

# **U.S. POLICY TOWARDS GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS: FROM RIO TO JOHANESBURG**

*Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the award of the degree of*

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**

**RAM PRATAP SINGH**



**Centre for American and West European Studies  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi-110067  
2003**



CENTRE FOR AMERICAN & WEST EUROPEAN STUDIES  
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES  
**JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY**  
NEW DELHI - 110067

21 July 2003

**CERTIFICATE**

Certified that the dissertation entitled, "**U.S. POLICY TOWARDS GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS: FROM RIO TO JOHANESBURG**" submitted by **RAM PRATAP SINGH**, in partial fulfilment of the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy**, of this university is his original work. This dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this or any other university.

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

(Prof. Abdul Nafey)  
Chairperson

  
(Dr. K. P. Vijaylakshmi)  
Supervisor

**Dedicated  
to  
My Father**

## CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>i-ii</i>
<i>Acknowledgment</i>	<i>iii</i>
<b>Chapter I</b>	<b>1-31</b>
EVOLUTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS: ISSUES OF OZONE DEPLETION AND GLOBAL WARMING	
<b>Chapter II</b>	<b>32-67</b>
U.S. STRATEGY ON GLOBAL WARMING: ROLE OF THE EXECUTIVE	
<b>Chapter III</b>	<b>68-93</b>
CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES AND LEGISLATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY	
<b>CHAPTER IV</b>	<b>94-121</b>
DOMESTIC INFLUENCES ON THE US ENVIRONMENTAL FOREIGN POLICY	
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>122-127</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>128-140</b>

## **PREFACE**

Environmental problems like global warming, ozone depletion, acid rain, deforestation and desertification, and the decline of biodiversity have taken the center stage in terms of concerns for the global community. Scientists are increasingly focusing their attention on environmental threats, such as global warming, ozone depletion, and deforestation that transcend national boundaries. Global environmental problems have international ramifications.

The concept of global environmental problems has thus entered the public arena, especially in the area of foreign policy and economic matters and it is necessary to evaluate U.S. options environmental issues, to explore the relationship between public policy in the US and the health of the planet.

In the first chapter I have tried to trace the course of the “environmental eras”, in the US. The first, from the 1960s-80s and the second environmental decade of the 1990s

The second chapter has focused on the process of how policymakers in the U.S are confronting and defining global environmental problems. I have discussed the environmental agenda of the international community and examine the key components of the controversy over environmental policy in the United States. The focus has been on global climate change, a trans boundary issue with cross-national impact; it

shall attempt an assessment of the three recent American presidents, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton and George Bush Jr in terms of the role each played in the area of addressing a common environmental threat, namely, global warming.

The fourth chapter deals with the various interest groups, business lobbies, pro-environment groups and NGOs who are constantly trying to influence U.S. official policy on the environment agenda.

In the conclusion an attempt has been to scrutinize the various sources of influence on U.S. environmental policy in a holistic manner.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to thank with deep sense of gratitude my supervisor Dr. K. P. Vijayalakshmi for her guidance during the course of writing this dissertation.

I have also benefited from the stimulating lectures and seminars of Prof. Christopher Sam Raj.

I owe my deepest sense of gratitude to my father, who has been most understanding and has provided me with deep insights in the course of writing this dissertation.

I am thankful to the various libraries in Delhi viz., library of the Jawaharlal Nehru University, the American Information Resource Center, and the Institute of Defense Studies and Analysis Library, and their staff members for their help and cooperation.

My friends Anurag and Vishal deserve mention as they provided delightful distraction. Vaishali was a source of undiminished criticism and sustenance.

*Ram Pratap Singh*  
**R.P. SINGH**

## CHAPTER-1

### EVOLUTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS: ISSUES OF OZONE DEPLETION AND GLOBAL WARMING

**"No transformation in the domestic political conception of environmentalism has more profound future implication than this internationalization of ecological issues."<sup>1</sup>**

Responding to concerns that human activities are increasing concentrations of "greenhouse gases" (such as carbon dioxide and methane) in the atmosphere, most nations of the world joined together in 1992 to sign the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The United States was one of the first nations to sign this treaty. It included a legally non-binding, voluntary pledge that the major industrialized/developed nations would reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000.<sup>2</sup>

According to Green Globe Yearbook of 1997 "two subsequent phases must be concluded successfully in order to make an impact on environmental improvement".<sup>3</sup> Of course the ratification of these treaties would be the second and substantive step.

The United States signed the Kyoto Protocol on November 12, 1998.

This treaty would have committed the United States to a target of

---

<sup>1</sup> W. A. Rosenbaum, Environmental Politics and Policy, (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1998), p11

<sup>2</sup> United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, "Report of the UN Conference on Environment and Development: Annex-I, Rio Declaration on Environment and Development", UN Doc. A/CONF.151/26, Vol.1, New York, 12 August, 1992

<sup>3</sup> Bergesen, Helge Ole and Pernon, G. eds. Green Globe Year Book 1997, (NY: Oxford University press), 1997, p-38



reducing greenhouse gases by 7% below 1990 levels during a "commitment period" between 2008-2012. Because of the way "sinks", which remove these gases from the atmosphere, are counted and because of other provisions discussed in this report, the actual reduction of emissions within the United States required to meet the target is estimated to be lower than 7%. The Administration has indicated that until developing countries also make commitments to participate in greenhouse gas limitations, it will not submit the protocol to the Senate for advice and consent, thereby delaying indefinitely any possibility of ratification. Stance adopted by the United States at Johannesburg summit in year 2002 was not different.

Having the distinction of the model of democracy with constitutional supremacy of judiciary; any American legislation cannot over rule the 'theory of expectation'; according to which the law made should not be in complete contrast with the expectation and tradition of the people in that field if there is not any substantive reasonableness. The questions that arise, therefore, are varied. For instance, what are the expectations of people over the policies concerning betterment of environment? How the various channels of political communication transformed those demands and supports? How do the lobbies and interest groups play their part in shaping the US policy towards global warming? To gain answers to these and related questions it is necessary to understand the United States stance over various environmental

concerns. This would lead to exploring roots of these policies as they evolved.

### **Origin And Growth Of Environmental Concerns In The USA**

The United States is of the crucial importance in the pursuit of the global environmental sustainability. As the most powerful political and economic state, it has potential to be major driving force in reaching international agreement on these issues. The global spread of environmentalism owes much to American influence in world politics. Studies have shown that United States pioneered domestic environmental programs were adopted elsewhere in the industrialized world, and the US environmental movement played a leading role in global environmentalism.

Environmental “sins and sufferings” are not new.<sup>4</sup> Today’s world community is facing a number of global environmental challenges, ranging from the thinning of the ozone layer to the depletion of natural resources and global warming. Growing bodies of scientific knowledge continue to find new threats to the “global commons”, which has led to the development of many institutions and agreements addressing specific environmental problems. Yet, the current international environmental regime reflects a lack of coordination, insufficient funding and, in some instances, inadequate authority or mandates. As a result, the international

---

<sup>4</sup> J.M Diamond, “Ecological Collapse of Ancient Civilizations: The Golden Age That Never Was” in Journal Bulletin of American Academy of Arts and Sciences, XLVII (5), (Cambridge: AAAS, 1994), pp37-55

community has realized that a more coherent international environmental framework must be established.

Environmentalism has not been an entirely untouched subject for Americans. Writings such as Cooper's, 'The Pioneers and The Prairie', Thoreau's 'Walden', Marsh's, 'Man and the Nature' are works of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. However, the term environmentalism was seldom used before its appearance in Rachel Carlson's book, 'The Silent Spring', in which she showed that chemicals introduced into the environment were harming songbirds.<sup>5</sup>

According to historian Samuel P. Hays, "the so called progressive conservation movement (1890-1920) was not a grass root movement but a scientific one" this evolution was a result of combination of several other sciences like botany, zoology, entomology, oceanography, limnology. Thus, its evolution was the result of a multidisciplinary approach.

The atmosphere of the 1960s was very liberal; many movements found this advantageous to their development. The environmental movement was no exception. As the world witnessed a huge renewed interest in environmental concerns, memberships increased to major environmental groups and the development of new ones became common. In the United States radical environment groups like 'Earth First!' and 'Friends of the Earth'

---

<sup>5</sup> Carlson, Rachel, The Silent Spring, (New York: Houghton Mifflin), (1962), 1994

emerged. Other organizations like 'Green peace', 'Conservation Federation', 'Earth Watch' (1971) and 'World Watch Institute' (1974) also began to emerge as influential voices in the environmentalism front.

There has been an upsurge of interests in environmental issues since the 1960s and this has definitely influenced American politics in a significant manner. The central idea of the environmental movement has been the noble concept of respect for nature. The mode of respect has been a vital question in attaining that goal. In the US, the concept has been evolving, changing with various stages of development. The period between the 60s until the 80s was a turning point in this respect. The concept of conservation was entwined with the concept of ecological preservation and sustainable development.

During the 1960s, the picture of the earth could be taken for the first time by an American satellite. The first whole earth catalogue was published in 1968. Earth day started in 1970. In 1968, the Biosphere Intergovernmental Conference for Rational Use and Conservation of Biosphere (UNESCO) was held. They were the earliest discussions of the concept of ecologically sustainable development.

The environmentalism of the 60s and 70s coincided with the period of liberation movements in America, with the Counter-Culture movement. Some people saw it as the logical culmination of the civil rights and peace movements. Wendell Berry in 1971 said, "the

mentality that destroys the environment is the same that abuses the racial and economic minorities". This was termed as 'Environmental Racism'. The intellectuals and students were prominent in spreading the movement.

The reaction of the lawmakers towards this movement was slow and hesitant. The US government was uncertain about regulatory authority. The evolving environmental issues were too complex to be grasped for the decision makers. The early environmentalism in America was seen as elitist movement whose proponents had nothing else to do.

Political scientist Lyndon Caldwell wrote in 1963, "In the evolution of the American political institutions so far there appears to be no clear doctrine for the human environment as such".<sup>6</sup> In 1969 Congress created the most important environmental law i.e., The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), one of the first modern environmental laws, establishes a broad national framework for efforts to protect the environment. This Act requires that federal agencies assess the environmental impact of implementing their major programs and actions early in the planning process. This Act establishes the use of Environmental Assessments (EAs) and Environmental Impact Statements (EISes) by federal agencies.

Environmental issues truly emerged on the international agenda with 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. The

---

<sup>6</sup> L. K. Caldwell, Environment As Focus For Public Policy (CS, Texas: A & M University Press, 1995), p 30

government of 114 countries send representative to, although, only two heads of state attended. The US government under Richard Nixon was active in pushing the agenda at Stockholm.<sup>7</sup> The world community agreed that their environmental fortunes were interconnected and that they shared 'Global Commons'<sup>8</sup>. Among the important product of the Stockholm conference were the Stockholm declaration, establishment of United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and creation of domestic environmental ministries. It was also the time report 'Limits to Growth' was published by " Club of Rome ". It was extremely controversial because it predicted dire consequences if growth was not slowed. Northern countries criticized the report for not including technological solutions while Southern countries were incensed because it advocated abandonment of economic development.

In October 1974, the US National Academy of Sciences convened an ad hoc panel, to look into evolving issues of CFCs. In November 1974, the Natural Resources Defense Council petitioned Consumer Products Safety Commission to ban CFC aerosol sprays, and finally in December 1974, Congressional hearings were held. Ultimately, US witnessed consumer boycott of aerosol product. In June 1975, Johnson Wax announced it would eliminate CFCs from its products

---

<sup>7</sup> For full text of the Conference see "Declaration of the UN Conference on the Human Environment", UN Doc. A/CONF.48/14, New York, 1972

<sup>8</sup> J. Vogler, The Global Commons, A Regime Analysis, (Chi Chester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 1995), pp1-5

(required changing only three). In September 1976, the National Academy released its report supporting the CFC-ozone hypothesis. This report concluded that, "selective regulation of (CFC) uses and releases is almost certain to be necessary at some time and to some degree" but "neither the needed timing nor the needed severity can reasonably be specified today."

During 1970s landmark legislation was passed in the areas of air and water pollution, pesticides, endangered species, hazardous and toxic chemicals ocean pollution, land degradation, wilderness protection, and energy use. Congress enacted several laws with regard to the environment, in fact the congress acted as the moderator as well as place where the differing views on environmental issues were to be resolved. The Clean Air Act (CAA, 1970); The Clean Water Act (CWA, 1977); The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA or Superfund, 1980); Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA, 1986); Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA, 1986); the Endangered Species Act (1973); The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA, 1972); The Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA, 1970); The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA, 1976) ; The Pollution Prevention Act (1990); The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA, 1974) ; The Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA, 1976).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> M.E. Kraft, and N.J. Vig, "Environmental Policies From 1970s to 2000: An Overview" in M.E.Kraft and N J Vig. eds., Environmental Policy (Washington D.C.: Congress quarterly, 2000) , p12

There was also significant local activity in the United States in terms of the stratospheric preservation. In June 1975, the state of Oregon banned CFC aerosols and this became effective 1977 onwards. New York state legislature passed labeling requirement. Bills were introduced in 12 other states and US Congress.

The 1980s saw the emergence of a new set of trends in terms of environmentalism In America. Almost every environmental issue was envisaged to be related with the whole biosphere. Shrinking time and space had made the world a neighborhood. The developing countries were also taken into the gambit of environmentalism. Thus, the movement was becoming less elitist and more common. Environmental issues like climate change and global warming were very new and more appealing than the older issues. In 1985, in Austria a meeting of the World Meteorological Society, UNEP and the International Council of Scientific Unions, reported on the build-up of CO<sub>2</sub> and other "greenhouse gases" in the atmosphere. They predicted global warming.

By 1985, governments around the world were sufficiently worried to call an international convention on the subject in Vienna, Austria. The convention enjoined negotiators to draw up a plan for worldwide action on the issue. Yet the scientific community had many questions about how these chemicals were affecting the ozone and the best ways to protect it. The call for action by the Vienna Convention was therefore based on the principle that the world could no longer wait until all the questions were answered. In



essence the logic was that, waiting to be certain would mean waiting too long; the damage would already have been done. One of the basic objectives of the Vienna convention was "to protect human health and environment against adverse effect resulting or likely to result from human activities which modify or likely to modify the ozone layer"<sup>10</sup>. The same "proactive principle", also motivated development of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on global warming.

Despite the influence of a multitude of factors that operate against members of the international community from joining to pursue common environmental goals, the fact that varieties of international agreements have been signed demonstrates that the environment has achieved an important place on the global agenda. The beginning was made with The Vienna Convention, 1985; followed by the Montreal Protocol or 'Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer' of 1987, which used extremely precautionary language, "Parties to this protocol ... determined to protect the ozone layer by taking precautionary measures to control equitably total global emissions of substances that deplete it."<sup>11</sup> In September 1987, it was opened for signature and it was ratified by all major parties. Thus, nations of the world negotiated an international agreement in which they committed to phase out the

---

<sup>10</sup> Helge Ole Bergesen, and G. Pernon, eds. Green Globe Year Book 1997, (New York: Oxford University press, 1997), p 93

<sup>11</sup> See United Nations Environment Program, Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer: Final Act (Nairobi: UN Environment Program, 1987), pp1-20

use of ozone-depleting chemicals such as chlorofluorocarbons. Current objectives are to phase out use of CFCs and Halons and CC14 by 2000 and phase out use of Methyl Chloroform by 2005. Over 160 nations have signed this landmark environmental treaty. The regime to implement this governance was set up in 1992 at the Rio Summit in Brazil. Interest in the greenhouse effect was then fairly recent. The First World Climate Conference at Geneva in 1979 was just of specialist interest. It was only in 1988 that it gained widespread public and political attention. In that year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was set up. It was established to assess the most up-to-date scientific, technical and socioeconomic research in the field. In 1990, it reported predictions of temperature change and sea level rises, which led to action. The Stockholm Environment Institute was established in 1989 as an independent institute for carrying out global and regional environmental research. The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) was established in Canada in 1990. It began publishing the Earth Negotiations Bulletin in 1992.<sup>12</sup>

### **The Issue Of Ozone Depletion**

Ozone layer depletion is the break down of the earth's natural sunscreen. The atmosphere is all that is between the Earth, and the onslaught of radiation crossing space from the sun. The Ozone layer

---

<sup>12</sup> Earth Negotiation Bulletin, Vol. 22, No. 20, March 25, 2002 (New York: International Institute of Sustainable Development) [this particular volume of the journal contains the summary of developments during period 1992-2002] also available online at <<http://www.iisd.ca/2002/PC3/html>>

is a major part of our atmospheric protection, forming a thick band in the stratosphere encircling the earth. Within the Ozone layer, a constant reaction takes place that absorbs many potentially harmful ultraviolet rays, whilst producing heat to warm our atmosphere. The issue of ozone depletion affects the world in different ways. For instance, combating smog is mainly confined to industrial nations, where the problem is largely linked to exhaust fumes coming from automobiles and industrial installations. Combating ozone depletion is a global effort, because serious disruption of this protective stratospheric shield affects everyone.

Concentrations of ozone molecules in the shield naturally fluctuate. The factors affecting the ozone (sunspots, the seasons and latitude) are well understood and predictable. Scientists have established records over several decades detailing the range of variations in the ozone layer during these normal cycles. In the early 1970s, these measurements began providing evidence that concentrations of ozone molecules in the shield might be falling below what might be expected due to natural processes.

Therefore, starting from the beginning of the 1970s, scientists began noticing variations that seemed to be going beyond norms. In particular, the layer appeared to be thinning. Although possibly part of a long term cycle, this variance was quickly identified as the result of human activity, in particular the production and use of CFCs, a class of chemical compounds containing chlorine and halons, a class of chemical compounds containing bromine.

In June 1974 US chemists Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina, discovered that CFCs were lowering average ozone concentrations in the stratosphere<sup>13</sup>. The Molina and Rowland paper identified a threat from CFCs. They postulated that these, man made wonder chemicals have a large flaw; there is no known natural process for their break down in nature. So once released in the environment they tend to last for 65 - 110 years, and are free to wreak havoc, which unfortunately they do. Rowland and Molina estimated that a single chlorine atom is capable of destroying 10,000 molecules of ozone.

This was not of immediate concern, because the limits of normal rise and falls of ozone in the shield had not yet been fully established. However, the discovery was sufficiently alarming that the ozone was subjected to immense scrutiny. By the mid 1970s, sufficient evidence had been amassed that proved the phenomena to be real and in fact dangerous. A spectacular manifestation of ozone depletion the "ozone hole" was first reported in 1985 when scientists observed a sharp springtime thinning of ozone over the Antarctic (south pole).

In the mid eighties, there were three competing theories to explain the Antarctic Ozone hole, only one of which incriminated the CFCs and related industrial compounds. The issue of ozone depletion as first popularized by the scientists and the media *in tandem*.

---

<sup>13</sup> M.Molina, and S. Rowland, "Stratospheric Sink in Chlorofluoromethanes: Chlorine Atom Catalyses Destruction of Ozone" *Nature* (249), June 1974, p 810.

Between 1974 and 1976 domestic policy on the ozone issue was driven by great public concern, backed by the NGOs and the mass media. In articles published in New York Times, on 26 and 27 September 1974 the scientific hypothesis that linked the release of CFCs to skin cancer from depletion of ozone layer.

The Reagan administration was ideologically opposed to environmental regulation as an unreasonable restraint of the free market and a threat to the economic growth. So, in 1981 United States pulled out of international effort to regulate the CFCs. Reflecting pro-business belief, the Reagan administration opposed further domestic regulating of the CFCs, and 1982 the Environmental Protection Agency cancelled plans to regulate certain non-aerosol use of CFCs.<sup>14</sup>

The incoherent scientific explanation of the ozone depletion assisted the Reagan administration to hold such policy. One group of scientists focused on the solar cycle, the periodic waxing and waning of the sun's energy output. Noting that solar radiation had been particularly strong in the early in the early 1980s, they suggested this intense flow of solar energy had created unusually high levels of reactive nitrogen compounds in the stratosphere. These then concentrated over Antarctica and destroyed the ozone. Another group focused on natural changes in stratospheric winds. According to this theory, the missing ozone had not been destroyed

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert W.Crandall and Paul R. Portney, "Environmental Policy" in Paul R. Portney ed. Natural Resources and Environment: The Reagan Approach, (Washington D.C.: Urban Institute, 1984), pp63-76

but transported away from the Antarctic to other parts of the planet.

