and expert practices that underpin global environmental politics and governance. Eva is coeditor of the volumes *Environmental Politics and Deliberative Democracy: Exploring the Promise of New Modes of Governance* (2010), *Research Handbook on Climate Governance* (2015), *Anthropocene Encounters: New Directions in Green Political Thinking* (2019), and *Anthropocene (In)Securities: Reflections on Collective Survival 50 Years After the Stockholm Conference* (2021).

Angela Oels is a professor of climate politics at the Centre for Climate Resilience and director of the Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Augsburg, Germany. Moreover, she is elected chairwoman of the German Climate Consortium, the federal association of the twenty-seven leading German climate research institutions. As a discourse and governmentality scholar, her work explores how dominant problematizations of climate change, digitalization/artificial intelligence, and democracy constitute the available solution space for policymaking.

Jonathan Barnes is a critical human geographer of climate and development whose work engages with questions of governance and finance. He is a Research Fellow in Climate Change Adaptation at University College London (UCL). Prior to joining UCL, he worked in Research roles at the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and at the Commonwealth Secretariat. His PhD research, carried out at the London School of Economics (LSE), explored Green Climate Fund (GCF) project development in South Africa through a climate justice lens.

Diana Eriksson Lagerqvist is a PhD candidate in Political Science at Lund University, Sweden. Her research focuses on environmental politics, green political theory, and critical theory. Her doctoral project explores imaginaries, subjectivity, and desire in times of planetary crisis. More specifically, she examines eco-communities as sites for investigating the relationship between imagined and enacted futures, and the forms of political subjectivity that emerge through these processes.

Marie Fischer is a PhD student and research associate at the Centre for Climate Resilience at the University of Augsburg, Germany. Her research combines a Foucauldian governmentality lens with decolonial theories to understand how the dominant governmentality on Loss and Damage from climate change is contested by multisited counter-conduct. Marie's work is inspired by her interdisciplinary background, having an MA in environmental ethics and a BA in international cultural and business studies.

Jennifer Gabrys is Chair in Media, Culture and Environment in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge. She leads the Planetary Praxis research group and was Principal Investigator on the ERC-funded project, Smart Forests: Transforming Environments into Social-Political Technologies. *Her publications include* *Citizens of Worlds: Open-Air Toolkits for Environmental Struggle* (2022), *How to Do Things with Sensors* (2019), *Program Earth: Environmental Sensing Technology and the Making of a Computational Planet* (2016), and *Digital Rubbish: A Natural History of Electronics* (2011). Her work can be found at planetarypraxis.org and jennifergabrys.net.

Aarti Gupta is Professor of Global Environmental Governance at Wageningen University, The Netherlands. Her research focuses on accountability, transparency and equity in global environmental and climate governance, and the challenges of anticipatory governance of novel technologies, including modern biotechnology and solar geoengineering. Among other publications, she is co-editor of *Transparency in Global Environmental Governance: Critical perspectives* (MIT Press). She is co-initiator and currently co-leads an academic initiative consisting of more than 600 scientists calling for an International Non-Use Agreement on Solar Geoengineering. She is the recipient of the 2026 Engaged Scholar Award from the International Studies Association's Environmental Studies Section.

Maarten A. Hajer is distinguished professor Urban Futures and Futuring and Director of the Urban Futures Studio. Previously Hajer was professor of Public Policy at the University of Amsterdam (1998–2015) and Director-General of the PBL – Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (2008–2015). He is the author of many scholarly books and articles, including *The Politics of Environmental Discourse* (Oxford University Press, 1995) and *Captured Futures: Rethinking*

the Drama of Environmental Politics (Oxford University Press, 2025, with Jeroen Oomen). Additionally, Maarten Hajer was a member of UNEP's International Resource Panel (IRP) from 2010 until he stepped down in 2025. Website link: <https://www.uu.nl/staff/MAHajer>.

Phoebe Hamilton-Jones is a Senior Social Researcher in the Environmental Land Management team at Defra (the UK Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs). Phoebe previously worked as a Policy Analyst within the Planetary Praxis research group in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge. She is interested in the intersections between policy making and academia, in the socio-political dynamics of rewilding and landscape regeneration, and in interdisciplinary approaches to environmental debates. Phoebe's academic background crosses humanities and social science disciplines. She has an MSc in Social and Cultural Anthropology from UCL and a BA in English Literature from the University of Cambridge.