The third theory put the blame on man-made CFCs and halons. According to this idea, cold conditions above Antarctica amplified the ozone-destroying potential of compounds, resulting in the hole.

These three put policy makers on the horns of a dilemma. If natural processes had formed the hole, then the phenomenon was temporary and equilibrium would soon be restored. However, if it resulted from man-made pollution, then it would probably remain and even expand unless action was taken to counter it.

The scientific community therefore launched an intensive investigation of the problem. In September 1986, ground based instruments and balloons were used to probe the Antarctic stratosphere, which detected ozone-destroying compounds. The following year, two research airplanes, backed by over 100 scientists on the ground, flew into the freezing Antarctic sky to gather additional data. By October 1987, the world's worst fears were confirmed: chlorine and bromine had indeed shifted the fragile chemical balance in the Antarctic. The ozone hole over the Antarctic was indeed man-made requiring man-made solution. But by 1983, as a result of domestic political pressure, the Reagan administration was forced to abandon its ideological opposition to environmental regulation.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> N. E. Harrison, "From the Inside Out: Domestic influences on Global Environmental Policy" in P. G. Harris, ed., Climate Change and American Foreign Policy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p95

Actions taken against ozone depletion are important not only because they will protect human, animal and plant life from disease and damage. They also demonstrate that the world's political powers are capable of forecasting and combating a danger whilst it is still theoretical, rather than real. Many of the detrimental effects of continued thinning of the stratospheric ozone shield are not likely to become evident for a number of years. Yet, almost immediately after scientists had recognized the potential threat and identified the major culprits (chlorofluorocarbons and halons), actions were taken to limit their use and eventually faze them out entirely. This foresightedness is almost unprecedented.

### **The Issue Of Emission Of Green House Gases And Climate Change**

The threat of global climate change emerged on the international political agenda in the summer of 1988 as the result of the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere (Toronto Conference). Participant states were called upon to reduce their CO<sub>2</sub> emission by 20% below 1988 level by 2005<sup>16</sup>. This was significant in that it marked first time the government officials had acknowledged that in an international forum the need to concrete steps to address the problem of climate change.

---

<sup>16</sup> World Meteorological Organization, Proceedings of the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security, (Geneva: WMO, 1998), p294

The most pressing long-term environmental issue is that of global climate change, variously referred to as global warming or the "Green House Effect".<sup>17</sup> Global warming simply means the rise in the mean global temperature to a level, which affects life forms on earth's surface. The factors responsible for this may be both natural and man-made. Warming of the globe due to natural factors is not an unusual phenomenon. The Earth's climate is variable. The planet has experienced numerous periods of cooling and warming over its long history. For example, about 18,000 years ago, the Earth was about 5° cooler than it is today. That was the last glacial period on earth. Thereafter the global temperature rose. We are now living in a warm interglacial period and the next one may descend in a few hundred or even thousand years. The earth in fact passed through a "mini ice age" from about 1300-1700 AD.

Mostly inefficient burning of coal or oil for energy causes the green house gas emissions. Roughly a third of these emissions come from industry, a third from transportation, a third from residential and commercial buildings. The situation may be improved by making cleaner technologies. President Clinton stated, "If we do this properly we would not jeopardize our prosperity".<sup>18</sup>

The greenhouse effect is essential for life on Earth and is one of Earth's natural processes. It is the result of heat absorption by

---

<sup>17</sup> Paul G.Harris, ed., The Environment, International Relations, and US Foreign Policy, (Washington D.C. Georgetown University Press, 2001), p 10

<sup>18</sup> White House Remark by President Clinton on Global Climate Change ( Washington D.C.: Office of the Press Secretary, Oct22,1997), p-2



certain gases in the atmosphere (called greenhouse gases because they effectively 'trap' heat in the lower atmosphere) and re-radiation downward of some of that heat. Water vapor is the most abundant greenhouse gas, followed by carbon dioxide and other trace gases. Without a natural greenhouse effect, the temperature of the Earth would be about zero degrees F (-18°C) instead of its present 57°F (14°C). This effect is part of our planet's natural protection from the coldness of space, keeping the temperature of our planet relatively stable (fluctuating 0.5-1.0°C every 100-200 years) over thousands of years.

Scientists first pointed to the Greenhouse effect more than hundred years ago. Since that time it has been confirmed by numerous laboratory experiments and the theory has become widely accepted by the scientific community. Concern today is based not around the validity of the Greenhouse effect, but the possible occurrence of an Enhanced global warming or the Greenhouse effect. So, the concern is not with the fact that there exists a greenhouse effect, but whether human activities are leading to an enhancement of the greenhouse effect, that is "Enhanced Global Warming".

The Greenhouse effect as it is understood, is believed to be controlled by the levels of certain chemicals within the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is thought to be of most concern, estimated by some to contribute around 55% to the global warming greenhouse produced by human activities (from combustion of coal, oil, and gas; plus a few other trace gases). There is no scientific

debate on this point. Pre-industrial levels of carbon dioxide (prior to the start of the Industrial Revolution) were about 280 parts per million by volume (ppmv), and current levels are about 370 ppmv. According to the IPCC Special Report on Emission Scenarios (SRES), by the end of the 21st century, one could expect to see carbon dioxide concentrations of anywhere from 490 to 1260 ppm (75-350% above the pre-industrial concentration).

Scientists are still divided, concerning the outcome of Enhanced Global Warming and this is due to the many associated (and unknown) factors involved.<sup>19</sup>

Surface temperature measurements recorded daily at hundreds of locations for more than hundred years indicate that the Earth's surface has warmed by about one degree Fahrenheit in the past century. This warming has been particularly strong during the last twenty years, and has been accompanied by retreating glaciers, thinning arctic ice, rising sea levels, lengthening of growing seasons for some, and earlier arrival of migratory birds. Abrupt climate change includes such things as droughts, and the recent rapid warming of temperatures in the north Atlantic. About half of that temperature increases since the last Ice Age has occurred in just a decade. "Greenhouse warming and other human alterations of the earth system may increase the possibility of large, abrupt and unwelcome regional or global climatic events". Greenhouse gases,

---

<sup>19</sup> D.Newton, Global Warming, (Oxford, ABC-CLIO, 1993), pp15-19 gives a detailed account of the debate in the scientific circles.

emitted by fossil fuels such as oil and coal, have been linked by many researchers to a rise in global temperatures.<sup>20</sup>

Many Scientists predict that ocean levels will rise as the temperature increases, some say 2-4cm per decade. Predictions also include the advent of storms, heat waves; and droughts, all of which may be uncharacteristic to many regions in which they may occur. Most notable the mid region of the Northern Hemisphere is noted as an area, which may suffer from some kind of climate change.<sup>21</sup>

The warming has not been globally uniform. Some areas (including parts of the southeastern U.S.) have, in fact, cooled over the last century. The recent warmth has been greatest over North America and Eurasia between 40 and 70°N. Warming, assisted by the record El Nino of 1997-1998, has continued right up to the present, with 2001 being the second warmest year on record after 1998.

Due to change in the climatic conditions United States may be forced to adapt the climate changed-induced effects like longer dry periods and more extreme weather events. For example, as much as

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid p17

<sup>21</sup> for scientific evidences regarding the linkages between global warming & its impact and green house gas emission see

1. Inter Governmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC First Assessment Report, Vol.1: Overview New York, Aug1990, pp2-13
2. R. T. Watson, M. J. Prather, Michael G. Kurylo, Present State of Knowledge of the Upper Atmosphere 1988: An Assessment Report, NASA Report Publication 1208, (Washington D.C.: USGPO, 1988)
3. National Research Council, Reconciling Observation of Global Temperature Change, (Washington D.C: National Research Council, 2000) also available online at <http://www.nap.edu/books/0309068916/html/>.
4. World Resource Institute, World Resource 1998-99: Environmental Change and Human Health, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp-170 180

50% of North America's coastal wetlands could be eliminated in the next century. Some scientists believe that apparent increase in floods, tornadoes, droughts, and other severe weather related events in the US are possible consequences of the global warming. The change in temperature would naturally affect all global wind patterns due to more energy being pumped into the atmosphere. This in turn would cause extreme climate. In the tropical regions incidence of desertification and drought would increase while in the temperate regions more rainfall may be expected. The poles will become much warmer. Due to change in wind patterns rainfall will not be uniform.

Enhanced global warming, also known as the enhanced greenhouse effect, has been caused by high levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) due to the use of fossil fuels. With the industrial revolution came the large scale burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil and gas). Thus if the current increase in carbon dioxide emissions continues it is predicted that sea levels will rise, which will flood low-lying cities. The circulation of the oceans will be altered, which could radically redistribute global temperatures. This would alter food production, which could cause famines and international tension. However, the effects of enhanced global warming are impossible to predict and the scientific proof is a point of contention in global governance.

As the debate continued in US on what options/actions US should take the conservative environmentalists accuse the UN and the



TH-11314

11/11/15 P  
R3

world community as exaggerating the implication of the climate change and blame the UN documents for portraying only one side of the story.<sup>22</sup> To them several differences obtained between the two problems.

The difference between the ozone problem and the greenhouse effect is that the damaging effects of ozone depletion were short term; it caused cancer. The damage caused by global warming is long term and uncertain. On the other hand, the costs of preventing global warming are immediate.

### **United States And Issue Of Global Warming: Rio To Johannesburg Summit**

Whereas United States provided political leadership at crucial junctures in the creation and evolution of the ozone regime, it has emerged as one of the most important opponents of drastic international action to fight green house gases.

### **Rio Summit**

The Framework Convention On Climate Change-1992 or Rio Summit or Earth-I Summit formalized a norm obliging the industrialized countries to aim to stabilize their green house gas emission at 1990 level by year 2000.<sup>23</sup> This norm was less stringent than what most industrialized countries were doing in practice. This caused one expert to comment that the framework convention

---

<sup>22</sup> J. R. Dunn, and, J. E. Kinney, Conservative Environmentalism, (Westport, CT: Quorum Books, 1996), p254

<sup>23</sup> UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, "Framework Convention on Climate Change" International Legal Material, Vol.31, 1992, pp849-73

can be viewed as an example of the hegemon imposing its preferred norms on the international community<sup>24</sup>. While US was not named pointedly, it was clearly seen as obstructionist. Within only a few years, between 1987 Montreal protocol and 1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the world wide reputation of the US in global environmental protection was profoundly undermined by US obstinacy in international climate negotiations. There are several reasons for the change in this policy. The onset of economic recession in early 1990s as well as ideological objections to binding international agreements led the Bush senior administration to adopt a cautious approach in international negotiations. The scientific evidence of climate change was considered less conclusive than the evidence of CFC-induced depletion of ozone layer. Being the largest consumer of fossil fuel in the world the cost involved in the process was given more weight over the benefits accrued. Stiff domestic opposition from business groups and Congress against any international reductions of green house gas emissions further, compounded the US administration's position. The Clinton administration in fact made some progress, although limited in scope, in edging the US towards an international commitment to Carbon Dioxide- reduction measures.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Michele M. Betsill, "The United States and the Evolution of International Climate Change Norms" in P. G Harris, ed., Climate Change and American Foreign Policy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p205

<sup>25</sup> P.G. Harris, Understanding America's Climate Change Policy: Realpolitik, Pluralism, and Ethical Norms, (Oxford: Oxford Center For Environment, Ethics and Society, 1998), pp18-19

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change-1992 attempted to share the responsibility of global warming and tried to set the limits of GHGs emission for each state. In the Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992), the precautionary language was repeated, "The Parties should take precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent or minimize the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects."<sup>26</sup> Five years later, with emissions still rising, countries beefed up the convention with the Kyoto Protocol, which contained binding targets on emissions reduction for industrialized countries. However, the pact has yet to come into force and the United States put its future in doubt when it pulled out in year 2002. The Framework Convention on Climate Change signed in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro drew wide international attention to the danger of gradual global warming from humanity's use of fossil fuels and other activities. Rio Conference committed signatory governments to do something about global climate change, but it did not commit them to take any specific actions. Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992) while both the EU and the US signed it; the US added cost-effectiveness language. President Bush senior threatened not to attend if specific commitments were included. The 1992 Earth Summit in Rio was surrounded by more hype than any previous environmental conference. Agenda 21 was described as the best-known product of Rio. Boutros Boutros Ghali

---

<sup>26</sup> United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio Declaration on Environment and Development UN Doc.A/CONF.151/5/Rev.1, 1992, pp5-10

expected Agenda 21 to play a "crucial role" in "galvanizing international cooperation", ensuring a flow of new resources from nations participating in the Earth Summit that would enable them to address these many issues. The UN estimated the cost of implementing Agenda 21 at approximately \$600 billion per year between 1993 and 2000. Of this, 'the North' (referring to the developed industrialized nations of the west) would contribute \$125 billion annually.<sup>27</sup>

Since Rio, governments of most rich countries undertook to reduce their levels of carbon dioxide emissions to estimated 1990 levels within the relatively near, but unspecified future.

### **Kyoto Negotiation**

At Kyoto, the twenty-four members of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the European countries of the former Soviet Union pledged to cut their greenhouse gas emissions by 2010.<sup>28</sup> The reduction targets, which also give credit for planting trees that remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, were eight, seven, and six percent below 1990 emission levels for the European Union, the United States, and Japan, respectively. Such reductions was difficult to achieve, at least for the United

---

<sup>27</sup> Gary Bryner, "Agenda 21: Myth or Reality" in Norman J. Vig and Regina S. Axlerod eds. The Global Environment, Laws and Policy, (Washington D.C.: CQ Press, 1999), pp157-89

<sup>28</sup> Frame Work Conference on Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol to the UN Frame Work Conference on Climate Change UN Doc.FCCC/CP/1997/L.7/Add.1 also available online at <http://www.unfccc.de/resources/docs/convkp/kpeng.html>.



States, whose emissions were otherwise expected to grow by over 30 percent between 1990 and 2010.

The main elements of U.S. Proposal in Kyoto were:<sup>29</sup>

- a) The GHGs emission should be stabilized at 1990 level within the period from 2008 to 2012
- b) Countries should have flexibility in meeting those targets i.e., emission trading
- c) The protocol should include meaningful participation by developing countries.

International negotiations have been deadlocked over how to implement the Kyoto Protocol.<sup>30</sup> The treaty was agreed upon by Clinton administration, but faced an uphill battle on Capitol Hill. President Bush argued that it would harm the U.S. economy and unfairly exempts developing countries like China and India. The likely failure of Kyoto should be used as the impetus for a hard look at the prospects for a treaty on global climate change.

The Kyoto Negotiations reflected the increasing nexus between climate change clauses and economy. During the Kyoto Protocol there was much lower emphasis on the scientific uncertainty surrounding the issue of climate change. There was relatively little debate over whether climate change was a problem that needed to be addressed.

---

<sup>29</sup> Footnote 10, p 218

<sup>30</sup> Michael Grubb, The Kyoto Protocol: A Guide of Assessment, (London: Earth scan, 1999), pp1-27

There is widespread belief in the US that the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol would harm the economy. Instead of working with the UNFCCC, the US emphasis is on bilateral climate change cooperation activities.

### **Johannesburg Summit**

The United Nations after spending \$85 million on the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, which had 70,000 participants from over 180 countries, has announced that there will be, "no more earth summits until governments put into practice what they have decided to do".<sup>31</sup>

Faced with alarming deterioration in the earth's vital life supporting systems ecosystems, world leaders gathered at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa, (26 Aug to 4 Sept, 2002) to pursue new initiatives to implement sustainable development and build a future of prosperity and security for their citizens.

The aim is to halve by 2015 the proportion of people earning less than a dollar a day, an aim set at the United Nations 2000 Millennium Summit, while preserving the planet's resources for future generations, under a goal dubbed sustainable development.

The US however reiterated its position, which is that it shall work with countries to help reduce emissions but would not sign the Kyoto Protocol. At a special panel discussion on the US climate

---

<sup>31</sup> Asha Krishnakumar, "Unfinished Agenda" in Frontline, Oct 11, 2002, p-48

change policy, Senior Climate Negotiator and Special Representative, the US State Department, Harlan L. Watson, said, "(the Protocol) is not ratifiable today, tomorrow or certainly during the first commitment period (of 2008 to 2012)." Effective international environmental governance is extremely difficult to achieve. Enhanced global warming is one issue area that demonstrates the complexities. Unfortunately, the Johannesburg summit was seen as a mixture of 'corporate green-washing, American bullying' by some.<sup>32</sup>

The current president George Bush Jr. opposed the Kyoto accord, which would require the United States to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases substantially by 2012. He preferred an approach that forces developing nations to shoulder more of the responsibility for cutting air pollution. He has promised that his administration would offer alternatives to the [Kyoto] treaty but that promise seems to have faded in the background as White House policymakers have shifted their focus to anti-terrorism efforts" Until the U. S. alters its current policy and assumes a leadership role on global environmental issues including global climate change, substantive and effective international environment governance will be unlikely. At the Johannesburg summit the US government delegation favored Type II initiatives - voluntary projects between governments, companies and other actors. Some other delegations feared -

---

<sup>32</sup> Walden Bello, "World Summit on Sustainable Development: A significant signpost in the struggle between capitalism and the environment, capitalism and community", August 23, 2002 available online at <http://www.codewan.com.ph/CyberDyaryo>

especially in view of the pushy self-projection by some companies - that in the negotiations the voluntary initiatives would overshadow the binding international agreements. In the end, however, this concern proved to be unfounded.

US emissions of pollutants that scientists believe contribute to global warming and climate changes that result from this warming, surpass those of any other country in the world. In simple words, the US is the most polluting country in the world. On a per capita basis, US emissions of these 'greenhouse gases' are among the highest in the world. With less than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of the world's population, the United States produces nearly 1/4<sup>th</sup> of the world's greenhouse gases. By reducing its emissions of greenhouse gases and similarly by reducing its impact on the global environment, the US can very significantly and positively influence the international environmental problems.

Next, as the world's largest economy, with considerable financial resources the United States has the potential to address these issues from a pragmatic standpoint. However US assistance to foreign nations, to deal with adverse environmental changes, has been one of the lowest if we compare the contributions made by top industrial countries, and so the United States has often been labeled as the "global Scrooge". The prospects for increasing US assistance to address environmental problems in developing countries are bleak. In addition, the US has the technological expertise as well as financial capacity to apply the technology to

successfully purge the environmental problems that hound the global community. However, critics point out that repeatedly it has been established that the US is unwilling, or rather reluctant to disseminate its technology. To many, the United States is just as stingy about its technology as it is with its monetary resources. Further, many point out that the United States is the only country, which can lead the world towards environmental protection efforts; it is the only nation that can hope to influence others. The US can be a leader on international environmental issues, as it often determines the success or failure of international environmental cooperation and affecting whether that cooperation leads to effective environmental protection on the ground throughout the world.

Lastly, a view is held that the United States has an ethical obligation – as the world's, principal polluter and the wealthiest nation – to protect the world's natural environment.

The National Environmental Trust's report, "First in Emission, Behind in Solutions", details how the emissions of some U.S. states exceed those of groups of developing countries. With a population of 288 million people, the U.S. releases more global warming gases than Africa, Central and South America, and most of the developing countries of Asia combined, that have a total population ten times larger--2.6 billion people. Texas' emissions of carbon dioxide, for example, the highest in the country, exceed the combined emissions of 119 developing countries with an aggregate population of over one billion people. (Texas has 21.8 million people). On a per capita

basis, Texas' emissions are 47 times higher than those of the 119 developing countries.

As stated by an analyst that environmental problems require international and even global action if they are to be reduced and mitigated. The world's governments and other important actors cannot deal effectively with environmental changes if the United States does not play an active role. Thus, environmental changes have become a major subject and feature of U.S. foreign policy. Furthermore the role of the US president and that of the US congress in making of environmental policy has a tremendous impact on eventual approach adopted by United States. In any event, the US political system has to be understood in its domestic context so as to provide the rationale for the US approach at Johannesburg summit.

## CHAPTER II

### U.S. STRATEGY ON GLOBAL WARMING: ROLE OF THE EXECUTIVE

**"Humanity is conducting an unintended, uncontrolled, globally pervasive experiment whose ultimate consequences could be second only to a global nuclear war".<sup>1</sup>**

Since the time of the Kennedy administration and the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963) that reduced the environmental threat of radioactive debris, the United States has joined with other countries to adopt numerous environmental treaties. Since then, hundreds of environmental agreements have been adopted. In fact, there has been a linear increase in the number of international agreements over the last forty years. Environmental agreements make up about one out of five international agreements concluded by the United States.

During the 1960s and 1970s, many bilateral and multilateral environmental agreements dealt with fisheries and wildlife. By the late 1970s until recently, the character of environmental issues changed, as transboundary concerns like ocean pollution, the ozone layer, deforestation, desertification, and biodiversity, became a focal point of global attention resulting in several important treaties. Included among these treaties was the issue of global climate change.

---

<sup>1</sup> World Meteorological Organization, Proceedings of the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security, (Geneva: W.M.O., 1988), p292

During the past century, the USA as well as other industrialized and developing countries have engaged in activities that are increasingly threatening the health of the environment. In the case of the United States as one observer aptly commented "the economic prosperity of the industrial revolution-indeed the rise of America came at the steep price: lost wilderness, contaminated waters, dirty skies, endangered animals and plants."<sup>2</sup>

Environmentalism is one among many complex and increasingly technical public policy issues that has challenged the political leaders nationally and globally. The history of the environmental policy process has been associated with state-level-politics, where there has been for the policy makers to support the economic development over environmental quality. Over the past several decades, however, the federal government has begun to assume increasing responsibility for environmental affairs. However, the public opinion has supported the environmentalism over the economic development.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the Americans are more likely to prefer that the federal govt. to action to protect the environment rather than to rely on the business and industries to do so.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Scott Harper, "Being Green Will Be Profitable", The Virginian pilot, jan20, 2000, Norfolk, Virginia, p15

<sup>3</sup> George Gallop, The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1995 (Wilmington, DC: Scholarly Resources Inc, 1996), pp 65-67

<sup>4</sup> Christopher Bosso, "Seizing Back the Day: The Challenge to Environmentalism in the 1990s", in Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, ed., Environmental Policy In 1990s: Reform or Reaction? 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Washington DC: CQ Press, 1997), p 56



## **Constitutional Powers Of The President Regarding Environment**

The environmental issues have over the years become quite diverse.

Whereas environmental concerns from the 1930s through the 1970s tended to focus attention on clean air and water, forest conservation, preservation of natural resources, and public land use, today the environmental issues that concern a President may include safe drinking water, over population, preserving certain species while preventing the spread of alien species to our particular eco systems.

The most important source and force in the US foreign policy is the US constitution.<sup>5</sup> The U.S. constitution separates power among the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the government and between the national government and the states. Naturally conflict is not unusual when different power centers are involved in policy making. This is especially true in the area of environmental politics, where there have been wider calls for the devolution of the regulatory authority to states and local government in recent years. As Robert Paarlburg points out, "the US government is particularly susceptible to having divergent international environmental policy preferences, because power is shared three separate branches."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> For a discussion on constitutional basis of the US Foreign Policy see Bresusta C. Dennis, Seeing American Foreign Policy as a Whole, (New Delhi: Macmillan, 1989), pp5-30

<sup>6</sup> Robert Paarlburg, "Earth in Abeyance: Explaining Weak Leadership" in J. Robert, ed., Eagle Adrift: American Foreign Policy at the End of the Century (NY: Longman, 1997), p 149

The US constitution grants the preeminent position to federal government to protect the environment through the Commerce clause, the Taxing and spending clause, and the Treaty making authority. Article II, section 2 of the constitution states that the president "shall have the power, by and with advice and consent of senate, to make treaties." And the treaties and the consequent legislation becomes the supreme law of the land.<sup>7</sup>

### **Presidential Responsibility And Leadership**

Global environmentalism has come to the forefront of foreign policy, challenging and reshaping traditional interactions between national governments. The implications of this "greening of foreign policy" have been profound—and often quite counterproductive. Items on the growing list of environmental issues that now drive international treaties and agreements have high costs with low benefits.

Taking the global environment as a case in point, the President has constitutional authority to negotiate with leaders of foreign countries; the president can negotiate agreements but depends on the Senate to ratify treaties; the president can try to influence public opinion through speeches (while public opinion can be assessed in terms of its support or opposition to global environmental initiatives) and has an interactive relationship with organized interests that lobby in favor of or in opposition to treaties;

---

<sup>7</sup> US Information Agency, US Constitution, Washington D.C., 1987, p25-27

presidents differ in terms of their level of expertise and ability to grasp technical knowledge as well as obtaining quality information from their advisors; and finally, environmental crises (pollution, nuclear reactor meltdowns, ozone depletion) can but do not always motivate presidents to take affirmative action.

As the chief diplomat, the President is expected to be actively involved with international conferences and the negotiation and implementation of international agreements. The president's role as chief diplomat is also shaped by custom and tradition.<sup>8</sup> At the same time, other responsibilities can play a part in presidential involvement in global environmental affairs and global climate change. For instance, in supporting or opposing global environmental initiatives, presidents act as "opinion/party" leader when making speeches about their position on the issue. It can be assessed as to how many references to the global environment are made in these national speeches and addresses in comparison to other issues to gain a better understanding of the president's commitment to global environmental issues in general and global climate change in particular. At one time academics downplayed the importance of party platforms in shaping the public policy. Some declared the party platforms as meaningless generalities that promised everybody the best of all world's.<sup>9</sup> but a line of empirical

---

<sup>8</sup> Erwin C. Hargrove, *The Power of Modern Presidency*, ( New York: Knopf, 1974), pp3-7

<sup>9</sup> Theodore H. White, *The Making of President 1960*, (New York: Atheneum, 1961), pp222-23

research disapproved these allegations that platforms were meaningless statements. Studies have shown that platform pledges are often implemented as public policy. Thus the platform which holds the president has become important in deciding the environmental policy.<sup>10</sup>

As the legislative leader, the president has to decide whether the policies on environment worth the time, effort, and cost of the nation. The political objectives of the president are no less important criteria in deciding the course of legislation over environmental issues in the congress.<sup>11</sup> As chief "executive," the president might bypass the legislative branch and issue an executive order that has the force of law in order to promote environmental protection. From a policy cycle perspective, presidents obviously have great potential influence. First, they have a major role in agenda setting. They can raise issues to the public's attention; define the terms of public debate; and rally public opinion and constituency support through speeches, press conferences and other media events. Without presidential endorsement, major policy initiatives have rarely been successful. Presidents can also take the lead in policy formulation by devoting presidential staff and other resources to particular issues, by mobilizing expert inside and outside government, and by consulting

---

<sup>10</sup> R. Joslyn, Mass Media and Election, (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1984), pp12-51

<sup>11</sup> Dennis L. Soden, "Presidential Role and Environmental Policy", in Dennis L. Soden, ed., The Environmental Presidency, (NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), p8

widely with interest groups and members of Congress in designing and proposing legislation. They can also stop legislation by the use of veto power.

Presidents use their powers as chief executive to shape policy implementation. They make appointments to federal agencies; propose annual operating budgets; issue executive orders; and oversee management and efficiency in the bureaucracy.

Another important function is regulatory oversight; i.e., the president oversees regulatory policy making by agencies such as the Environment Protection Agency (EPA). Finally, presidents play an increasingly important role in international leadership, as many environmental issues are now international or global in nature and scope.

At the same time, Presidents cannot govern alone; they are part of a government of "separated powers." They must rely on Congress to enact the legislation and provide the funding to carry out all activities of the federal government. When different parties control the Congress and the presidency, the President may have little control over the policy agenda. Nevertheless, even when the President's own party has a majority in one or both houses, majority coalitions particular issues may be difficult if not impossible to build. Moreover, Congressional Committees have substantial powers of legislative initiative, administrative oversight, and investigation that can blunt executive initiatives and embarrass the President.

One is the nature of the president's agenda and personal leadership style. Some presidents are "active" in the sense that they vigorously utilize presidential powers to pursue policy change. Others are more "passive" or pursue only incremental change; they are sometimes called "guardians." Agendas may be "expansive" in the sense of advocating new governmental programs, "contradictory" in seeking to reverse existing policies or reduce the role of government, or "consolidative" if their goal is to preserve or refine past gains. Thus, Reagan entered office as an "active contractionary" president, Bush as a "passive consolidator" and Clinton as an "active expansive" leader.

### **Environmentalism In Reagan And Bush Senior Era**

The "environmental decade" of 1970s came to an abrupt halt with Reagan's landslide victory in 1980. This was the period of "Norm Emergence" in the global environmental issues.<sup>12</sup> Although the environment was not a major issue in the election, Reagan was the first president to come to office with an avowedly anti-environmental agenda.

Reagan viewed environmental conservation as fundamentally at odds with economic growth and prosperity. He saw environmental regulation as a barrier to "supply side" economics and sought to reverse or weaken many of the policies of the previous decade.

---

<sup>12</sup> Martha Finnmore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change", International Organization, vol. 52, Autumn-1998, pp 895-900

Reagan made controversial political appointments to position that had power over the environment , proposed drastic cuts to the budgets of EPA, and used deregulation and executive agreements to undercut much of the progress towards environmental protection that had been made under previous administration. Although only partially successful, Reagan's contradictory agenda laid the groundwork for a renewed attack on environmental policy a decade later. After a period of economic decline and weak leadership, Reagan's victory provided a strong mandate for policy change.

Faced with this situation, Reagan turned to what has been termed a "Guardianship Presidency." Essentially, this involved an attempt to change federal policies by maximizing control of policy implementation within the executive branch. That is, rather than trying to rewrite legislation, Reagan attempted to alter its content and effect, through control of the bureaucracy. Reagan clearly lost the battle of public opinion on the environment. His policies had the unintended effect of revitalizing environmental organizations. Memberships in such groups increased rapidly, and polls indicated a steady growth in the public concern for the environment that peaked in the late 1980s.<sup>13</sup> It was not surprising that Bush Sr. decided to distance himself from Reagan's environmental record in 1988.

---

<sup>13</sup> David Mervin, *George Bush and Guardianship Presidency*, (London: Macmillan, 1996), p8

During the presidential campaign G. W. Bush Senior declared himself a “conservationist” in the tradition of Teddy Roosevelt and promised to be an “environmental president.” Like president Nixon twenty years earlier, he rode a wave of environmental concern during the first half of his term that culminated in the passage of a new Clean Air Act. Nevertheless, also like Nixon, he retreated to a harsher stance on the environment later in his term in the face of economic recession and business pressure. Indeed, by 1992 he sounded a lot like Reagan.

In a remarkable speech at Detroit’s Metro Park, near Lake Erie, on August 31, 1988, Bush laid out an ambitious environmental agenda calling for a new Clean Air Act and other reforms. Among other things, Bush committed himself to a program of “no net loss” of wetlands and called for strict enforcement of toxic waste laws. In reference to global warming, Bush stated, “Those who think we are powerless to do anything about the ‘greenhouse effect’ are forgetting about the ‘White House effect.’” “In my first year in office,” he said, “I will convene a global conference on the environment at the White House...and we will act.”<sup>14</sup>

If Bush surprised almost everyone by seizing the initiative on what most assumed was strong issue for the Democrats, he impressed environmentalists even more by soliciting their advice and by appointing a number of environmental leaders to his

---

<sup>14</sup> Barbara Rosewicz, “Bush Proposes Revision of Clean Air Law that Would Cut Acid Rain by 2000”, Wall Street Journal, June 13, 1989, A3



administration. William Reilly, the president of the World Wildlife Fund was made the EPA administrator. Michael Deland, formerly New England director of the EPA, became chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality. Bush promised to restore the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to an influential role and made it clear that he intended to work closely with the Democratic Congress to pass a new Clean Air Act early in his administration.

The Clean Air Act was passed in 1990 and this indeed as some argue was the single most important legislative achievement of George Bush Sr's presidency.<sup>15</sup> His draft bill sent to Congress had three major goals: Firstly, to control acid rain by reducing sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) emissions from coal burning power plants by nearly half by the year 2000; Secondly, to reduce air pollution in eighty urban areas that still had no met 1977 air quality standards; Thirdly, to lower emissions of 200 airborne toxic chemicals by 75 to 90 percent by the year 2000. To achieve the acid precipitation goals, Bush proposed an innovative approach advocated by environmental economists that relies on marketable pollution allowances rather than "command and control" regulation to achieve emission reductions more efficiently.

In the international arena, there were pressures for the United States to agree to an international convention to stabilize CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The President drew a line against any further

---

<sup>15</sup> Michael Weisskopf, "With Pen, Bush to Seal Administration Split on Clean Air Act", Washington Post, Nov15, 1990,A23

commitments. Therefore, although Bush had promised to confront “the greenhouse effect” with the “White House effect,” it soon became apparent, strong forces within the administration as well as from the energy industries opposed any change that would limit fossil fuel production. Climate change policy was formally put under control of the Domestic Policy Council, chaired by science advisor Allan Bromley.

“Some presidents have no much aspiration. They come to office with a feeling that success means holding the line against change in one way or another”- said a presidential scholar and argued that president Bush clearly falls into this category. He was conservative in traditional sense.<sup>16</sup> President Bush showed little personal interest in the subject, and adopted a policy stance that was similar to the policy adopted by Reagan on acid rain. Both presidents ultimately, resorted to the dismal plea that more research was needed on the subject. The president increased funding for global climate research and development and supported accelerated curtailment of CFCs, but he continued to resist all pressures to limit CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, on the grounds that the effects of emissions on global warming were yet to be substantiated with more research in the field.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Alonzo Hamby, “Essay on Truman” in Fred Greenstien, ed., Leadership in Modern Presidency, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), p-43

<sup>17</sup> Michael Wines, “The Earth Summit”, New York Times, June 14, 1992, Sec. 1, 10

It was President Bush's stance on the UN Conference on Environment and Development, held in June 1992, most defined his environmental image. The Earth Summit "provided the opportunity for the president of the United States to provide global leadership concerning the environment". Three significant issues were debated at this conference namely, the principle of "sustainable development" outlined in Agenda 21, the Convention on Biodiversity, and the Convention on Climate Change. President Bush's behavior vis-à-vis the two conventions provided a clear portrait of his orientation toward major global environmental issues generally, and biodiversity and global warming in particular. In the case of biodiversity, Bush had isolated the United States in his failure to join with other countries on this most important international issue. Global climate change was another major source of contention at the Rio Summit. The global warming treaty had several requirements that Bush opposed. He used his influence to revise aspects of the treaty before he was willing to sign it. George Bush threatened to boycott the historic summit until he had ensured that the climate change convention contained no binding targets for CO<sub>2</sub> reduction. He further alienated much of the world as well as the American environmental community by refusing to sign the biodiversity treaty at the conference, despite efforts by his delegation chief William Reilly to arrive at a last minute compromise. Although the United States became a signatory to the Convention on Climate Change at the Rio Summit along with 153

other countries, it was done only after George H.W. Bush ensured that voluntary rather than mandatory guidelines were established. Therefore, even though Bush had the opportunity to provide leadership on the global warming issue at the 1990 World Climate Conference, under him the United States failed to join with other industrialized countries in a collaborative effort to address global climate change. Bush had succumbed to political pressure from Republicans in the Congress and economic pressure from business and industry that lobbied heavily to protect their interests. Consequently, despite the success he achieved with the Clean Air Act at home, the Bush presidency failed to live up to the expectations of an "environmental presidency" on the global stage.

### **The Rio Summit**

In 1992, the city of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil had hosted the Conference on Environment and Development. The Rio conference may well be remembered in posterity for putting the concept of "sustainable development" on the global agenda. It would be difficult to claim that the Rio conference defined in all its complexities what lay behind the two words. But, for a large number of people, Rio symbolizes sustainable development. The conference in Rio generated an expectation that global resources would be used more prudently in the future. In retrospect, we may say that such expectations were naïve to start with, but Rio was all about hope for a better world.

The agenda at Rio focused on finding ways for countries to cooperate in addressing global environmental problems such as pollution, climate change, the depletion of the ozone layer, the use and management of marine and freshwater resources, deforestation, desertification and land degradation, hazardous waste, and loss of biological diversity. The conference culminated in the drafting of Agenda 21, a groundbreaking program for international action on environmental and developmental issues intended to help guide international cooperation and policy development into the 21st century. Its recommendations included new ways to educate, to care for natural resources, and to participate in designing a sustainable economy.

The US took a greater interest in the deliberations at the Rio conferences. Though it had supported the general environmental agenda at Stockholm, it was much less supportive at Rio. This weakened support was demonstrated by Bush administration's effort to have the Rio declaration called the "Earth Charter", a name that would underline the environment objectives of United States over the development objectives of the developing countries.<sup>18</sup> Robert Reinstien, head of the US delegation at Rio, said "the issues are at the heart of the economy- they are extremely complicated. The price if you guess wrong could be very damaging."<sup>19</sup> At the end

---

<sup>18</sup> Paul G. Harris, "International Environmental Affairs and US foreign policy" in Paul G. Harris, ed. The Environment, International Relations, and US Foreign Policy (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2001), p-8

<sup>19</sup> See footnote-8

the US agreed to relatively weak framework convention that contained only voluntary commitments for the United States and other developed countries to reduce their green house gas emissions to 1990 level by 2000. The strong US interest in the Rio Conference was frequently directed toward preventing more international regulation in the environmental issue area- though president Bush had promised to become the 'Environmental President'

From 1988 to 1992 the issue of climate change moved from an environmental crisis frame to economic frame.<sup>20</sup>George W. Bush's Jr. presidency has to be analyzed in terms of the global-national dichotomy over the issue of climate change, in an effort to better understand the role of domestic influences, the impact of global participation/non-participation by the United States, and the difficulties in achieving effective international environmental management.

### **Clinton Administration: Policy Reversal**

#### **I-Term:**

With the advent of president Clinton to the White House, many expected new and stronger effort by the United States to implement the objectives of the Earth Summit. Clinton talked in terms of environmental justice for all citizens. The president declared, "...all

---

<sup>20</sup> Michele M. Betsill, "The United States and the Evolution of International Climate Change Norms" in P. G. Harris, ed., Climate Change and American Foreign Policy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p-214

Americans have a right to be protected from pollution. Today we direct federal agencies to make environmental justice a part of all that they do".<sup>21</sup>

One of the administration's first acts was to replace the Council on Environmental Quality with a new Office of Environmental Policy (OEP), this body was to coordinate departmental policies on environmental issues. A new President's Council on Sustainable Development was also appointed in June 1993.

President Clinton reversed President Bush's position on biodiversity by signing the Earth Summit's Convention on Biodiversity. However, despite Clinton's effort to cooperate with its global partners on this issue, the United States Senate refused to ratify the treaty. Consequently, although he had signed the biodiversity treaty and announced his intentions to achieve the target proposed at the Rio summit for stabilizing carbon dioxide emissions, the administration failed to implement either policy. Another failure of the Clinton administration was to elevate the EPA to cabinet rank.

On the global climate issue, Clinton worked to fulfill a commitment made during the 1992 presidential campaign when he and his running mate, Al Gore, indicated that they would provide "real international leadership to protect the world's delicate environmental balance" that would include "reducing U.S. carbon

---

<sup>21</sup> White House, "Statement on the Executive Order on Environmental Justice", Weekly Compilation Presidential Documents, Vol.30, no.7, (Washington D.C., 1994, p283

dioxide emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000 and accelerate the phase-out of substances that deplete the ozone layer".