Maria Jernnäs is an assistant professor in environmental change at the Department of Thematic Studies, Linköping University, Sweden. Her research focuses on the political rationalities, power dynamics, and governing practices of global climate politics. She is the author of the PhD thesis "Governing Climate Change Under the Paris Regime: Meeting Urgency with Voluntarism," and her work is widely published in journals such as *Global Environmental Change*, *Climate Policy*, *Earth System Governance*, and *Environmental Politics*.

M. Cecilia Oliveira is head of the Ecopolitics and Just Transformations (EcoPol) research group at RIFS Potsdam. A leading scholar in aesthetics and ecopolitics, she investigates how political and technological systems mediate neoliberal and ecological processes to shape societal understandings of planetary change. Her research focuses on climate change regimes, environmental justice, environmental media, and the circulation of data infrastructures, particularly within the Amazon region. Utilizing audiovisual ethnography and environmental humanities, her recent work explores ancestral infrastructures of technological knowledge and the politics of landscape. More details can be found via her RIFS Profile.

Jeroen Oomen is assistant professor at the Urban Futures Studio, where he researches the social, cultural, and scientific practices that create societies' conceptions of the future. Oomen is a recognized expert on futuring, environmental politics, and climate engineering. His books include *Captured Futures: Rethinking the Drama of Environmental Politics* (Oxford University Press, 2025, with Maarten Hajer) and *Imagining Climate Engineering: Dreaming of the Designer Climate*. Website link: <https://www.uu.nl/staff/JJOomen>.

Johannes Stripple is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Lund University, Sweden. His research explores climate politics and environmental

governance, with a particular focus on environmental futures—how they are envisioned, normalised, and otherwise imagined. He examines the cultural, temporal, and affective dimensions of societal transitions, tracing power across sites ranging from the United Nations to everyday life, including urban governance, infrastructure, markets, and the low-carbon self. He also develops speculative and immersive methods to explore how imaginaries of crisis and transformation shape political possibilities. He has co-edited three books with Cambridge University Press.

References

- Allan, Bentley B. 2017. Producing the Climate: States, Scientists, and the Constitution of Global Governance Objects. *International Organization* 71 (1): 131–162. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818316000321>
- Allan, Jen Iris. 2019. Dangerous Incrementalism of the Paris Agreement. *Global Environmental Politics* 19 (1): 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00488
- Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities*. Verso.
- Aykut, Stefan C., and Lucile Maertens. 2022. The Climatization of Global Politics: Introduction to the Special Issue. *International Politics* 58: 501–518. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-021-00325-0>
- Aykut, Stefan C., Edouard Morena, and Jean Foyer. 2021. Incantatory Governance: Global Climate Politics' Performative Turn and Its Wider Significance for Global Politics. *International Politics* 58 (4): 519–540. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-020-00250-8>, PubMed: 40476999
- Aykut, Stefan C., Felix Schenuit, Jan Klenke, and Emilie d'Amico. 2022. It's a Performance, Not an Orchestra! Rethinking Soft Coordination in Global Climate Governance. *Global Environmental Politics* 22 (4): 173–196. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00675
- Bäckstrand, Karin, and Eva Lövbrand. 2006. Planting Trees to Mitigate Climate Change: Contested Discourses of Ecological Modernization, Green Governmentality and Civic Environmentalism. *Global Environmental Politics* 6 (1): 50–75. <https://doi.org/10.1162/glep.2006.6.1.50>
- Bäckstrand, Karin, and Eva Lövbrand. 2019. The Road to Paris: Contending Climate Governance Discourses in the Post-Copenhagen Era. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 21 (5): 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2016.1150777>
- Beck, Silke, and Martin Mahony. 2018. The Politics of Anticipation: The IPCC and the Negative Emissions Technologies Experience. *Global Sustainability* 1: e8. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2018.7>
- Beck, Silke, and Jeroen Oomen. 2021. Imagining the Corridor of Climate Mitigation: What Is at Stake in IPCC's Politics of Anticipation? *Environmental Science and Policy* 123: 169–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.05.011>
- Bernstein, Steven. 2001. *The Compromise of Liberal Environmentalism*. Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/bern12036>
- Blühdorn, Ingolfur, and Michael Deflorian. 2019. The Collaborative Management of Sustained Unsustainability: On the Performance of Participatory Forms of Environmental Governance. *Sustainability* 11 (4): 1189. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11041189>
- Buhre, Frida. 2025. Dissensus Rhetoric in Youth Climate Justice Activism. *Environmental Communication* 19 (8): 1411–1427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2025.2470881>