For vice-president Al Gore, environmental policy was an issue of critical importance. From his years in Congress, his authorship of a truly significant book detailing environmental concerns facing America and the world (the 1992 epic), to his actions as Vice President, Gore has demonstrated his commitment to the preservation and protection of the planet's fragile environmental systems. During the campaign, Al Gore focused on environmental policy as an issue of significance to him during his political career. One aspect of his concern dealt with American presidential leadership and the crisis of global warming. Gore criticized former President George H.W. Bush on the question of political leadership in the following ways: "Yet President Bush and his advisors continue to oppose suggestions that the United States offer leadership in organizing a global response to the crisis, ostensibly because they are not yet convinced there is a problem." And, "It is, of course, partisan for me as a Democrat to assess the performance of President Bush; and in his failure to act, he is not alone. Congress is also at fault, as are most other, world leaders. But the United States is the only nation truly in a position to lead the world in facing up to a global crisis and organizing an adequate response." "If the history of this century is any guide, it is safe to say that if we do not lead the world on this issue, the chances of accomplishing the massive changes necessary to save the global environment will



be negligible if the United States does choose to lead, however, the possibility of success becomes much greater."<sup>22</sup> The Clinton-gore administration professed a new philosophy for their administration. The administration pledged to, "...protect people, not bureaucracy; promote results, not rules; get action, not rhetoric".<sup>23</sup> But how far the administration became successful in providing results have been remained a matter of diverse opinions.

President Clinton's most important environmental legacy may be the governmental "reinvention" effort carried out under the direction of the former Vice President Al Gore. A program that began in March 1993 as the 'National Performance Review' developed into a much broader reform initiative known as the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, which focused on thirty-two agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency. A "reinventing environmental regulation" program launched at EPA on March 16, 1995, has produced more than forty new programs. Essentially these programs invite states, industries, individual companies and communities to collaborate with the EPA to develop new performance-based management systems in return for greater regulatory flexibility. Clinton deserves credit also for substantially increasing the budget for environmental programs.

---

<sup>22</sup> Al Gore, Earth in the Balance (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1992), pp 174-177

<sup>23</sup> Al Gore, Best Kept Secrets of Government, (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1996), p90

Before the Berlin conference the dilemma over the causes of the climate change became more coherent as the IPCC report, involving about 2500 scientists worldwide concluded, "balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate".<sup>24</sup> At the 1995 Berlin Conference to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Clinton administration accepted the principle that developing countries would not be obligated to accept mandates in the next series of talks that would occur on global climate change but, so far, the United States was against any legally binding negotiation for reduction of the green house gases. At same time the administration accepted that voluntary commitment to reduce the gases was not working.<sup>25</sup>

Secretary of State Warren Christopher announced in an April 1996 speech at Stanford University that environmental issues would play a heightened role in U.S. foreign policy. He said, "The United States is providing the leadership to promote global peace and prosperity. We must also lead in safeguarding the global environment upon which that prosperity and peace ultimately depend." Clinton administration has promoted a "consensus building" approach to environmental policy that attempts to accommodate diverse stakeholder perspective via use of mechanism such as Task forces- featuring representatives from business leaders and the

---

<sup>24</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp4-5

<sup>25</sup> Associated Press, "Nations Urged to Pass Law on Emissions", NY Times, 19 July; 1996, A5

environmentalists. The early period of Clinton presidency is characterized as one of "environmental ambivalence."<sup>26</sup>

## **II Term: Signing The Kyoto Protocol**

In December 1997, the world's nations met in Kyoto to tackle with the problem of global warming and the percentage reduction of greenhouse-gas emissions (the Kyoto protocol, among other things, required countries to set targets for greenhouse gas emissions). The Kyoto Protocol evolved from the landmark the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992 at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, which was signed by, George Bush Sr. in Rio de Janeiro. The Kyoto Protocol is designed to address rising global temperatures caused by the green house effect through reductions in emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and five other green house gases (GHGs) (methane, nitrous oxide and three synthetic substitutes for ozone-depleting CFCs).

The Clinton administration promoted the principle of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the end of the century. The meeting that occurred in Kyoto found the delegates debating over the level of greenhouse gas reductions that were to be mandated. Japan, the host country of the conference, would cut its greenhouse emissions by 6% compared to the United Kingdom's

---

<sup>26</sup> Jonathan P. West, and Glen Sussman, "Implementation of Environmental Policy", in Dennis L. Soden, ed., The Environmental Presidency, (NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), p99

reduction of 8% while the United States would reduce its emissions by 7%.

The first blow to the Kyoto Treaty was struck by the U.S. Senate on July 25, 1997, the day when the Senate passed a resolution, 95 to 0, advising President Clinton not to sign any treaty imposing limits on U.S. carbon dioxide emissions that would injure the U.S. economy or that would not be imposed also on developing nations such as India and China. In making this commitment to a Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly, Bill Clinton put the American administration in a leadership position in an effort to address global warming. Clinton was constrained, however, by the United States Senate. The Byrd-Hagel Resolution passed by the Senate in June 1997 stated that the legislative body would not ratify any greenhouse emission treaties unless the developing countries also contributed in the reduction of greenhouse gases.

However, Clinton was compelled to act, in part, due to pressure exerted by the scientific community. According to the Scientists' Statement on Global Climatic Disruption signed by over two thousand American scientists, "further accumulation of greenhouse gases commits the earth irreversibly to further global climatic change and consequent ecological, economic, and social disruption.

. . . It is time for the United States, as the largest emitter of greenhouse gases, . . . to demonstrate leadership in a global

effort"<sup>27</sup>. Subsequent to the publication of the scientists' statement, President Clinton stated that it was the obligation of the United States, the largest emitter of greenhouse gases, to bring to the Kyoto conference a strong American commitment to realistic and binding limits that will significantly reduce our emissions of greenhouse gases.

Clinton began working on the corpse of the Kyoto Treaty. Amid reports that his administration was looking for ways to implement the key provisions of Kyoto even without Senate ratification, Clinton instructed acting UN Ambassador Peter Burleigh to sign the treaty on Nov. 13, 1998. Though President Clinton was aware of the difficulties ahead regarding the domestic approval of the protocol. President Clinton said, "despite these win-win innovations and commitments emerging literally everyday, I know full well that some will criticize our targets and time table too ambitious"<sup>28</sup>

The protocol then languished in Washington for the final three years of the Clinton administration, which chose not to present it to the Senate for ratification. In accordance with a Senate resolution calling for the full participation of the main developing countries in the protocol's emissions-cutting requirements, that pause was supposed to allow time for negotiation to bring those countries on

---

<sup>27</sup> John P. Holdren, "Scientists' Statement on Global Climatic Disruption", Ozone Action, Washington, DC: 1997 also available online at <http://www.ozone.org>.

<sup>28</sup> White House, Remark by President Clinton on Global Climate Change (New York: Office of the Press Secretary, Oct22,1997),pp2-3

board. But nobody thought any such negotiation could produce results, and no negotiation was ever attempted.

Despite the many setbacks, that the Clinton administration was faced with it must be given credit for raising environmental considerations to a higher level of attention in the White House. The Clinton administration's guidelines for cost benefit analysis allowed for agencies to use contingent valuation. Cost benefit analysis treats environmental values as being on the same level as ordinary consumer decisions: people are willing to for other issues for example, metro construction. What a contingent valuation seeks to determine is whether the people are willing to pay a higher tax, and also sacrifice some of their own tastes in order to protect the environment.

During the previous administrations it was often sought to prevent mandatory international regulations of green house gas emissions. But the Clinton administration was more responsive to the environmental issues, but US action towards reducing emissions of gases causing climate change has been incremental at best.<sup>29</sup>

The US leadership in the international environmental issue area has not been consistent. Nevertheless, in looking broadly at international environmental diplomacy in recent decades, one can see a gradual US engagement with the world in an increasingly multilateral approach to environmental protection. In the words of

---

<sup>29</sup> Lamont C. Hempel, "Climate Policy on Installment Plan" in Michel E. Kraft, and Norman J. Vig, eds., Environmental Policy 4<sup>th</sup> ed.. (Washington, D.C.: CQ, 2000), pp281-302

Rosenbaum "... the US diplomatic trajectory from Stockholm to Kyoto was leading the United States steadily, if unevenly, toward a broadening and deepening commitment to international environmental governance."<sup>30</sup>

### **George W. W. Bush jr.: Policy Withdrawal**

George W. Bush, succeeding to the presidency three years after the protocol's signing, had some choices and may not have made the best choice when he rejected the plan outright last year i.e., withdrawing his country's support for it in March 2001. In declining to support the Kyoto Protocol, Bush outlined three concerns regarding any future greenhouse-gas agreement. First, the main developing countries need to adhere as full participants, as the Senate had earlier resolved; so far, developing countries have made it clear that they have no intention of doing so. Second, he cited the immense uncertainty about the likely extent of climate change and its impact on society. Third, he expressed a preference for "voluntarism" over enforceable regulation, even though he did not make clear whether his "voluntarism" referred to domestic or international commitments.

"I oppose the Kyoto Protocol because it exempts 80 per cent of the world, including major population centers such as China and India, from compliance, and would cause serious harm to the US economy." This retrogressive statement made by US President

---

<sup>30</sup> Walter A. Rosenbaum, Environmental Politics and Policy, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, (Washington, D.C.: Congress Quarterly, 1998), p338

George Bush in a letter to Republican senators thereafter sparked off a series of horrified reactions from leaders across the world, and from non-government organizations who have condemned Bush for backing off from pre-election promises.

In abandoning the agreement, the President cited the uncertainty of the science, the lack of commercially available technology, the loss of American jobs, and disruptions to the U.S. economy it would cause if the drastic cuts in carbon dioxide called for in the Protocol were implemented. In rejecting the Kyoto Protocol, President Bush noted that mandatory reductions would hurt American workers and the U.S. economy. This "voluntary" program sends a mixed message to businesses and investors as to the President's commitment to economic growth and prosperity.

President Bush recently unveiled his Global Climate Change policy to combat global warming. The President's climate change policy set goal to cut greenhouse gas intensity by 18 percent over the next 10 years. To achieve this reduction, the plan set up a "voluntary" scheme to reduce these emissions. It expand the current voluntary emission reduction registration program under 1605(b) of the 1992 Energy Policy Act to provide credit to those firms that reduce their emissions, ensure that those businesses that register reductions will not be penalized under future climate policy, and calls for a review of the plan in 2012 to determine whether this goal has been met. It suggests that additional measures, such as a mandatory cap and trade regulatory program for carbon dioxide, will be imposed on



businesses if they fail to meet this goal. This policy is, fortunately, inconsistent with the President' position on the Kyoto Protocol and his commitment to ensure reliable and affordable energy to American families and businesses.

The President's plan acknowledges the scientific uncertainties of climate change and the need for more information and advanced technologies to study this issue. Given the ongoing debate on global warming, this is the direction the President should lead the world. The President has committed \$4.5 billion in climate change spending in fiscal year 2003, including \$1.7 billion for basic scientific research on climate change and \$1.3 billion for advanced energy and sequestration technologies. While the amount of federal dollars dedicated for climate change study is debatable, the President's insistence that Washington have a sound basis for determining climate change policy is not.

President Bush's rejection of the Kyoto agreement on global warming shows that he is quite prepared to accept arguments and rows with friend and foe alike over issues in which he thinks vital American interests are at stake. George Bush has never made any secret that he doesn't like the Kyoto agreement, which seeks to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases in order to combat the rapid change in the planet's climate some scientists argue is now taking place. Observers noted that he thought it unfair on the United States, as it leaves out developing countries. Further many cite evidence of the President's fear that it would lead to higher energy

prices in the United States. The Senate has already voted not to ratify the treaty, in a sense, the issue was buried at least for the moment.

At the Johannesburg, World Summit for Sustainable Development, the U.S. did promote a couple of new initiatives. These included a joint U.S.-Japanese effort to provide safe drinking water to poor nations and a partnership among six African governments, European nations, and conservation and timber groups to protect vast rain forests in the Congo Basin (a project that was begun in the Clinton administration).

#### **JOHANNESBURG SUMMIT: THE SAME STORY**

In September 2002, the United Nations held the World Summit on Sustainable Development (also known as Rio +10), in Johannesburg, South Africa; a high-level gathering of world governments, concerned citizens, United Nations agencies, multilateral financial institutions, and other major actors to assess global change since the historic United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) or as it is commonly known, "Earth Summit".

More than hundred heads of states and fifteen thousand delegates representing the governments, private sector, and non-governmental organizations participated in the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), from August 26 to September 4, 2002 in the South African city of Johannesburg.

The Johannesburg summit was held exactly a decade after the Rio de Janeiro summit produced Agenda 21 and the Rio Charter, which were supposed to be landmark agreements that would guide the Governments of the world in fulfilling their "common but differentiated" responsibility in promoting sustainable development. The 1992 Rio summit generated a tremendous amount of public awareness about environment issues — particularly on climate change, degradation of forests and the consequences of unequal and profligate consumption — but this has not been transformed into remedial action. No fig leaf can hide the fact that Agenda 21 has been a complete failure. National, regional and local plans have been prepared in a number of countries, but other than isolated examples few have been seriously implemented. The fact is that the environment has lost its high profile on the national and global political agendas, in spite of the fact that ecological stress has worsened in the past decade. In the developed countries, only in the European Union do green issues have any constituency. A failure to act now pushes global and national environmental deterioration closer to the point of irreversibility.

If Rio was about hope, Johannesburg is all about cynicism. This perhaps is the key difference between Rio and the World Summit on Sustainable Development, which concluded in Johannesburg on September 4. The defining emotions that Johannesburg conjures are cynicism and surrender to corporate control of global resources. It is not as if corporate interests were not present in Rio.

Nonetheless, they were present in much larger numbers in Johannesburg, more visible, and much more aggressive.

### **NOW WHAT?**

The percentage of environmental executive orders of total executive orders in various presidencies is<sup>31</sup> –

1- Reagan-I	7%
2- Reagan-II	7%
3- Bush, Sr.	11%
4- Clinton-1	15%
5- Clinton-II	13%

The above data substantiate that despite much rhetoric of the modern presidents about environmental issues the traditional president like Roosevelt had implemented more environmental policy.

The very notion of dealing with the problem of global warming was premised on the notion of common but differentiated responsibilities. It was recognized that it is the developed countries, which are responsible for putting the maximum stress on the resources of the globe and hence have the major responsibility in remedying the situation. To quote and oft cited example, an average American is responsible for as much greenhouse gas emission as 19 Indians, 30 Pakistanis, 49 Sri Lankans, 107 Bangladeshis, 134

---

<sup>31</sup> Inter Governmental Panel on Climate Change, Footnote 15, p80

Bhutanese, and 269 Nepalis.<sup>32</sup> Clearly the crass consumerist culture, which typifies societies under capitalism and which, arguably, allows capitalism to thrive, is today responsible for putting pressures on global resources that cannot be sustained over a long period. Capitalism has responded to this in two ways—both of which do not even touch the basic problem. It has sought to pass on the blame to the impoverished nations of the world by claiming that rising populations in the global South is responsible for making this planet resource poor. To activists, it is seen as attempt to deny reality. They argue that If this logic is to be true, for India to match the consumption load of the US its population would have to be 20 times and not just 2 ½ times that of the US. The other ploy has been to off-load environmentally degrading activities on to developing countries. By this, capitalist nations have sought to silence domestic critics. Japanese consumption, for instance, was responsible for up to 70 per cent of timber logged—most of it illegally -- in the Philippines from the fifties to the nineties.

What global capitalism is not prepared to accept is the fact that unsustainable lifestyles of the developed global North has brought the planet to the brink of a disaster. Instead, President George H. W. Bush Sr. responded to the Rio Summit of 1992 by saying "America's lifestyle is not up for negotiation." If that was the case in 1992, the situation is far worse in 2002. The Johannesburg Summit

---

<sup>32</sup> Bruce E. Johansen, The Global Warming: Desk Reference, (CT: Greenwood, 2002), p9

may well be classified as an attempt to redefine sustainable development as sustainable free trade.

Leading up to Bonn, in July 2001, George Bush had deemed the Kyoto Protocol 'fatally flawed' and expressly stated that the US would not be part of it. Japan, whose support was essential without the US on board, objected to the terminology of some clauses concerning compliance to target cuts. The 'Umbrella countries' (forested nations like Canada, Japan, Australia and Russia) sought the inclusion of carbon sinks to offset their GHG emissions cuts. After days of intense negotiations, however, a deal endorsed by 178 countries was announced, albeit a significantly diluted version from the one the EU had been pushing.

When ratified, the countries will have to implement strict systems to verify and report carbon emissions. The deal has been met with mixed responses. Many environmentalists have focused on the cost of compromise to the environment, saying that the original targets, which averaged 5.2% of 1990 levels by 2012, have been reduced to about 2%. To put that into further perspective, many climate scientists say that cuts of 50% will be required during this century.

The Bush Administration's approach at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg has seriously undermined the global community's efforts to protect clean air and water, and fight global warming. The international community is stressing to the Bush Administration that working with other countries, and holding enormous global corporations accountable

for their environmental impact will help protect the environment both here within the United States and around the world. "The Administration has consistently blocked attempts to protect the global environment by promoting plans that benefit large corporations rather than the billions of citizens who have to deal with environmental crises, like dirty water and air, and global climate change," said Sierra Club Director Michael Dorsey.

At Johannesburg the US government delegation, following the directive of the Bush Administration, repeatedly resisted any serious steps to address a host of global environmental problems, especially global warming. The Administration steadfastly opposed international efforts to hold multinational corporations accountable for their business practices. The head of the US delegation criticized environmental targets and timetables as "theater" and "fiction" not worthy of serious consideration. Even as the summit was underway, more than 200 non-governmental organizations have signed a critique of the Johannesburg meeting entitled, "A Disaster in the Making".

Hence, the record of the past three presidents demonstrates that the White House has had a vital but hardly consistent role in shaping national environmental policies. Most of Reagan's anti environmental initiatives were repudiated by Congress, but he indirectly influenced the environmental agenda by intervening in regulatory processes, cutting agency budgets and personnel, delaying new environmental commitments and challenging the cost

and effectiveness of programs established in the 1970s. Bush attempted to strike a balance between cooperating with Congress and holding the line on other new policies, and he restored some of the funding and integrity of the regulatory processes lost in the 1980s. However, his administration remained deeply divided internally and Bush adopted an increasingly conservative stance during the second half of his term. Clinton seemed to adopt a reverse strategy of postponing environmental commitments at the beginning of his term when his party controlled Congress, taking a firm pro-environmental approach only after the opposition gained ascendancy in 1994. Nevertheless, he also established an "administrative presidency" that ultimately laid the groundwork for innovative approaches to environmental protection and sustainable development policies. Most importantly, President Clinton began to restore America's flagging leadership on international environmental issues.

Candidate Bush during the presidential Campaign 2000 said, "I'll tell you one thing I'm going to do, is I'm not going to let the United States carry the burden for cleaning up the world's air like the Kyoto treaty would have done." George W. Bush, succeeding to the presidency three years after the protocol's signing, had some choices and may not have made the best choice when he rejected the plan outright last year.

With President Bush Jr. an altogether new era in terms of environmental policy has started, an era of outright defiance and



rejection of any efforts to control global warming and of denying responsibility towards it.

The administration has followed the argument of featuring the intractability of environmental problems, of the scientific uncertainty over the causes, and implications of global warming, "My cabinet-level working group has met regularly for the last ten weeks to review the most recent, most accurate, and most comprehensive science. They have heard from scientists offering a wide spectrum of views; they have reviewed the facts, and they have listened to many theories and suppositions. The working group asked the highly respected National Academy Of Sciences to provide us the most up-to-date information about what is known –and what is not known –on the science of climate change ...the United States [will] help lead the way by advancing the science on climate change." President Bush. In a report requested by the Bush administration, a committee of the National Academies' National Research Council summed up science's current understanding of global climate change by characterizing the global warming trend over the last 100 years, and examining what may be in store for the 21st century and the extent to which warming may be attributable to human activity.

President George W. Bush stated in context of the climate change, "we're going to make decisions based on sound science, not some environmental fad or what may sound good." But, these steps did not convert into actual implementation at the Johannesburg

summit, which was in many ways a repeat show of the Rio summit held almost ten years back. So far, the Administration has shown a lack of commitment to curbing climate change and protecting clean air, as evidenced by withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol on climate change, and domestic efforts to weaken the Clean Air Act.

Even the recently concluded Conference of Parties at New Delhi on global warming ended with the Delhi Declaration after deliberations, which showed little common ground between various State parties on many contentious issues.

## CHAPTER III

### CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES AND LEGISLATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

**Congress, by contrast to the executive branch is fragmented institution and is subject to pressure from a variety of political actors involved in the policy process.<sup>1</sup>**

In the arena of environmental policy-making the presidential-congressional relationship can be characterized as dichotomous as large degree of consensus about environmental problems and strategies are on partisan mode and difficult to achieve.

#### **Constitutional Powers Of The Congress Over Environmental Issues**

Under the U.S. constitution, the Congress bears primary responsibility with the president for federal policymaking on the environment. Congress is given chief responsibility for enacting public policies and for appropriating the funds necessary to implement them, powers that translate into a continuing role of oversight. Historically however, Congress has been just as influential as the White House in setting the overall direction of environmental policies. For most of the modern environmental era, Congress has operated with broad bipartisan agreement on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Glenn Sussman, and Mark Andrew Kelso, "Environmental Priorities and President as Legislative Leader" in Dennis L.Soden, The Environmental Presidency, (New York: New York State University Press), p114

issues. The commerce clause under Article-I, section-8 of the constitution grants congress the authority “ to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states.”<sup>2</sup> Supreme Court of the United States has held that the commerce clause gives the congress plenary authority that is complete in it and may be exercised in no limitation other than prescribed in the constitution. Once congress has concluded that an activity affects interstate commerce, it has full authority over it.

### **‘Composition’ Affects The Nature Of The Congress**

Congress has effectively, so far, overshadowed the presidential initiative on environmental issues via its control over legislative process and oversight function, particularly the authority vested in the power committee system.<sup>3</sup> Congress’s actions on the environment reflect not only its partisan and ideological makeup but also its dualistic nature as a political institution. In addition to serving as a national lawmaking body, Congress is an assembly of politicians who are elected to represent politically disparate districts and states. This means they focus as much on local and regional impacts of environment and resource policies as they do on the effects of these policies on the nation as a whole. Members also tend to adopt a relatively short term view of environmental policy issues compared with the long-term perspective frequently adopted by

---

<sup>2</sup> USIA, Constitution of America, Washington D.C. 1987, p-27

<sup>3</sup> A. Robert Shanely, Presidential Influence and Environmental Policy, (Westport, CT.: Greenwood, 1992.), p51

environmental scientists and policy analysts in touting such new approaches as ecosystem management and sustainable development.

These institutional characteristics mean that action on environmental policies in Congress is rarely easy. Sometimes it is impossible at least in the short run. In the face of inaction, the public may see a body of politicians who do little about environmental and other public problems. This perception reinforces the prevailing negative image of Congress and its members; it is generally held that Congress is as two political scientists put it, "slothful, slow, conflict-ridden, immobilized, and inactive."<sup>4</sup>

The "do-nothing" Congress is in reality a deeply divided Congress. The fundamental political reality is that all too often members can find no way to reconcile their diverse and conflicting interests and build consensus on policy actions.

There are however some striking exceptions to this common pattern of deadlock. In 1990, for instance Congress approved a far-reaching extension of the Clean Air Act, the nation's most demanding environmental statute.<sup>5</sup> In 1996, it ended a long stalemate on

---

<sup>4</sup> Samuel C. Paterson and Gregory Caldeira, "Standing up for Congress: Variations in Public Esteem since the 1960s" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 15 (1990), pp-20-22

<sup>5</sup> For details of the act see

- Alyson Pytte, "Clean Air Act Amendments." Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, 48 (24 November 1990), pp3934-3963
- Todd Smith, "Big Oil, Big Three Argue with Clean Air Act." Washington Times, 13 June 1991. Sec. C, p.3. and

pesticide policy through adoption of the Food Quality Protection Act, and in the same year, it approved a major revision of the Safe Drinking Water Act.<sup>6</sup> An intriguing question is how it is possible for Congress to achieve a remarkable consensus on some environmental policies while remaining mired in gridlock in case of others.

### **Causes of Gridlock in Congress**

Achieving international agreement on global responsibility for reducing green house gas emissions is tantamount to establishing international agreement on how to divide right to emit green house gases over the long term. Any international treaty on global warming signed by United States must be ratified by the senate and senate as the true representative of the various groups and voices in American politics often goes into the gridlock.<sup>7</sup>

A recent example of this was witnessed when the differences between the Senate and the House which are also controlled by the opposing parties, came to surface the U.S. Senate approved 88-11 a version of the National Energy Policy Act differing in several areas from the version passed in the House. The House bill allows oil and gas drilling on parts of Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

---

➤ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Clean Air Act of 1990, a Primer on Consensus-Building. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1990)

<sup>6</sup> Newt Gingrich and Dick Armey ed., Contract With America, (New York: Random House, 1994), pp133-40

<sup>7</sup> Michael A.Toman, Moving Ahead with Climate Policy (Washington D.C.: RFF press book), 2001, P262

(ANWR); the Senate version bans it, including not allowing oil drilling in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), a vital part of the Bush administration's plan for U.S. energy independence. That job of resolving the differences between the two versions then falls on a House and Senate conference committee, which will have some "tall conferencing" to do. The Senate did this despite the fact that President Bush considered drilling in ANWR a key to decreasing the nation's dependence on foreign oil. Therefore, a divided Congress can very much ignore the wishes of the president.

Then again a consensus was displayed when, in September 2002 one-fourth of the members of the U.S. House of Representatives, including its Democratic leaders, said this week the energy bill being assembled by House and Senate negotiators should address global climate change. "We believe prudent action is needed to address the environmental and economic impacts of climate change." The letter lauded "common sense steps" in the U.S. Senate version of the energy bill that would require public disclosure of greenhouse gas emissions by large factories and power plants; create a White House office on climate change; encourage U.S. participation in global talks on climate change, and expand research and innovative technology. "Our climate is changing and if the current system continues, we are headed toward drastic disruptions in our climate," said Rep. John Olver, Massachusetts Democrat and a co-author of the letter.

Building consensus within the Congress is made difficult as well by the political independence of members, who vigorously pursue their narrow district, state, or regional interests regardless of the preferences of party leaders, including the president. On June 3, 1999, President Clinton issued an executive order to reduce government dependence on electric and coal-produced energy by utilizing renewable energy. In response, Senator Thad Cochran (R-MS), a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, inserted language into the Interior Appropriations bill prohibiting the use of funds to "study, develop, or implement procedures or policies to establish energy efficiency ... other than those based upon the provisions of the Energy Conservation Policy Act of 1975." The language was inserted to counter what some saw as a move by the president to implement small parts of the Kyoto Protocol without the Senate's approval.

In March of 1999, Senators Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) and the late John Chafee (R-RI) submitted the Credit for Voluntary Reductions Act.<sup>8</sup> The Act would give early credits to companies for reducing their greenhouse gas emissions before any regulations are imposed. These credits will then be able to be traded or sold when or if the Kyoto treaty is ratified or other regulatory legislation is passed. The legislation has drawn critics from all sides, who either claimed that

---

<sup>8</sup> US Senate, Committee on Energy and National Resources, "Credit For Voluntary Reduction Act" March 25, 1999, 106<sup>th</sup> Congress, Senate Resolution no. 547, Washington D.C.; USGPO)



the legislation did not go far enough or that it is a "back door" attempt to implement the Kyoto treaty.

There are other reasons as well why environmental policy is stuck in gridlock. One of these is the complexity and intractability of environmental problems compounded by scientific uncertainty over their scope, causes, and implications. The more complex the issue and less the consensus among the scientists, on causes and solutions the more likely stalemate is to occur. Wherever scientific consensus reigns, Congress is less likely to impede policy action. Despite all these factors, the Congress has been deeply involved in process of 'creation of norms' to regulate United States response towards global warming.<sup>9</sup>

Despite the United State's intensive investment in climate change science over the past decade, numerous gaps remain in the understanding of climate change. The National Academy of Sciences identified in its report, *Climate Change Science: An Analysis of Some Key Questions* (June 2001), critical uncertainties about the science of climate change. At the most fundamental level, the report indicated the need to better understand the causes of warming. The National Academy of Sciences stated, "Greenhouse gases are accumulating in Earth's atmosphere as a result of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise. Temperatures are, in fact, rising. The changes

---

<sup>9</sup> Peter J. Katzenstien, "Alternative Perspective on National Security" in Peter J. Katzenstien ed., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* ,(New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), p5

observed over the last several decades are likely mostly due to human activities, but we cannot rule out that some significant part of these changes are also a reflection of natural variability.”

Another cause for stalemate is the lack of public consensus. The more the public aggress on basic policy directions, the easier it is for Congress to act. That relationship could in fact help vastly in furthering action on environmental policy because there has been a tremendous increase in the public support for environmental protection. Yet, the fears exist of this support from the public being inconsistent.

Thirdly, interests groups willingly enter the political vacuum created by an inattentive and disengaged public. Most groups also have markedly increased their presence in the nation’s capital over the past twenty-five years in what is termed as an “advocacy-explosion” i.e., a sharp rise in the number of groups, the scope of their activities, and the intensity of their efforts. Business groups have become especially well represented and generally have greater resources than environmental organizations to use in furthering their legislative agenda. Yet, even interest groups disagree with each other and this increases the possibility of gridlock. In recent years business and environmental groups have proven adept at blocking each other’s initiatives in Congress, thus assuring political stalemate.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> J.Connelly, & G. Smith, Politics and the Environment, (London: Rutledge, 1999), pp45-65

Fourthly, the high cost of environmental protection and the way that policy makers think about and compare the costs and the benefits of taking action causes gridlock. Adopting policies to deal with problems such as climate change or protection of biological diversity- policies with highly visible short term costs and uncertain long term benefits - is difficult without compelling scientific evidence of the risks to human or ecological health or to economic well being. Such evidence is rarely available, as scientific findings are nearly always subject to dispute. The value in financial terms is not easy to apply to the benefits of spending on environmental protection and so it is forever a matter of disagreement. Those who are calling for immediate action to reduce emissions of heat-trapping gases recognize the financial and social costs involved with this proposal and argue that the stakes are much too high to just wait or do nothing at all. Even with immediate action, warming trends are likely to continue well into the next century. It is argued that too many questions remain to justify investing money in solutions.

This has been the attitude of the US government in recent years-- that it would be cheaper to adapt to climate change rather than restructure the whole energy system. A powerful coalition of companies have worked for years to slow any efforts to control global warming pollution, claiming that efforts to reduce emissions would be too expensive. According to Michael Boskin, chairman of the Bush administration's Council of Economic Advisors, cutting

emissions by 20 percent would, for no reason, cost the US "trillions of dollars". This argument, however, blatantly ignores the huge economic and human costs of living with the impacts of a warming planet.

In 1998 the Energy Information Agency's emission figures show that US industry has made some surprising progress in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Fossil fuel use in 1998 fell 1.4% from the 1997 level, even as the gross domestic product grew 3.9%. Similar trends can be seen around the world, showing a disconnection between economic stability and carbon emissions. If this falling trend continues, it could show that cutting back will not be as hard as previously thought. As global temperatures continue to rise, the costs too expensive to contemplate will be the costs of doing nothing.

A final explanation for gridlock in the Congress is the absence of effective political leadership. The role of presidential initiative has indeed been argued in the second chapter. Similarly strong leadership within the Congress either at the Committee level or among party leaders helps to forge the majorities needed for enacting legislation. Just as effective leadership from the White House is needed, so is effective leadership at the Congressional level required for building consensus among disparate interests.

### **Congressional policymaking**

Global environmental policies of United States have been deeply intertwined with domestic politics and policy. Action on global climate change has emerged a notable example, where domestic politics greatly shaped the stance that United States was prepared to adopt.<sup>11</sup>

The 1970s offer examples of both successful and unsuccessful environmental policy making. The record of the “environmental decade” is nevertheless remarkable, particularly in comparison with actions taken during most of the 1980s and 1990s. The National Environmental Policy Act, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, among others were signed into law in the 1970s, largely between 1970 and 1976. Their enactment demonstrates that the Congress is in fact capable of developing major environmental policies in fairly short order under the right conditions. Consensus on environmental policy could prevail in the 1970s because the issues were new and politically popular, and attention focused on broadly supported program goals such as cleaning up the nation’s air and water.

The new republican Congress elected in 1994, expressed big opposition towards environmental regulation and singled out US

---

<sup>11</sup> Sheldon kamieniecki and Michael E. Kraft “ Series Forward” in ] Elizabeth R. D. Sombre Domestic Sources of International Environmental Policy: Industry, Environmentalists, and U S. Power (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000), p-ix

EPA for budget cuts and restraint on regulatory authority, and sought to weaken most environmental laws.<sup>12</sup> The environmental policies pursued by the republican dominated congress in 1995, along with memories of the hostility shown toward environmental legislation in the early years of Reagan administration and disappointment of president Bush's self-proclaimed "environmental president" strengthened the belief held by many observers that republicans are necessarily less sympathetic to environmental protection than democrats.<sup>13</sup>

Some environmentalists termed the 103<sup>rd</sup> Congress and the 104<sup>th</sup> Congress, in which the Republicans held majority, as, "the worst environmental Congress," in the last two decades.<sup>14</sup>

The conflict between the president and Congress in 1995 was so intense that President Clinton's overall success rate in Congress dropped from the record high in 1993 to the lowest points since 1953.<sup>15</sup>

Since the initial Climate Change Treaty conference in Kyoto, Congress has been an obstacle in the attempt to fight against global warming, both internationally and at home.

Scientists have reported that the changing climate will keep on creating increasingly costly killer storms, fires, floods and droughts.

---

<sup>12</sup> John H. Cushman, "Senate Approves Deep Cuts in Environmental Spending", New York Times, Dec15, 1995, A14

<sup>13</sup> Footnote 1, p131

<sup>14</sup> John H. Cushman, "Few Environmental Law Emerge from 103<sup>rd</sup> Congress," New York Times, Oct 3, 1994; A10

<sup>15</sup> John Healy, "Clinton Success Rate, Declined to a Record Low in 1995," Congress Quarterly Weekly Report, Jan 7, 1996, p-193

In June 1997, congress refused to support the climate treaty negotiating process. Indeed, the Senate refused to ratify the treaty before negotiations were even finished. In late 1997, a blue ribbon panel of U.S. energy experts, including environmentalists and far-sighted oil industry representatives, called for a dramatic increase in public spending to foster increased efficiency in use of fuel and to develop new sources of power. A Clinton administration proposal to spend \$6.3 billion on energy saving measures (partly in response to the panel's recommendations) was rejected by Congress. In July of 1998, Congress actually approved a spending bill that restricted funding for the fight against global warming and other government programs. In one particularly offensive section, the bill barred the EPA from spending any money for actions in line with the still un-ratified Kyoto treaty. The EPA was even prohibited from encouraging industry to increase U.S. energy efficiency, cut energy costs, and reduce carbon emissions. These maneuvers, and others like them, were slipped onto other essential pieces of budget legislation as "riders," out of the range of public scrutiny and debate.

At the December 1997 Conference on Climatic Change which was to be held in Kyoto, Japan Long before the compromise involving the reduction of global greenhouse gas emissions by 5.2 percent over the next 15 years had been reached, there was evidence of its hollow echo, with U.S. congressmen, representing coal, iron and steel interests, intimating that they would scupper any treaty by voting to oppose it when it comes up for ratification by Congress later this

year. The signing of the treaty by the Clinton administration is seen largely as symbolic, and because of intense Senate opposition, the administration did not even submit the treaty for ratification. Even before the actual Kyoto conference, Senators Robert Byrd (Democrat-West Virginia) and Chuck Hagel (Republican-Nebraska) sponsored a "sense of the Senate" resolution that passed 95-0 declaring that the Senate would not ratify the treaty unless large developing nations like China and India were in the first round of emission cuts, and that the treaty cause no "serious harm to the economy of the United States."<sup>16</sup>

However, where one controversy has died, others have quickly arisen. Nowhere has this been more evident than in the conflicting reactions that have greeted the president's Clear Skies Initiative, which aims to cut greenhouse gas intensity by eighteen percent over the next ten years primarily through market incentives. Two aspects of the plan in particular have attracted criticism: the use of "greenhouse gas intensity," which is defined as emissions per dollar of gross domestic product, as a metric; and the use only of voluntary measures to control emissions.

"Unless the concept of greenhouse gas intensity can be clearly documented and result in measured and verifiable reductions in emissions it has as much integrity as an Arthur Anderson audit,"

---

<sup>16</sup> Senate Resolution. 98, 105<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, Congressional Record S 8138; July 25, 1997 (The resolution also stated the view that any agreement which would require Senate advice and consent should be accompanied by a detailed analysis of its economic impact and of any legislation and regulations necessary to implement the agreement)



said Sen. John Kerry (Democrat-Maryland) to several Bush Administration officials at one of the recent congressional hearings, held July 11 by the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. "... Given that reducing intensity corresponds to increasing emissions, and 10 years of voluntary action has failed to decrease our aggregate emissions, many of us have little confidence that this administration will assert responsible global environmental leadership on climate change."

A significant part of the president's climate strategy focuses on the need to conduct more research in order to improve climate models and predictions. The president has proposed two new research and development programs: the Climate Change Research Initiative and the National Climate Change Technology Initiative.

The day before the Senate hearing, the House Science Committee held a hearing to examine these programs. While the tone was less confrontational, Chairman Sherwood Boehlert (Republican-NY) nonetheless made some pointed statements. "It's extremely hard to figure out what the administration is doing in, or planning for its climate change science and technology programs," Boehlert said. "We have had trouble getting answers to our questions, we've heard contradictory descriptions of programs from different agencies and even from different parts of the White House, we've had trouble learning how the administration plans to spend the \$80 million for its initiatives."

The third hearing, held July 25 by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, focused on the usefulness of climate models presented in the 2000 U.S. National Climate Change Assessment for examining regional climates. This hearing also engendered a good deal of debate, as several panelists argued that current models are helpful though imperfect, and James J. O'Brien, a climatologist at Florida State University, argued that they are basically useless.

As the United States is responsible for the majority of world emissions, Congress must recognize that climate change is a genuine and pressing national security issue -- exactly like a full-scale military emergency --and it's time to defend ourselves. Not curing our emissions is just plain negligence.

There are legal questions relating to the role of Congress, for instance it has been asked whether the Kyoto Protocol be treated as an executive agreement for which Senate or Congressional consent is not required. During the hearing on the Convention, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee propounded to the Administration the general question of whether protocols and amendments to the Convention and to the Convention's Annexes would be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent.<sup>17</sup>

The precautionary principle says, 'if the scientific evidence is incomplete, you shouldn't do anything to make the situation worse.'

---

<sup>17</sup> Congressional Research Service, 'Treaties And Other International Agreements: The Role Of The United States Senate' (106<sup>th</sup> Congress-71, 2001), Washigton, D.C.: pp 76-96.

It should not be 'if you do not understand everything, you should shut up and do nothing.'<sup>18</sup>

However, the developing economies are the most vulnerable, in a way the developed economies are not, by the time climate change occurs. In the developed world, hardly any component of the national income is affected by climate. Agriculture is practically the only sector of the economy affected by climate, and it contributes only a small percentage -- three percent in the United States -- of national income. If agricultural productivity were drastically reduced by climate change, the cost of living would rise by one or two percent, and at a time when per capita income will likely have doubled. In developing countries, in contrast, as much as a third of GNP and half the population currently depends on agriculture. They may still be vulnerable to climate change for many years to come.

"Global climate change is the supertanker environmental issue; it can potentially affect our values, our behavior, our social structures, and our institutions, which like a supertanker are slow to form, slow to stop, and slow to change."<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Bette Hillman, "Case Grows For Climate Change", Chemical and Engineering News, 9 August 1999; pp 16-23

<sup>19</sup> Terrell J., Minger ed. Greenhouse Glastnost: The Crisis of Global Warming, (New York: Ecco Press, 1990), pp 49-63.