- Bulkeley, Harriet. 2016. *Accomplishing Climate Governance*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139839204>
- Bulkeley, Harriet, Liliana Andonova, Michele Betsill, Daniel Compagnon, Thomas Hale, Matthew Hoffmann, Peter Newell, Matthew Paterson, Charles Roger, and Stacy D. VanDeveer. 2014. *Transnational Climate Change Governance*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706033>
- Bulkeley, Harriet, Matthew Paterson, and Johannes Strippel. 2016. *Towards a Cultural Politics of Climate Change: Devices, Desires and Dissent*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316694473>
- Campbell, Lisa M., Catherine Corson, Noella J. Gray, Kenneth I. MacDonald, and J. Peter Brosius. 2014. Studying Global Environmental Meetings to Understand Global Environmental Governance: Collaborative Event Ethnography at the Tenth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Global Environmental Politics* 14 (3): 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP_e_00236
- Cassegård, Carl, and Håkan Thörn. 2018. Toward a Postapocalyptic Environmentalism? Responses to Loss and Visions of the Future in Climate Activism. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 1 (4): 561–578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848618793331>
- Castree, Noel, William M. Adams, John Barry, et al. 2014. Changing the Intellectual Climate. *Nature Climate Change* 4 (9): 763–768. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ndclimate2339>
- Choi, Young Rae. 2017. The Blue Economy as Governmentality and the Making of New Spatial Rationalities. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 7 (1): 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820617691649>
- Collins, Yolanda Ariadne. 2019. Colonial Residue: REDD+, Territorialisation and the Racialized Subject in Guyana and Suriname. *Geoforum* 106: 38–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.07.019>
- Corry, Olaf. 2024. Making the Climate Malleable? Weak and Strong Governance Objects and the Transformation of International Climate Politics. *Global Studies Quarterly* 4 (3): ksae062. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isagsq/ksae062>
- Daggett, Cara. 2018. Petro-Masculinity: Fossil Fuels and Authoritarian Desire. *Millennium* 47 (1): 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829818775817>
- Dean, Mitchell. 2010. *Governmentality*. 2nd ed. SAGE.
- Death, Carl. 2010. *Governing Sustainable Development: Partnerships, Protests and Power at the World Summit*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203847411>
- Death, Carl. 2011. Summit Theatre: Exemplary Governmentality and Environmental Diplomacy in Johannesburg and Copenhagen. *Environmental Politics* 20 (1): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2011.538161>
- De Roeck, Frederik. 2019. Governmentality and the Climate–Development Nexus: The Case of the EU Global Climate Change Alliance. *Global Environmental Change* 55: 160–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.02.006>
- DeSombre, Elizabeth R. 2026. Expanding What Constitutes Global, Environmental, and Politics: Twenty-Five Years of Books in GEP. *Global Environmental Politics* 26 (1): 201–213. <https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP.a.21>
- Edwards, Paul N. 2010. *A Vast Machine: Computer Models, Climate Data, and the Politics of Global Warming*. MIT Press.
- Fisher, Stephen D., John Kenny, Wouter Poortinga, Gisela Bohm, and Linda Steg. 2023. The Politicization of Climate Change Attitudes in Europe. *Electoral Studies* 79: 102499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2022.102499>