### **Kyoto Negotiations: Analyzing Congressional Response**

During the various pre negotiation meetings prior to the meeting at Kyoto, the US was not willing to sign any legally binding environmental treaty. But president Clinton took initiative in this regard and gave the assurance to consider such treaties. The Kyoto protocol, in december1997 was first such treaty. As Timothy Wirth, Under Secretary for Global Affairs has testified, "President Clinton's announcement of the US target on oct22 changed the dynamics of negotiations. His speech marked the beginning of a new initiative to undertake realistic and achievable efforts to reduce green house gas emission."<sup>20</sup>

The Kyoto Protocol, negotiated in December 1997, set targets for developed countries to reduce their emissions. As sessions concluded, the U.S. signed the protocol amid much fanfare. This was mainly "a ceremonial act, because the US is not bound by the treaty unless the Senate ratifies it," and opposition to the treaty is so strong that the Clinton administration will not be sending it to Capitol Hill for a vote anytime soon. Most members of Congress seem to agree with the view of Representative Jim Sensenbrenner (Wisconsin) that the Kyoto Protocol "poses a severe threat to the vitality of the US economy in the form of drastic energy price increases, job losses in key manufacturing industries, and an

---

<sup>20</sup> Statement by Timothy Wirth, Under Secretary for Global Affairs, House Committee of International Relations, "The Administrations Position on Climate Change Policy", 105<sup>th</sup> Congress, I session, Nov13,1997,(Washington D.C.: USGPO), p17

overall decline in our standard of living". It is this view from our leadership that is resulting in government inaction-- the US has made little progress toward meeting its goal to reach 7% below 1990 greenhouse gas levels by 2012.

The Kyoto Protocol should not be a partisan issue. The percentage reduction of greenhouse-gas emissions to which the United States committed itself was in all probability unachievable when the protocol was adopted in 1997. The protocol then languished in Washington for the final three years of the Clinton administration, which chose not to present it to the Senate for ratification. In accordance with a Senate resolution calling for the full participation of the main developing countries in the protocol's emissions-cutting requirements, that pause was supposed to allow time for negotiation to bring those countries on board. The Clinton administration's plan to combat rising levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere was subjected to much criticism, and provided fodder for skeptical Members of Congress. The Administration's plan and the Kyoto Protocol have come under attack from Congress for several reasons, including whether the emissions targets can be reached without devastating the domestic economy and doubt about the effectiveness of emissions reductions in preventing global warming. Another major sticking point is the uncertain role of developing nations in the treaty that will emerge from the Kyoto Protocol. The Senate, in a 95-0 vote, resolved last year not to ratify any treaty that excluded developing nations like China and India.

The U.S. "commitment" to the protocol meant cutting emissions significantly below their 1990 level by 2010 -- which required a 25 or 30 percent reduction in projected emissions levels. Such a cut was almost certainly infeasible when the Clinton administration signed the protocol in 1997. Three years later, with no action toward reducing emissions, no evidence of any planning on how to reduce emissions, and no attempt to inform the public or Congress about what might be required to meet that commitment, what might barely have been possible to achieve over 15 years -- 1997 to 2012 -- had become unreasonable. The Senate will not confirm a treaty unless it knows what actions the "commitment" entails, and no president could answer that question without a year's preparation. Even well-informed congressmen disagree about what the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change will accomplish. Some cheer the fact that the generally richer nations participating in the protocol agreed to cut their collective emissions of the greenhouse gases that cause global warming to about five percent less than 1990 levels by early in the next century. These optimists also applaud features of the Kyoto accord designed to hold down the costs of achieving these reductions. In computing their emissions, nations can include changes in the six major greenhouse gases emitted because of human activity, not just carbon dioxide, the most important of the six. In addition, countries can factor in reduced carbon dioxide levels from changes in land use and new forestry techniques that take the gas out of the atmosphere. Groups of participating nations

may comply jointly and reallocate commitments among themselves, as the European Union (EU) plans to do within a European "bubble," and there is agreement in principle to some form of emissions trading. Joint implementation, under which agents in one country can get credit for reductions they achieve in another, is to be permitted between participating nations, and a new Clean Development Mechanism will provide access to these opportunities in nonparticipating countries, mainly in the developing world. Finally, emissions targets are not rigidly tied to a single year, but to averages over a five-year "commitment period" from 2008 to 2012.

Pessimists, on the other hand, see Kyoto as a costly defeat. They note that there is no solid proof that human-induced climate change will occur or that its adverse effects would be serious were it to happen. At the same time, the expense of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to meet the Kyoto targets will be substantial, and pessimists believe that the effort will make participating countries less competitive. In the darkest interpretation, the Kyoto agreement is a pact among rich nations that will cripple their economies for decades to come, made simply because today's political leaders needed to burnish their environmental credentials.

US Representative Claudine Schneider (Rhode Island), author of the Global Warming Prevention Act, reports that detailed government and private studies show the US economy could maintain its robust economic growth while achieving \$200 billion per year in energy through use of alternative forms of energy. In the case of these

renewables-- solar, biomass, hydro, wind, and geothermal resources- the United States has barely tapped its massive reserves. According to the Department of Energy's Energy Research Advisory Board, the nation's reserves of these renewable energy resources exceeds a thousand times the total US energy consumption of 1989, and 5-10 times the US coal reserves. Both new technologies and greater efficiency, while they require an up-front investment, are more cost-effective than the traditional use of fossil fuels, so why haven't they been universally implemented?

The Kyoto pact on global warming is neither a battle won nor a costly burden -- more like a quick political fix for the vast problems of climate change. Above all, policymakers need to think more about the long term. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions requires including the developing countries that sat out Kyoto. Research into affordable energy sources that emit little carbon dioxide must intensify. In addition, the world must develop international bodies to minimize the costs of cutting greenhouse gas emissions, including trading emission rights.<sup>21</sup>

### **107<sup>th</sup> Congress: Two Years of Bush Administration**

On November 12, 1998, the United States signed the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The Protocol had been concluded a year earlier (on December 10, 1997) by delegates from 161 nations and sets binding targets for

---

<sup>21</sup> Henry D. Jacoby, Ronald G. Prinn, and Richard Schmalensee, "Kyoto's Unfinished Business" by Foreign Affairs, July/August 1998



reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases by developed nations. It cannot be legally binding on the U.S. until it enters into effect internationally and the Senate gives its advice and consent. Nonetheless, signature of a treaty does impose an obligation under international law to refrain from actions that would undermine the Protocol's object and purpose. That obligation continues to apply until the signatory ratifies the Protocol or makes clear its intent not to do so. Signature alone does not implement the Protocol, nor does it provide a legal basis for the provisional implementation of the Protocol by the U.S.. Congress can, however, pursuant to its own constitutional authority, adopt measures, which parallel or support the obligations of the Protocol. This report addresses each of these legal issues and will be updated as events warrant. Signature in itself does not make the Protocol legally binding on the United States.<sup>22</sup>

The administration under president Bush during the 107<sup>th</sup> congress is not a different story to tell. The new administration, as the earlier ones, has talked of 'Green' rhetoric. By deploying the green rhetoric, however vacuous, the state makes a token gesture to placate the concerns of the public and to forestall a crisis of legitimacy.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Kyoto Protocol, Art. 24. As of September 27, 2002, the Protocol had been signed by 84 states and ratified by 95, including Japan, France, Germany, China, India, and the United Kingdom. The ratifying states produced only 37.1 percent of the carbon dioxide emitted in 1990, however. For a list of the signatures and ratifications, see the official website for the Framework Convention: [<http://www.unfccc.int/resource/kpstats.pdf>].

<sup>23</sup> Colin Hay, "Environmental Security And State Legitimacy" in Michael O'Connor, ed., Is Capitalism Sustainable? Political Economy And Politics Of Economy (NY: Guilford), 1994, p-221

While many heads of state from around the world used the opportunity of the largest international meeting in history to announce their country's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, The Bush administration worked furiously to remove renewable energy targets and timetables from the final plan of action.

Members of the Green Party of the United States are promoting positive US participation in solving the global environmental issues. However, Greens despair that the interests of the American people are being betrayed by the bullying anti-environmental stance of a delegation sent by the Bush White House. In the midst of a global ecological crisis that the Bush Administration's own studies have confirmed, the President continues to enact corporate-friendly policies and legislation that aggravate the damage, threaten public health, and compromise national security, charge, Greens. "We Americans place the greatest burden on the environment, through CO2 emissions and over consumption," said Margaret Lewis, Congressional candidate in NY State's new 20th Congressional District. "It takes 12.2 hectares of land to support each American citizen, while it takes just half a hectare to support someone in Burundi".

Senator John Chafee (Republican-Rhode Island) and eleven cosponsors reintroduced their bill on March 4<sup>th</sup> to provide regulatory credit for voluntary early action to mitigate potential environmental impacts from greenhouse gas emissions. "Business

interests were and still are concerned that an early credit bill could be the first step toward ratifying the Kyoto protocol--a move they vehemently oppose on both scientific and financial grounds. Environmentalists--save the Environmental Defense Fund--oppose the measure".

Whatever the short-term outcomes, setting policy directions ultimately requires a greater level of public involvement in environmental politics. This is because such decisions must necessarily address fundamental questions about the role of government, the policies that are most appropriate, the setting of priorities for environmental protection, and the willingness of the American people to bear the costs.

Political institutions in a democracy, especially a representative legislature like Congress, are guided by public preferences. Yet, the public's political influence will depend on its willingness to become more knowledgeable about environmental problems and to participate in the search for effective solutions, from local communities to the national level. Fortunately, detailed information about Congress and pending legislation is widely available on the Internet. Many of the sites provide direct links to facilitate the communication with members of Congress, thus potentially enhancing the public's capacity to keep informed and influence the outcome of legislative decision-making. Mark Dowie, in his book "Losing Ground" has argued that the environmental movement is "courting irrelevance"; unable to meet its stated goals, it lost ground

during the conservative and corporate 1980s and can now choose to evolve or die. It is a "respectable, safe, and polite" movement, more consumed with expensive litigation and direct-mail marketing than with grassroots action. The modus operandi has become compromise, not the tougher stance that, Dowie argues, is essential. It is important the Congress develops a critical approach to global, environmental problems. The major power structures of world politics are deeply problematic in ecological terms, and they cannot be easily used to resolve major environmental challenges such as global warming. Instead of simply advocating the construction of new international institutions to respond to such challenges, it is important that the Congress argues for the construction of alternative social and political structure, through an analysis of globalized social practices, which generate environmental change. The environmentalists believe that the United States needs a new "environmental ethics" and the congress, as representatives of people must lead the way.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Thomas Hayed , "The Case For Environmental Morality", Journal Environmental Ethics, Spring 2003, vol.25, no.1, (Denton, Texas: environmental philosophy inc.), p-5

## CHAPTER IV

**DOMESTIC INFLUENCES ON THE US  
ENVIRONMENTAL FOREIGN POLICY**

**Nation states are not the only actors that play important role in global environmental politics, though the roles of nation states are most crucial to outcome of the issue.<sup>1</sup>**

This chapter is an attempt to explore the links between domestic interests and U.S. public policy on the environment. It would also attempt to analyze the US environmental policy in a political-economic context. Expansion of industrial and agricultural activity by a growing human population has caused a progressive extension of the range and persistence of human influence on the atmosphere. The phenomena of urban air pollution, long-range transport of smog and acidic pollutants (i.e., acid rain), depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer, and global warming demonstrate the progression of human influence from local to regional and global atmospheric scales over the past two centuries. The changes wrought by human activities, are many and so are the consequences of those changes. They also reflect a growing persistence of human perturbation of the atmosphere that ranges from days to weeks to centuries to millennia.

The exploitation of fossil fuels stands out as a source of several of these problems. Atmospheric emissions and their effects extend

---

<sup>1</sup> Gareth Porter and Janet Welsh Brown, Global Environmental Politics (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1991), p35

across physical and regulatory boundaries into the marine, fresh water, and terrestrial environments, contributing to changes as diverse as coastal flooding, eutrophication of estuaries, regression of glaciers, early emergence of insects, and bleaching of coral reefs. Scientists and scientific information, the latter often properly applied but sometimes abused, have shaped responses to these problems by the public, private, and non-governmental sectors. In addition to regulatory responses to these problems like the US Clean Air Act, a new regime of international law and regulation is embodied in the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Kyoto Protocol.

The response of the private sector has ranged from opposition to regulation to innovative voluntary efforts by firms to reduce emissions. Environmental non-governmental organizations (NGO's) have also played a critical role in shaping public and private policy responses to problems of the atmosphere.

### **Actors influencing the U.S. Environmental foreign policy**

Domestic policy to mitigate climate change would be much more invasive than ozone depletion mitigation policy. As global environmental issues such as stratospheric ozone depletion and climate change create significant dissension in U.S. domestic politics, environmental foreign policy in the United States can only rarely support accession to the relevant international agreements.

Further, as the United States is such a large emitter of greenhouse gasses, any international policy to mitigate climate change is held hostage to its domestic politics.

The president and Congress are central to any discussion of who governs American foreign policy. Nevertheless, a literal interpretation of constitutional responsibilities can leave out the involvement of many governmental and non-governmental actors that often have major impact on foreign policy process. What is required is a discussion of the pertinent issues that extends beyond constitutional powers and bureaucratic politics to a careful discussion of the role played by a wide variety of policy advocacy groups in influencing American foreign policy. In the case of climate change, the key policy actors are business and commercial enterprises and environmental non-governmental organizations as well as White House and Congress.

Important participants, other than White House and Congress, in making of global environmental policy whose role has increased in importance are the various interest groups. By 1995, the number of interest groups participating in the American political process in Washington was estimated as over eleven thousand firms or groups and fifteen thousand individuals.<sup>2</sup> These interest groups range from the oldest – economic interest groups – to the newest – foreign lobbying groups. Within and between these two types of

---

<sup>2</sup> Arthur C. Close, J. Valerie Steele, and Michael E. Buckner eds. Washington Representatives 1995, 19<sup>th</sup> edition (Washington D.C.: Columbia Books, 1995), p-2

organizations, we may identify several other categories of environmental interest groups: Labor unions, agricultural organizations, and academic think tanks.

Interest groups primarily target Congress with their influence efforts. They seek to influence members of Congress and policy making through the use of professional lobbyists (e.g., lawyers or Public Relations firms) or their own staff personnel located or assigned to Washington. Yet, a considerable portion of interest groups activities may also focus on influencing key environmental foreign policy bureaucracies.

The governmental and citizen concern about the environment originated in 1970s that was made clear when representatives of more than 100 governments gathered in Stockholm in 1972 for the UN Conference on the Human Environment. That conference laid out a remarkably foresighted agenda for intergovernmental action. In a unprecedented phenomena, thousands of concerned citizens from around the world, including many from the United States, participated in the accompanying Stockholm environmental forum.<sup>3</sup>

### **Domestic Business Interests**

Economic interest groups probably comprise the largest number of foreign policy groups. Several umbrella economic organizations lobby for business interests. For example, the National Association

---

<sup>3</sup> Thomas B. Stoel "Public Engagement in International Environmental Policy" Chapter 11, in Daniel Yankelovich and I M Destler eds., Beyond The Beltway (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1994) p-255



of Manufacturers, the United States Chambers of Commerce, the Committee on Economic Development and the Business Round Table, among others, would fit into this category.<sup>4</sup> Beyond these umbrella groups, particular manufacturing, industrial and commodity interests usually engage in separate lobbying activities.

Business plays a central role in the formation of U.S. foreign environmental policy. Business, of course, is not the sole influencing factor in the making of U.S. foreign policy, but it does occupy a privileged place in the variety of interest groups involved in the process. This is mainly because of the command that industry has over technology. In addition, through its key role in giving direction to investment and technological innovation, business is able to set parameters for the regulatory options available to policymakers. Therefore, based on the technological power and lobbying influence, American firms have been able to exert considerable influence over the formation of U.S. foreign environmental policy.<sup>5</sup>

In climate change politics, the fossil fuel industry has been able to create a powerful business front against strong U.S. commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, based on its key role in energy production and industrial manufacturing. Fossil fuel energy firms are also heavily engaged in developing alternative energy forms (e.g.,

---

<sup>4</sup> Norman J. Ornstein and Shirley Elder, Interests Groups, Lobbying And Policy Making (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1978), pp 35-39

<sup>5</sup> Robert Falkner "Business Conflict and U.S. Policy" in Paul G. Harris, ed The Environment, International Relations, and U.S. Foreign Policy (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2001), p-173

solar energy). They play a crucial part in the technological conversion away from fossil fuels, thus setting the pace for political change.

Even if the benefits to society from regulation outweigh the costs borne by industry, the smaller number of individuals harmed, and the greater degree of harm per capita, gives industry superior organizational advantages to prevent regulations from being imposed.<sup>6</sup>

Carbon dioxide emissions in the United States have risen approximately 15 percent since 1990. But at Kyoto in December 1997 the Clinton administration, agreed to a protocol to the FCCC that requires the US to reduce emissions 7 percent below 1990 levels over the averaging period, 2008 – 12. Due to recent increases in emissions, this constitutes a reduction of between 30 and 40 percent (depending on whether the increase since 1990 is assumed to be exponential or merely linear) beneath where they would be under a “business as usual” scenario. That “business as usual” has resulted in one of the greatest explosions in wealth creation in the history of the world. The next meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Conference on Climate Change took place in November 2000 at The Hague. This important gathering was charged with the responsibility to define the mechanisms for compliance with the Kyoto Protocol.

---

<sup>6</sup> Mancur Olson; The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Social Rigidities (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), p-41

In order to provide linkages to the US approach in climate change treaty negotiations, it would appear that, the study of some major oil companies and their lobbying strategies are necessary. The example of Exxon Mobil is the most compelling one, in order to elucidate the premise that US opposition has to do with the big business.

For more than a decade, ExxonMobil (or Esso in Europe) has been working consistently and systematically to derail any international action to tackle global warming, steering the US away from international action, not only through direct lobbying but also through covert funding and support for industry lobbying organizations and climate-skeptic scientists. (Exxon and Mobil merged in 1999 to form Exxon Mobil.)

The argument ExxonMobil uses to make its case both on the legitimacy of its economics and the long-term position of the US government, is the 1997 Senate Resolution 98 (SR-98), the so-called Byrd-Hagel resolution. The vote went 95-0 in favor of a resolution by Republican senator Chuck Hagel from Nebraska and Democratic senator Robert Byrd from West Virginia` recommended that the US should not sign an international agreement on climate unless it contained specific new commitments for developing countries. Nevertheless, a closer look at the political context of the time reveals extensive lobbying by Mobil, and by Exxon's trade and lobby groups

in favor of the resolution.<sup>7</sup> ExxonMobil is the world's most powerful climate change skeptic.

While President Bush claims he wants to lead the world on climate change, it is clear that he is the one being led by ExxonMobil, who has, in effect, both written and funded his climate policy. Exxon provides support to selected organizations that assess public policy alternatives on issues with direct bearing on the company's business operations and interests.<sup>8</sup>

At the same time, corporations are not in control of U.S. foreign environmental policy. They cannot fully determine policy choices or completely eliminate state autonomy. Other actors especially environmental and consumer groups can significantly affect the political environment within which both states and corporations formulate their environmental strategies. Most importantly, however, the business community is far from united in its attempts to influence U.S. foreign environmental policy. The fragmentation of corporate sector and the emergence of divergent, often conflicting business interests in environmental politics have given rise to a new political economy of environmental protection.

The notion of business conflict thus provides important insights into the scope for state autonomy in environmental policy making.

---

<sup>7</sup> Senate Resolution. 98, 25 July 1997. The transcript of the Senate floor debate and the Byrd-Hagel resolution are found in 'Expressing sense of Senate Regarding UN Framework Convention on Climate Change' Congressional Record (Washington D.C.: USGPO) 25 July 1997:S8113-S8139

<sup>8</sup> Ross Gelbspan, "ExxonMobil emerges as major Funder of greenhouse skeptics", The Economist, December 2000 pp 78-81 Online edition on [www.heatisonline.org](http://www.heatisonline.org)

Pro environmental state actors can derive limited autonomy from business conflict if sufficiently powerful corporate interests supports international environmental standards.

Not withstanding all these, differences have arisen between industrial groupings primarily over political strategy and tactics. The potential for a more fundamental rift has emerged with the creation of a loosely organized group of corporations that have actually supported international controls on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This group comprises large international companies who have been hit recently by a growing number of insurance claims resulting from natural catastrophes that they perceive to be linked with climate change. A number of insurance firms have advocated, more tangible efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions, and have supported the 1997 Kyoto agreement.<sup>9</sup>

Although there is considerable scope for business conflict over climate change policy, and although some analysts have expressed the hope that the fragmentation of the business community with regard to this issue may form the basis for new pro-environmental political alliances.<sup>10</sup>

### **Arguments Mounted By Big Business**

Since the first Inter Governmental Panel on Climate Change(IPCC) report, business houses have consistently followed a strategy of

---

<sup>9</sup> Peter Newell and Mathew Paterson, "A Climate for Business: Global Warming, the State and Capital", Review of International Political Economy, Vol 5, 1998 p-680

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

exploiting selective and outdated scientific studies to question the existence of global warming and the causal role of fossil fuels, in their efforts to undermine the emerging consensus from the IPCC on both the reality and the cause of climate change.

According to one estimate large industrial houses have also been funding some of the most visible and notorious 'climate skeptics', whose work it can use to back up its anti-Kyoto lobbying, and has actively sought to use them publicly to distort the debate. Whether or not money from the fossil fuel industry can be said to have corrupted the findings of scientists, these climate skeptics have been given a voice and a global platform from which to deliver their opinion to the public.<sup>11</sup> Their prominence and influence has been completely out of proportion both in terms of their contribution to the science and in the extent to which they represent wider scientific opinion. Scientists who have credibility in one field have often been hired to do PR work for the fossil fuel industry in another field, thereby parading opinion as scientific fact<sup>12</sup>

In lavish terms, the study pointed out that numerous deceptive arguments have been used to protect the corporate interests of the industry. In particular in the US, the true skeptics issue of

---

<sup>11</sup> "Charting a new course for the environment and the economy"- International Herald Tribune, November 18, 2000

<sup>12</sup> Ibid

looming large economic disaster, massive unemployment and loss of competitiveness if emissions reductions are accepted.<sup>13</sup>

### **Lobbying To Undermine The Climate Treaties**

Various pro-business lobby groups based in the U.S. have worked hard to both undermine the climate science and overplay the economic implications of climate protection. One hundred seventy-eight nations have now agreed on legally binding emissions reductions. However, with the US still refusing to take any part in the Kyoto agreement, these lobby groups funded by the industrial houses bear significant responsibility, for the current, weakened state of the international agreements to tackle global warming.

The Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), which aimed at reducing emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases signed by 166 countries (mostly non-binding agreements), was established in 1992 at the Rio summit with the aim of reducing greenhouse emissions to 1990 levels by 2000. Despite the agreement of all governments in the FCCC, few have done anything meaningful to meet the targets that were set. With production costs set to rise if the FCCC guidelines were applied, business lobbies were established to prevent any changes from being adopted. In such a situation, as the fate of the FCCC norms were bound to fail as proved in the Conference in Buenos Aires in

---

<sup>13</sup> Source of these Articles which reflect opposition to treaty on Global Warming are "Why Global Warming Would Be Good For You" in Public Interest, Winter 1995 and "Happiness in a Warm planet" op. ed. Piece in Wall Street Journal Oct7, 1997 and "A Dangerous Treaty" op. ed. in Asian Wall Street Journal, Dec10,1997

November 1992. It confirmed as near impossible the adoption of any action to reduce future emissions, let alone produce any framework for combating any rise in temperatures.

Some of these groups are mentioned below in order to identify the major actors that eventually influenced the U.S. government policy.

- **Global Climate Coalition**-Set up in 1989, the GCC, is the most outspoken and confrontational lobby group battling emissions reduction commitments. It has put enormous resources into full-scale attacks on international climate agreement, waging extensive, and multi-million dollar “disinformation” campaigns. Both Exxon and Mobil were board members of the GCC. Today, Exxon Mobil is no longer a member, but not by choice. Taking the lead from British Petroleum (BP), which left in 1997 after admitting that climate change required action, a large-scale defection of companies such as Ford, Texaco and General Motors occurred in 1999-2000. Exxon was the last to leave, and only left then because the GCC ended its corporate members programme, thereby excluding the company from eligibility.<sup>14</sup>

The coalition made essentially two arguments. The first was that deal at Kyoto would cut the economic growth & cost jobs. Administration had put out a study that indicated a \$100billion carbon tax would be needed to bring down US emissions to 1990

---

<sup>14</sup> Andreas Missbach “Regulation Theory and Climate Change Policy” Chapter-7 in Paul G. Harris ed. Climate Change and American Foreign Policy (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000) pp-146-147



level and it would reduce GDP by 1% for first 10 years.<sup>15</sup> Further by leasing out to developing countries the treaty would actually not target the reduction of emission and made more attractive for the US firms to relocate themselves and contribute to further loss of jobs at home. Others include-

- **API or American Petroleum Institute** until recently; the API is a member of the GCC.
- **International Chamber of Commerce -ICC-** is an industry lobby group. This lobby played a major role in undermining the agenda at the COP 6 in The Hague, November 2000, influencing the climate talks with economic scare stories.
- **IPIECA-International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association**
- **US Business Round Table-BRT-** The BRT is made up of CEOs from over 200 large corporations The agenda it pushes calls for global climate agreements that include developing countries, voluntary agreements for industry, 'flexible policies' and tradable emissions permits between countries. Tax and regulatory measures are strongly opposed. Its 1997 position statement proposed that 'a climate policy which fails to include all nations should be opposed.'
- **Global Climate Information Project-GCIP** - In the run up to Kyoto in 1997, this industry coalition ran a \$13m advertising

---

<sup>15</sup> " Meeting the Challenges of Climate Change at Reasonable Cost" fact Sheet Released by White House, Jul31, 1998 also available at [http://www.state.gov/global/oes/fs\\_climate\\_costs\\_980731.html](http://www.state.gov/global/oes/fs_climate_costs_980731.html).

campaign in the US press, national and local TV and radio. It was sponsored by both the API the GCC.

- **US Council on International Business-USCIB** – this corporate lobby group actively supported Bush's rejection of the Kyoto protocol.

Although developing countries emit only a fraction of global greenhouse gases, and the historical burden for emissions rests on the industrialized world, these industrial lobbies continue to argue that developing countries should make the same binding agreements to immediate reductions in emissions as the industrialized world. At the same time, they lobby developing countries to reject any environmental obligations that might 'strangle economic growth'. They allege heavy costs for developing countries, if CO2 reduction policies are implemented by industrialized nations – in an effort to undermine, developing nations calls for the rich to honor their commitments under the convention and act first. Their arguments were also directed towards the various branches of U.S. government from time to time. For instance, appearing before a Congressional Committee on Global Warming the Global Climate Coalition argued that measures to limit greenhouse gas emissions would impose severe and inequitable burdens on American Economy, citizens and competitiveness.

The GCC has been trying to work with the Congress and the Administration to support federal budget proposals that sustain

and improve upon existing policies that emphasize voluntary actions and continued advances in technologies to address greenhouse gas emissions issues. Consequently, Global Climate Coalition also lobbied U.S. Congress, making use of advertising campaigns, economic forecast studies and the like, constituting in the process an advocacy coalition. The Global Climate Coalition efforts were aimed at undermining the climate negotiations. Towards this end the Global Climate Coalition began using well-known climate skeptics like Patrick Michaels, Robert Balling and Fred Singer as 'experts' at press conferences in its attempts to undermine the credibility of accepted climate science and the findings of the IPCC.<sup>16</sup>

In 1994, the Global Climate Coalition hired a PR firm to take climate skeptic Dr Sallie Baliunas on a media tour. Under the banner of the conservative think tank, 'The George C. Marshall Institute' Dr Sallie Baliunas has published several reports which attempt to show that human activities such as burning fossil fuels have no role in global warming, that science does not suggest dangerous climate change, and that scientific findings do not support federal regulation.<sup>17</sup> To many experts of eminence, Dr Baliunas was an expert in astrophysics, not climate, and the reports were not subject to the peer review process. As such, these

---

<sup>16</sup> Ross Gelspan The Heat is On: The Climate Crisis, the Cover up, the Prescription, (Boston: Perseus Publishing, 1998), pp136-145

<sup>17</sup> Sallie Baliunas, Ozone and Global Warming: Are the Problems Real? December 1994 also available online at  
<<http://www.campaignexxonmobil.org/learn/unsettledscience.html>>.

claims were patently pro-business and meant to influence policy makers in favor of business priorities. Indeed a perusal of website of various law firms, which manages business houses strategy, it is clear that many conservative institutions such as the Hoover Institution are placing the arguments in the contexts of US economic slowdown and reciprocity arguments. Public opinion and transnational action by nongovernmental actors may provide another incentive for states to adopt the regulations they are being pressured to adopt. Many studies of environmental regulation attribute action to public opinion.<sup>18</sup>

The Global Climate Coalition (GCC) has favored forward-looking legislative approaches that could provide for expanded and coordinated research to better understand the world's climate.

### **Misusing Economics: Counting The Costs Of Climate Action**

The scientific consensus is that the earth is getting warmer. However scientists with opposing views argue that earth goes through cycles of warming and cooling anyway. However, most other scientists believe that human activity is making a difference.<sup>19</sup> Such divisions have made difficult to convince the public, that climate change is not a problem. Industries have begun to refocus

---

<sup>18</sup> Francis Cairncross, Costing The Earth: The Challenge To Governments, The Opportunities To Business (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1991) pp-2-6

<sup>19</sup> A detailed account of this argument on global warming can be found in, Michaels, P. J. "The Consequences of Kyoto." Cato Institute Policy Analysis no. 307, May 7, 1998. see also, "Long Hot Year: Latest Science Debunks Global Warming Hysteria." Cato Institute Policy Analysis no. 329, December 31, 1998

propaganda on the alleged costs of action. Numerous arguments have been made in the US, warning of economic disaster, massive unemployment and loss of competitiveness if emissions reductions are accepted.

### **The Role Of The Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)**

The emergence of global environmental problems like climate change coincided with the rise in the number and influence of NGOs. NGOs are distinctive entities with important skills and resources to deploy in the process of international environmental cooperation.<sup>20</sup> In the 1990s, there has been a remarkable rise in the number and prominence of NGOs, and their ability to precipitate change has increased.

In terms of American NGOs working on global related issues, more than 50 groups make up the US Climate Change Network, an umbrella organization for climate policy activities in the US. The work of the environment NGOs in this policy network can be classified into three broad categories:<sup>21</sup>

1. Organizations that are affiliated with international NGOs e.g. World Wide Fund for Nature and Greenpeace International,
2. Environmental organizations whose primary interest is advocacy work in the United States, e.g. Sierraclub

---

<sup>20</sup> Kal Raustiala, "States NGOs, and International Environmental Institutions", International Studies Quarterly, Vol-41, 1997, p-719

<sup>21</sup> Park, Jacob, "Governing Climate Change Policy: From Scientific Obscurity to Foreign Policy Prominence" in Paul. G. Harris, ed, Climate Change and American Foreign Policy, (New York, St. Martin's Pres, 2000), p-77

3. Research oriented environmental research groups and think tanks, e.g. PEW Centre on Global Climate Change

NGOs have built public awareness about environment through conferences and other public activities.<sup>22</sup> The greatest asset of NGO, are their large membership, which is ready to cast their votes in elections, as these NGO works. Environmental NGO can persuade legislators and president to listen to their concern.<sup>23</sup>

NGOs cannot, at least formally, dictate terms to anyone. They cannot tax, legislate, adjudicate, or establish national foreign assistance policies. However, they do have influence. The bargaining advantage of NGOs is not built on traditional power resources such as territories and armies but they do wield considerable economic strength and they can draw on concerned constituencies to rally support for opposition against state policies.<sup>24</sup>

Public opinion and transnational action by nongovernmental actors may provide another incentive for states to adopt the regulations they are being pressured to adopt. Many studies of environmental regulation attribute action to public opinion.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Robert Falkner, "Business Conflict and U.S. Policy", in Paul. G Harris, ed, The Environment, International Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2001), p-159

<sup>23</sup> Paul. G. Harris, "International Environmental Affairs and U.S. Foreign Policy", *ibid* p-23

<sup>24</sup> Morten Boas, "Multilateral Development Banks, Environmental Impact, Assessments and NGOs in U.S. Foreign Policy", *ibid*, p-183

<sup>25</sup> Francis Cairncross, Costing The Earth: The Challenge To Governments, The Opportunities To Business (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1991) pp-2-6

NGOs, can also influence from “outside”. During 1990s, NGO representatives have increasingly participated in U.S. delegation in international environmental deliberations sitting alongside American diplomats. Sometimes, former members of NGO are appointed to executive branch agencies dealing with international environmental issues. For example Rofe Pomerance, a former environment activist, and a former president of Friends of Earth, a senior associate of World Resources Institute (WRI) was appointed to head the Clinton administration’s climate change delegates as deputy assistant secretary of state for environment and development. Pomerance pushed the cause for environment.<sup>26</sup>

### **EPA's Global Warming Grants**

The Kyoto global warming treaty may pose a looming threat to the U.S. economy, but it has spawned a cottage industry based in the nation’s capital, courtesy of the U.S. taxpayer. A review of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grants shows that the federal government has shelled out almost \$7 million to private groups that advocate the U.N. climate treaty. These groups typically call themselves “non-governmental organizations,” but many wonder where they can truly be considered non-governmental when they are on the government’s payroll?

---

<sup>26</sup>: Philip Shabecoff, A New Name for Peace: International Environmentalism, Sustainable development and Democracy (Hanover, NH: university press of New England, 1996), p-152

The EPA carefully designs its grants to cultivate support for international regulation of energy markets. EPA paid over a \$1.3 million to "Local Environmental Initiatives-USA" for organizing municipal government bureaucrats into a global warming lobby. Yet another called, the Climate Institute received \$727,000 to educate the public about global warming and the evils of fossil fuels generally. In 1982 the EPA formally cancelled plans to regulate CFCs it also refused to press for international action, calling instead for more research, monitoring, and information exchange as blocking majors. The agency also paid the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security \$190,000 to disseminate "objective information" regarding climate change. The study concluded that, "objective" in this context meant that it must promote the official interpretation of the Clinton-Gore administration.<sup>27</sup>

Another interpretation of how NGOs fund their activities has revealed that the way to promote the climate treaty is to fund research that supports the government's predetermined scientific conclusions. Accordingly it was satated that the World Resources Institute was given \$150,000 to demonstrate how the climate treaty would improve public health. Resources for the Future was rewarded \$437,000 to show how poor people are traumatized by the "hydrologic effects" of global warming.

---

<sup>27</sup> Peter Morrisette, "The Evolution of Policy Responses to Stratospheric Ozone Depletion" Natural Resource Journal, Vol 29, Summer 1989, pp-793-820



To generate support for the climate treaty from business, EPA gave \$103,000 to the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy (a.k.a. the International Climate Change Partnership), a lobbying group for corporations such as British Petroleum, Boeing, and General Electric. These companies either seek regulatory protection from competitors or have close ties to the government from their dependence on federal subsidies.

Other EPA grants promote a similar form of business rent seeking. The American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, the Institute for International Energy Conservation, and the Climate Institute were all paid hundreds of thousands of dollars to agitate for energy restrictions. U.S. tax dollars are being used to propagandize American industry about the need for energy conservation, to write "climate change action plans" for Third World countries, and to manage carbon reduction programs in China. These groups and their affiliates hope the Kyoto treaty will lead to an avalanche of government-funded energy conservation subsidies in the future. <sup>28</sup>

EPA's activities reveal a symbiotic relationship between power-seeking government bureaucrats and rent-seeking "NGOs," each of whom stands to benefit tremendously from the environmental policies they advocate. Legions of environmental pressure groups, business lobbyists and tax-exempt research institutes have been put on the global warming dole. In return for Washington's largess,

---

<sup>28</sup> *ibid*

this vast special interest constituency lobbies the government to give itself stronger regulatory powers.<sup>29</sup>

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) is supposed to monitor the work environment and protect workers on the job. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is supposed to monitor the environment and thus protect. It took vigorous struggles by environmental organizations against bitter corporate opposition to establish EPA in 1969; and by unions (with help from environmentalists) against the same opposition to establish OSHA in 1971. OSHA and EPA standards are fought down to the last part per millionth of a pollutant, their enforcement resisted, evaded and fought case by case by polluting corporations. The regulatory agencies have been under funded, understaffed and undercut. Both are subject to constant and powerful pressure from the very industries they are supposed to regulate. Both EPA and OSHA have set their standards, not to eliminate pollutants dangerous to the health of workers on the job and communities outside, but to reduce them to "acceptable risks." "Acceptable" means the corrective cost to the corporation will not be too high to frighten the owners and the number of illnesses or fatalities will not be too high to frighten the public.

While the pro business and conservatives like to hold up the U.S. quality of life as a model, they ignore the fact that it is built on the

---

<sup>29</sup> John J. Fialka, "Environmental Group Lobbies Businesses on Global Warming.- Environmental Defense", Wall Street Journal, Nov22, 2000

use of a larger amount of non-renewable energy than any other country, and consequently on a larger release of the gases causing global warming than any other country. Also if the rest of the world were to imitate the U.S., the energy sources would rapidly run out and the natural balance in the atmosphere would be overwhelmed.

### **Lobbies Derail Climate Accord**

Lobbies try to convince developing countries to reject any environmental obligations that might 'strangle economic growth'. It alleges heavy costs for developing countries of CO2 reduction policies implemented by industrialized nations – in an effort to undermine, developing nations calls for the rich to honor their commitments under the convention and act first.

✓ The importance that corporates had assumed in the Johannesburg process was clear from the following excerpt from the draft declaration: "We recognize that the process of globalization is accompanied by the emergence of leading private sector corporations which have a responsibility to contribute to the evolution of equitable and sustainable communities and societies, even as they pursue their legitimate activities."<sup>30</sup>

Lobby groups can now be found wherever international meetings like the one in The Hague take place. The fiasco at the Hague Conference on Climate Change was mainly the result of the

---

<sup>30</sup> Walden Bello, "WSSD: A significant signpost in the struggle between capitalism and the environment, capitalism and community" Friday, 23 August 2002, online edition on CyberDyaryo <http://www.codewan.com.ph/CyberDyaryo>

intransigence of the United States and its allies (Japan, Canada and Australia), the appropriately named Umbrella Group. In the Kyoto Protocol signed at the previous conference in 1997, they had recognized only the document's flexibility mechanisms. United under the banner of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), the North American groups are the most numerous. Their strategy has changed. Having systematically sought to derail the talks on climate change, the transnational corporations are now laying claim to a more "constructive" approach.

However, at the same time, they are trying to secure unlimited use of the Kyoto Protocol's flexibility mechanisms and this is beyond doubt the result of their hold over the North American negotiators. Take the trade in emission permits to begin with. Under the terms of the Protocol, this mechanism should not come into force until 2008, but brokerage of such permits has already become a flourishing speculative business. International Emissions Trading Association, whose members include such bodies as the Australian Stock Exchange, the International Petroleum Exchange, Shell, British Petroleum, Amoco, Stat oil and Tokyo Electric Power - in other words, mainly companies from the Umbrella Group of countries. Therefore, what they are trying to do is to create a global emissions market, with or without the Kyoto Protocol.