- Foucault, Michel. 1976. *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*. Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991a. Governmentality. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller. University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991b. Questions of Method. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller. University of Chicago Press.
- Fransen, Anouk, and Harriet Bulkeley. 2024. Transnational Governing at the Climate–Biodiversity Frontier: Employing a Governmentality Perspective. *Global Environmental Politics* 24 (1): 76–99. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00726
- Gabrys, Jennifer. 2016. *Program Earth: Environmental Sensing Technology and the Making of Computational Planet*. University of Minnesota Press. <https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816693122.001.0001>
- Gordon, Colin. 1991. Governmental Rationality: An Introduction. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. University of Chicago Press.
- Hajer, Maarten A., and Jeroen Oomen. 2025. *Captured Futures: Rethinking the Drama of Environmental Politics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198955382.001.0001>
- Hale, Thomas. 2020. Catalytic Cooperation. *Global Environmental Politics* 20 (4): 73–98. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00561
- Hamilton, Scott. 2019. I Am Uncertain, but We Are Not: A New Subjectivity of the Anthropocene. *Review of International Studies* 45 (4): 607–626. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210519000135>
- Huber, Robert A., Tomas Maltby, Kacper Szulecki, and Stefan Četković. 2021. Is Populism a Challenge to European Energy and Climate Policy? Empirical Evidence Across Varieties of Populism. *Journal of European Public Policy* 28 (7): 998–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2021.1918214>
- Hulme, Mike. 2023. *Climate Change Isn't Everything: Liberating Climate Politics from Alarmism*. John Wiley.
- Igini, Martina. 2026. One Year of Trump: How the US Reversed Climate Progress, at Home and Abroad. Available at: <https://earth.org/one-year-of-trump-how-the-us-reversed-climate-progress-at-home-and-abroad/>, last accessed April 13, 2026.
- International Court of Justice. 2025. Obligations of States in Respect of Climate Change. July 23. Available at: <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/187/187-20250723-adv-01-00-en.pdf>, last accessed June 28, 2026.
- Jackson, Guy. 2024. The Influence of Climate Resilience Governmentality on Vulnerability in Regional Australia. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 7 (3): 1098–1121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25148486241226919>
- Jackson, Guy, Alicia N'Guetta, Salvatore Paolo de Rosa, et al. 2023. An Emerging Governmentality of Climate Change Loss and Damage. *Progress in Environmental Geography* 2 (1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/27539687221148748>
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2001. Image and Imagination: The Formation of Global Environmental Consciousness. In *Changing the Atmosphere: Expert Knowledge and Environmental Governance*, edited by Clark Miller and Paul Edwards. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1789.003.0013>
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2004. Heaven and Earth: The Politics of Environmental Images. In *Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance*, S. Jasanoff and M. Long Martello. MIT Press.

- Jernnäs, Maria. 2024. Governing Through the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC): Five Functions to Steer States' Climate Conduct. *Environmental Politics* 33 (3): 530–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2023.2192146>
- Jernnäs, Maria, and Eva Lövbrand. 2022. Accelerating Climate Action: The Politics of Nonstate Actor Engagement in the Paris Regime. *Global Environmental Politics* 22 (3): 38–58. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00660
- Jordan, Andrew, Dave Huitema, Harro van Asselt, and Johanna Forster, editors. 2018. *Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action?* Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108284646>
- Joseph, Jonathan. 2021. Variations of Governmentality Across the Globe: The Case of Resilience. In *The Globality of Governmentality: Governing an Entangled World*, edited by Jan Busse. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003044727-4>
- Kaika, Maria. 2017. "Don't Call Me Resilient Again!": The New Urban Agenda as Immunology . . . or . . . What Happens When Communities Refuse to Be Vaccinated with "Smart Cities" and Indicators. *Environment and Urbanization* 29 (1): 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247816684763>
- Kanitkar, Tejal, Akhil Mythri, and Thiagarajan Jayaraman. 2024. Equity Assessment of Global Mitigation Pathways in the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. *Climate Policy* 24 (8): 1129–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2024.2319029>
- Keohane, Robert O., and David G. Victor. 2011. The Regime Complex for Climate Change. *Perspectives on Politics* 9 (1): 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592710004068>
- Kloppenburger, Sanneke, Aarti Gupta, Sake R. L. Kruk, et al. 2022. Scrutinizing Environmental Governance in a Digital Age: New Ways of Seeing, Participating, and Intervening. *One Earth* 5 (3): 232–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.02.004>
- Kozlov, Max, Jeff Tollefson, and Dan Garisto. 2026. US Science After a Year of Trump. *Nature* 649: 815. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-026-00088-9>
- Krasner, Stephen D., editor. 1983. *International Regimes*. Cornell University Press.
- Lemke, Thomas. 2012. *Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique*. Paradigm.
- Levenda, Anthony M. 2019. Thinking Critically About Smart City Experimentation: Entrepreneurialism and Responsibilization in Urban Living Labs. *Local Environment* 24 (7): 565–579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2019.1598957>
- Lövbrand, Eva, Silke Beck, Jason Chilvers, et al. 2015. Who Speaks for the Future of Earth? How Critical Social Science Can Extend the Conversation on the Anthropocene. *Global Environmental Change* 32: 211–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.03.012>
- Lövbrand, Eva, and Johannes Striipple. 2011. Making Climate Change Governable: Accounting for Carbon as Sinks, Credits, and Personal Budgets. *Critical Policy Studies* 5 (2): 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2011.576531>
- Lövbrand, Eva, and Johannes Striipple. 2014. Governmentality. In *Critical Environmental Politics*, editor by Carl Death. Routledge.
- Low, Sean, and Miranda Boettcher. 2020. Delaying Decarbonization: Climate Governmentalities and Sociotechnical Strategies from Copenhagen to Paris. *Earth System Governance* 5: 100073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100073>
- Luke, Timothy W. 1997. *Ecocritique: Contesting the Politics of Nature, Economy, and Culture*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Luke, Timothy. 2016. Caring for the Low-Carbon Self: The Government of Self and Others in the World as a Greenhouse Gas. In *Towards a Cultural Politics of Climate Change: Devices, Desires, and Dissent*, edited by Harriet Bulkeley, Matthew Paterson,

- and Johannes Strippel. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316694473.005>
- Malm, Andreas, and Wim Carton. 2024. *Overshoot: How the World Surrendered to Climate Breakdown*. Verso.
- Methmann, Chris, and Angela Oels. 2015. From "Fearing" to "Empowering" Climate Refugees: Governing Climate-Induced Migration in the Name of Resilience. *Security Dialogue* 46 (1): 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010614552548>
- Meyer, John M. 2024. The People and Climate Justice: Reconceptualizing Populism and Pluralism Within Climate Politics. *Polity* 56 (2): 252–274. <https://doi.org/10.1086/729277>
- Mills-Novoa, Megan, Rutgerd Boelens, Jaime Hoogesteger, and Jeroen Vos. 2020. Governmentalities, Hydrosocial Territories and Recognition Politics: The Making of Objects and Subjects for Climate Change Adaptation in Ecuador. *Geoforum* 115: 90–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.06.024>
- Mills-Novoa, Megan, and Michael Mikulewicz. 2025. The Promise of Resistance: A New Lens for Climate Change Adaptation Research and Practice. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 16 (1): e922. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.922>
- Müller, Franziska. 2017. "Save the Planet, Plant a Tree!": REDD+ and Global/Local Forest Governance in the Anthropocene. *Resilience* 5 (3): 182–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2016.1241478>
- Nightingale, Andrea Joslyn, Siri Eriksen, Marcus Taylor, et al. 2020. Beyond Technical Fixes: Climate Solutions and the Great Derangement. *Climate and Development* 12 (4): 343–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2019.1624495>
- Oels, Angela. 2012. From "Securitization" of Climate Change to "Climatization" of the Security Field: Comparing Three Theoretical Perspectives. In *Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict: Challenges for Societal Stability*, edited by Jürgen Scheffran, Michael Brzoska, Hans Günter Brauch, Peter Michael Link, and Janpeter Schilling. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28626-1_9
- Oels, Angela. 2005. Rendering Climate Change Governable: From Biopower to Advanced Liberal Government? *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 7 (3): 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15239080500339661>
- Okereke, Chukwumerije, Harriet Bulkeley, and Heike Schroeder. 2009. Conceptualizing Climate Governance Beyond the International Regime. *Global Environmental Politics* 9 (1): 58–78. <https://doi.org/10.1162/glep.2009.9.1.58>
- Paterson, Matthew, Harriet Bulkeley, Peter Newell, and Stacy D. VanDeveer. 2026. The Changing Contours of Climate Politics. *Global Environmental Politics* 26 (1): 59–78. <https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP.a.702>
- Paterson, Matthew, and Johannes Strippel. 2010. My Space: Governing Individuals' Carbon Emissions. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (2): 341–362. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d4109>
- Randalls, Samuel. 2016. Climatic Globalities: Assembling the Problems of Global Climate Change. In *The Politics of Globality Since 1945*, edited by Rens van Munster and Casper Sylvest. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315628059-8>
- Remling, Elise. 2018. Depoliticizing Adaptation: A Critical Analysis of EU Climate Adaptation Policy. *Environmental Politics* 27 (3): 477–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1429207>
- Rose, Nikolas, and Peter Miller. 1992. Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government. *British Journal of Sociology* 43 (2): 173–205. <https://doi.org/10.2307/591464>

- Rose, Nicholas, Pat O'Malley, and Mariana Valverde. 2006. Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2 (1): 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.2.081805.105900>
- Rutherford, Paul. 1999. The Entry of Life into History. In *Discourses of the Environment*. Blackwell, edited by E. Darier.
- Steig, Florian, and Angela Oels. 2025. Governing the Climate in the Paris Era: Organized Irresponsibility, Technocratic Climate Futures, and Normalized Disasters. *WIREs Climate Change* 16 (2): e70001. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.70001>
- Steig, Florian, Pascal D. Koenig, Jens Marquardt, Angela Oels, Jörg Radtke, Rainer Rehak, and Sabine Weiland. 2025. Sustainability Powered by Digitalization? (Re-)Politicizing the Debate. *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy* 21 (1): 2521181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2025.2521181>
- Stoddard, Isak, Kevin Anderson, Stuart Capstick, et al. 2021. Three Decades of Climate Mitigation: Why Haven't We Bent the Global Emissions Curve? *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 46 (1): 653–689. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012220-011104>
- Strippel, Johannes, and Harriet Bulkeley, editors. 2014. *Governing the Climate: New Approaches to Rationality, Power and Politics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107110069>
- Swyngedouw, Erik. 2010. Apocalypse Forever? *Theory, Culture, and Society* 27 (2–3): 213–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409358728>
- Tschakert, Petra, and Alicia Wheatley. 2025. More-Than-Climate Politics in Rurality: Normative Pathways for Living with Loss and Vanishing Continuity in Place. *Journal of Rural Studies* 119: 103752. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2025.103752>
- Turnhout, Esther. 2024. A Better Knowledge Is Possible: Transforming Environmental Science for Justice and Pluralism. *Environmental Science and Policy* 155: 103729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2024.103729>
- UNEP. 2025. *Emissions Gap Report 2025: Off Target—Continued Collective Inaction Puts Global Temperature Goal at Risk*. UNEP.
- UNFCCC. 2025a. *Global Mutirão: Uniting Humanity in a Global Mobilization Against Climate Change*. Available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Mutir%C3%A3o_cop30.pdf, last accessed June 28, 2026.
- UNFCCC. 2025b. *Nationally Determined Contributions Under the Paris Agreement: Synthesis Report by the Secretariat*. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/650664>, last accessed June 28, 2026.
- UNFCCC. 2025c. Simon Stiell Closing Speech: “COP30 Showed That Climate Cooperation Is Alive and Kicking, Keeping Humanity in the Fight for a Livable Planet.” November 22. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/news/simon-stiell-closing-speech-cop30-showed-that-climate-cooperation-is-alive-and-kicking-keeping>, last accessed June 28, 2026.
- van Beek, Lisette, Jeroen Oomen, Maarten A. Hajer, Peter Pelzer, and Detlef van Vuuren. 2022. Navigating the Political: An Analysis of Political Calibration of Integrated Assessment Modelling in Light of the 1.5 C Goal. *Environmental Science and Policy* 133: 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.03.024>
- Vanhala, Lisa. 2025. *Governing the End: The Making of Climate Change Loss and Damage*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226843018.001.0001>

- Walters, William. 2012. *Governmentality: Critical Encounters*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203116937>
- Weatherill, Charlotte Kate. 2023. Sinking Paradise? Climate Change Vulnerability and Pacific Island Extinction Narratives. *Geoforum* 145: 103566. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2022.04.011>
- World Economic Forum. 2026. Special Address by Mark Carney, Prime Minister of Canada, Davos. January 20. Available at: <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2026/01/davos-2026-special-address-by-mark-carney-prime-minister-of-canada/>, last accessed July 1, 2026.

Corrected Proof