The American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) is one of the US' most powerful agricultural lobbies, and its political demands extend far beyond agriculture. Most of its members are not in fact farmers

but speculators, contributing to the Farm Bureau's investment portfolio, said to be worth \$4bn; it includes such firms as Philip Morris, Sweyerhauser, Union Carbide and Ford Motors. Apart from disputing that human activity contributes to global warming, their concerns are centered on "the impacts international climate change agreements could have on the competitiveness of US agriculture". The AFBF has launched the Farmers against the Climate treaty (Fact) group, which, as its name unmistakably suggests, is opposed to any talks about the climate. This was because applying the Kyoto Protocol would cause the sector's profits to plummet given farming and ranching's intensive use of fuel and energy. Republican senator Chuck Hagel, is one of a number of senators actively backing Fact in the US Congress.<sup>31</sup>

### **U.S. Negotiating Stance Weakens Global Warming Treaty: Assessing the Impact of Lobbies**

While many environmental groups and some businesses agree that an international treaty is necessary, though not necessarily Kyoto, the Kyoto Treaty and legislative proposals that deal with carbon dioxide emissions have produced a host of opposition from a wide range of industries who stand to lose if they are forced to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Often led by the Global Climate Coalition, they have combined to form a web of coalitions, non-profit foundations, and scientific studies that dispute global

---

<sup>31</sup> James M. McCormick, American Foreign Policy and Process (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1998) p-489

warming, climate control legislation and regulation, and the Kyoto treaty itself. Critics argue that the Kyoto agreement and emission reduction proposals contain overly ambitious, expensive and largely unreachable emission reduction schedules. Domestically, groups fighting climate change legislation have framed regulations as being bad for U.S. businesses. Companies argue that regulation will increase the price and decrease the demand for their products, and jobs will be lost or exported to developing countries. International negotiators are currently deciding how strong the Kyoto Global Warming Protocol will be. While countries such as Great Britain are actually finding ways to reduce their emissions negotiators for the U.S. are trying to avoid making any real reductions in US emissions. Instead, the U.S. is promoting a system of pollution permit trading which would allow U.S. polluters to continue polluting as usual domestically while placing the burden of making real reductions upon other countries. The U.S. would then buy the "credits" earned by those countries making reductions.

Moreover, critics have pointed to one clause of the agreement -the trading of emissions quotas-, which would enable the U.S.A. to make no cuts at all, and perhaps even increase emissions. Impoverished countries would be all too tempted to sell portions of their quota on emissions to countries such as the US where powerful fuel interests care more for short-term profit than the long-term damage to the environment. In short, this clause-and one the US insisted was included before they would agree to anything-is

a loophole designed to let Western corporate elites buy their way out of the obligation to cut emissions. Environmental leadership by United States can provide structural assistance to developing countries to tackle their own sort of difficulties in dealing with climate change regulations.<sup>32</sup>

The power of environmental lobby will not be enough to ensure that environmental issues receive the right kind of attention in the future. New approaches will be needed to meet the problems of the 1990s. Single-issue solutions will not suffice for problems like global warming, the environmental impacts of international trade and investments, and ensuring that growth in developing nations is environmentally sound. This issue will require more sophisticated approaches on the part of governmental institutions, interest groups, media and the public. The pro climate change treaty argument has thus stressed the need for concerted action to tackle global warming rather minimizing its severity.

At the turn of the century, the changing nature of interactions between states and markets are endlessly debated under the complex concept of globalization. Notwithstanding disputes about the nature of this phenomenon, there is an urgent need for governance, especially transnational governance, to anticipate and address potentially transformative technological, environmental and social changes associated with globalization. So far, the Bush

---

<sup>32</sup> Robert O. Keohane, After Hegemony: Cooperation And Discord In The World Political Economy (Princeton: Princeton University press, 1984) p-31

Administration has shown a lack of commitment to curbing climate change and protecting clean air, as evidenced by withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol on climate change, and domestic efforts to weaken the Clean Air Act. The Administration needs to represent public interests before corporate interests by supporting binding corporate accountability measures, including public release of corporate environmental performance data and support voluntary, non-binding environmental agreements that rely on corporations policing themselves. The need of the hour is to reverse its position that World Trade Organization rules should trump international environmental agreements. In Johannesburg, the Administration advocated the privatization of vital public services leaving it open to corporate manipulation and profiteering.



## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

The US can very significantly and positively influence the international environmental problems. Next, as the world's largest economy, with considerable financial resources the United States has the potential to address these issues from a pragmatic standpoint. Further, while many point out that the United States is the only country, which can lead the world towards environmental protection efforts, it is also the only nation that can hope to influence! Thus, the US can be a leader on international environmental issues, or it can be a veto state. Climate change is a long-term, global issue, policies to address climate concerns must be designed for the long-term by all nations, and the role of the U.S. in such a scenario is of paramount importance. The United States has over and above an ethical obligation – as the world's, principal polluter and the wealthiest nation – to protect the world's natural environment.

International environmental politics and negotiations do not take place in a vacuum, screened off from the reconfigurations of power and governmentality. As the U.S. approach to the Kyoto Protocol has demonstrated, responses to environment and development issues are framed within familiar interests and can in familiar languages of efficiency, competitiveness, and technology. Paradoxically U.S. responses are also compromised by ideological commitments to trade liberalization and the diminution of state competence that must flow such policies. Alternatives to conceptions of development and modernity have not been considered by U.S. foreign policymakers. Hence, the tensions between the demands of the developing world

and the requirements of the natural environment, on the one hand and U.S. climate change policy on the other.

When the US government does advocate international government regulation, the primary aim may not be environmental protections abroad. Instead it may be trying to create a "level playing field" that requires foreign businesses to operate under the same environmental restrictions as those in the United States. Broadly, however the US seeks to maintain its sovereignty and to retain its ability to act unilaterally. However, US leadership in the international environment issue area has not been consistent. Sometimes it leads-as in the case of ocean dumping and stratospheric ozone depletion; at others it resists action, despite possibly severe consequences-as in the case of climate change. Businesses and industry actors actively try to influence – US international environmental policy.

The issue is dizzyingly complex; the science remains uncertain, at least for many policymakers concerned with the local effects of climate change, and the number of domestic and international stakeholders with interests in the U.S. policy is seemingly limitless. Activists interested in pushing the United States to do more have a difficult task ahead of them. Formulation of sensible policies for dealing with Global Warming is greatly complicated by some fundamental scientific uncertainties that are unlikely to be fully resolved in the near future. This poses a nasty dilemma: by the time reliable answers are forthcoming, the damage inflicted on the planet will have increased greatly if the pessimists turn out to have been right and we don't follow their prescription for drastic changes now.

Beyond agreeing that greenhouse gases are likely to result in atmospheric warming, other factors held constant, there is no consensus on any of these questions.

Seemingly, prudence would dictate waiting for some resolution of these uncertainties before undertaking expensive abatement programs.

American domestic politics is hawkish toward global environmental agreements. The United States is an important veto state in the international environmental negotiations. Domestic U.S. politics can therefore inhibit an effective international agreement to reduce GHG emissions. The Congress plays an important role in shaping US International environment policy so do the US courts which are frequently called upon to interpret US statutes and regulations related to international environmental matters. Party affiliations are also another source of policies. Republicans it is agreed lean toward an anti-environmental approach, and the Democrats are more sympathetic to the environmental concerns; and as the public opinion has to be considered. The way in which Congress exercises its formidable policymaking powers is shaped by several key factors. Among the most important of these is whether the president's party also dominates Congress. In the U.S. political system, divided government, which has been common in recent decades, makes coalition building and policy compromise essential if anything at all is to be accomplished. The extent to which Congress is willing to work cooperatively with the White House, however, depends on the ideological and political differences between them, and on judgments people make about the president's legitimacy, as measured for example, by his public approval ratings and leadership abilities. President Clinton's capacity to cooperate with the 106<sup>th</sup> Congress remained in some doubt following his impeachment by the House in 1998 and the Senate trial-despite pledges by both the president and congressional leaders to work together.

Evidently, at the Johannesburg summit, the line taken by George Bush Jr was the same as that of George Bush Sr at the time of the Rio conference; the American way of life is not a matter for negotiation. Johannesburg was again only a summit of the lowest common denominator. The results depict what was achievable in realpolitik terms in the international community. They are insufficient and not appropriate to the urgency of the global problems. Today, the Johannesburg Summit is stillborn, killed over a year before it was held by George W. Bush's decision to withdraw the world's prime capitalist power from being party to the Kyoto Climate Change protocol. Though the issue of global warming barely came up during the presidential campaign, Bush had then itself signaled at his second debate during Election 2000 with Democratic candidate Al Gore that he would not sign onto the Kyoto treaty, "I'll tell you one thing I'm not going to do," Bush said during the debate, "I'm not going to let the United States carry the burden for cleaning up the world's air, like the Kyoto treaty would have done."

International negotiations are currently deadlocked over how to implement the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. The treaty was agreed upon by the Clinton administration, but faced an uphill battle on Capitol Hill. Bush argued that it would harm the U.S. economy and unfairly exempts developing countries like China and India. The likely failure of Kyoto should be used as the impetus for a hard look at the prospects for a treaty on global climate change.

The US will have to help developing countries leapfrog old energy technologies and adopt wind and solar power to reduce reliance on burning fossil fuels like coal and oil. Bush has promised that his administration would offer alternatives to the [Kyoto] treaty but that promise seems to have faded in the background as White

House policymakers have shifted their focus to anti-terrorism efforts" Until the U. S. alters its current policy and assumes a leadership role on global environmental issues including global climate change, substantive and effective international environment governance will be unlikely.

Clearly there are many issues worthy of consideration in understanding and explaining American foreign policy on climate change. Many variables fed the policy process that produced American climate change policies. There are many interpretations of these causes and explanations and also, different evaluations of the merits and ethics of U.S. climate change policies. Thus, policy paralysis reflects the structure of the political system, the nature of environmental problems, the state of public opinion, the power of organized interests, the high cost of environmental protection, and the difficulties political leaders face in the prevailing political climate in trying to build majority consensus. The partisan, polarized, and caustic debates that have substituted for policy deliberation in recent Congresses have compounded the challenges of environmental policymaking. So too, has public cynicism toward politics and the lack of broadly based vision for the collective environmental future.

Besides the president and Congress, other governmental and non-governmental actors often have major impact on foreign policy process. Pertinent issues extend beyond constitutional powers and bureaucratic politics. The role played by a wide variety of policy advocacy groups in American politics, has been crucial in terms of influencing the final policy outcome. In the case of climate change, the key policy actors are business and commercial enterprises and environmental non-governmental organizations as well as White House and Congress. Important

participants, other than White House and Congress, in making of global environmental policy whose role has increased in importance are the various interest groups. Besides the interest groups, there are NGOs, which help in building public awareness about environment through conferences and other public activities. The greatest asset of NGOs, are their large membership, which is ready to cast their votes in elections, as these NGOs work. Therefore, environmental NGOs can persuade legislators and president to listen to their concern. Public opinion and transnational action by nongovernmental actors may provide incentive for governments to adopt the environmental regulations.

The impact of power and realist conceptions of the world, domestic politics and the pluralist nature of American politics and the influence of ideas and norms, therefore in tandem affect the U.S. policy towards environmental issues.

The American foreign policy process is inconsistent with the need for global leadership because climate change is, and will continue to be, one of the defining issues in international affairs. Deep divisions exist over the purpose of American power and how to maintain a delicate balance between unilateral purposeness and multilateral cooperation. Indeed, global warming is likely to remain an important American foreign policy issue in the new century, although decision-making regarding climate change will remain divisive.

Climate change is and will continue to be an important U.S. foreign policy issue because it represents a litmus test of how the United States should exercise and maintain its international leadership as the world's most dominant economic and political superpower.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES

- United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, "Report of the UN Conference on Environment and Development: Annex-I, Rio Declaration on Environment and Development", UN Doc. A/CONF.151/26, Vol.1, New York, 12 August, 1992
- United Nations Environment Program, Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer: Final Act (Nairobi: UN Environment Program, 1987),
- For full text of the Conference see "Declaration of the UN Conference on the Human Environment", UN Doc. A/CONF.48/14, New York, 1972
- United Nations Environment Program, Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer: Final Act (Nairobi: UN Environment Program, 1987)
- "Declaration of the UN Conference on the Human Environment", UN Doc. A/CONF.48/14, New York, 1972
- World Meteorological Organization, Proceedings of the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security, (Geneva: WMO, 1998),
- White House Remark by President Clinton on Global Climate Change (New York: Office of the Press Secretary, Oct22,1997)
- Inter Governmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC First Assessment Report. Vol.1: Overview New York, Aug1990
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- National Research Council, Reconciling Observation of Global Temperature Change, (Washington D.C: National Research Council, 2000) also available online at <http://www.nap.edu/books/0309068916/html/>
- World Resource Institute, World Resource 1998-99: Environmental Change and Human Health, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998)

- United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio Declaration on Environment and Development UN Doc.A/CONF.151/5/Rev.1, 1992
- Frame Work Conference on Climate Change, Kvoto Protocol to the UN Frame Work Conference on Climate Change UN Doc.FCCC/CP/1997/L.7/Add.1 also available online at <http://www.unfccc.de/resources/docs/convkp/kpeng.html>.
- US Information Agency, US Constitution, Washington D.C., 1987
- White House Remark by President Clinton on Global Climate Change ( Washington D.C.: Office of the Press Secretary, Oct22,1997)
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- White House, “ Statement on the Executive Order on Environmental Justice”, Weekly Compilation Presidential Documents, Vol.30, no.7, (Washington D.C., 1994
- Al Gore, Best Kept Secrets of Government, (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1996)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Clean Air Act of 1990, a Primer on Consensus-Building. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1990)
- CP [Cartagena Protocol]. 2000. *Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity: text and annexes*. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Online edition <http://www.unep.org>.
- Senate Resolution. 98, ‘Expressing sense of Senate Regarding UN Framework Convention on Climate Change’ Congressional Record (Washington D.C.: USGPO) 25 July 1997:S8113-S8139
- US Senate, Committee on Energy and National Resources, “Credit For Voluntary Reduction Act” March 25, 1999, 106<sup>th</sup> Congress, Senate Resolution no.547, Washington D.C.; USGPO)
- Congressional Research Service, ‘Treaties And Other International Agreements: The Role Of The United States Senate’ (106<sup>th</sup> Congress 71, 2001), Washigton, D.C



- White House, "Meeting the Challenges of Climate Change at Reasonable Cost" (Washington D.C.: Office Of The Press Secreatry)Jul31, 1998 also available at [.http://www.state.gov/global/oes/fs\\_climate\\_costs\\_980731.html](http://www.state.gov/global/oes/fs_climate_costs_980731.html)
  - Frame Work Conference on Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol to the UN Frame Work Conference on Climate Change UN Doc.FCCC/CP/1997/L.7/Add.1 also available online at <http://www.unfccc.de/resources/docs/convkp/kpeng.html>.
  - Pytte, Alyson, "Clean Air Act Amendments." Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, 48 (24 November 1990), pp3934-3963
  - Building Livable Communities For The 21st Century: A Report From The Clinton-Gore Administration; President's Council on Sustainable Development, 1999. 23p. (Excerpts available on the Internet at [http://www.smartgrowth.org/library/gore\\_pr11199.htm](http://www.smartgrowth.org/library/gore_pr11199.htm))
- Greening Industry: New Roles for Communities, Markets, And Governments; A World Bank Policy Research Report World Bank, 1999. 150p. On the Internet at [http://www.worldbank.org/nipr/greening/full\\_text/index.htm](http://www.worldbank.org/nipr/greening/full_text/index.htm))
- Frank Biermann, Rainer Brohm and Klaus Dingwerth, eds. 2002. *Proceedings of the 2001 Berlin Conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change "Global Environmental Change and the Nation State"*. Potsdam: Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research
  - Global Environment Assessment Project. *A Critical Evaluation of Global Environmental Assessments: The Climate Experience*. CARE, Calverton, Md. 1997.
  - U. S. President's Council on Sustainable Development TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE AMERICA: ADVANCING PROSPERITY, OPPORTUNITY, AND A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY President's Council on Sustainable Development, 1999. 165p. (On the Internet at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/PCSD/Publications/index.html>)
  - World Meteorological Organization: *Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 1998*. WMO, Geneva. 1999.

**BOOKS**

- George Philander. Is the Temperature Rising? The Uncertain Science of Global Warming. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998)
- Caldwell, Lynton Keith, International Environmental Policy: From the Twentieth To the Twenty-First Century. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996)
- Caldwell, Lynton Keith. Between Two Worlds: Science, the Environmental Movement, and Policy Choice. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Gingrich, Newt and Armev, Dick ed., Contract With America, (New York: Random House, 1994),
- Caldwell, L. K. ed, Environment As Focus For Public Policy (CS, Texas: A & M University Press, 1995)
- Toman, Michael A., Moving Ahead with Climate Policy (Washington D.C.: RFF press book, 2001),
- Kraft, M.E. and Vig, N.J., "Environmental Policies From 1970s to 2000: An Overview" in Kraft, M.E. and Vig, N J. eds., Environmental Policy (Washington D.C.: Congress quarterly, 2000)
- Connelly ,J., & Smith, G., Politics and the Environment, (London: Rutledge, 1999)
- Newton, D., Global Warming, (Oxford, ABC-CLIO, 1993)
- Katzenstien, Peter J., "Alternative Perspective on National Security" in Katzenstien, Peter J. ed., The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics ,(New York: Columbia University Press,1996)
- Kamieniecki, Sheldon and Kraft, Michael E. " Series Forward" in Sombre, Elizabeth R. D. Domestic Sources of International Environmental Policy: Industry, Environmentalists, and U S. Power (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000)
- George Gallop, The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1995 (Wilmington, DC: Scholarly Resources Inc, 1996) pp 65-67
- Grubb, Michael, The Kyoto Protocol: A Guide of Assessment,(London: Earth scan, 1999)

- Bosso, Christopher, "Seizing Back the Day: The Challenge to Environmentalism in the 1990s", in Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, ed., Environmental Policy In 1990s: Reform or Reaction? 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Washington DC: CQ Press, 1997)
- Paarlburg, Robert, "Earth in Abeyance: Explaining Weak Leadership in US International Environmental Policy" in Lieber, Robert J., ed., Eagle Adrift: American Foreign Policy at the End of the Century (NY: Longman, 1997)
- Soden, Dennis L., "Presidential Role and Environmental Policy", in Soden, Dennis L. ed., The Environmental Presidency (NY: State University of New York Press, 1999)
- Johnson, Stanley P. The Earth Summit: The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). (Boston: Graham and Trotman/Martinus Nijhoff, 1993)
- Gribbin, J., Hothouse Earth: The Greenhouse Effect, (London: Transworld Publishers, 1990)
- Vogler, J., The Global Commons, A Regime Analysis (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd. ,1995)
- National Research Council, Reconciling Observation of Global Temperature Change, (Washington D.C: National Research Council, 2000) also available online at <http://www.nap.edu/books/0309068916/html/>.
- World Resource Institute, World Resource 1998-99: Environmental Change and Human Health, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp-170 180
- Connelly, J. & Smith, G., Politics and the Environment, (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Harris, Paul G. ed., The Environment, International Relations, and US Foreign Policy, (Washington D.C. Georgetown University Press, 2001)
- Al Gore, Earth in the Balance (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1992)
- W. A. Rosenbaum, Environmental Politics and Policy (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1998)
- Carlson, Rachel, The Silent Spring, (New York: Houghton Mifflin), (1962), 1994

- Crandall, Robert W. and Portney, Paul R., "Environmental Policy" in Portney, Paul R. ed. Natural Resources and Environment: The Reagan Approach, (Washington D.C.: Urban Institute, 1984)
- P.G. Harris, Understanding America's Climate Change Policy: Realpolitik, Pluralism, and Ethical Norms, (Oxford: Oxford Center For Environment, Ethics and Society, 1998)
- Bryner, Gary, "Agenda 21: Myth or Reality" in Vig, Norman J. and Axlerod, Regina S. eds. The Global Environment, Laws and Policy, (Washington D.C.: CQ Press, 1999)
- Gallop, George, The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1995 (Wilmington, DC: Scholarly Resources Inc, 1996)
- Dennis, Bresusta C., Seeing American Foreign Policy as a Whole (New Delhi: Macmillan, 1989)
- Hargrove, Erwin C., The Power of Modern Presidency, ( New York: Knopf,1974)
- Mervin, David, George Bush and Guardianship Presidency, (London: Macmillan, 1996),
- Joslyn, R., Mass Media and Election, ( Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1984)
- Hamby, Alonzo, "Essay on Truman" in Greenstien, Fred, ed., Leadership in Modern Presidency, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998)
- White, Theodore H., The Making of President 1960 (New York: Atheneum, 1961)
- Paarlburg, Robert, "Earth in Abeyance: Explaining Weak Leadership" in Robert, J. ed., Eagle Adrift: American Foreign Policy at the End of the Century (NY: Longman, 1997)
- Johansen, Bruce E., The Global Warming: Desk Reference (CT: Greenwood, 2002)
- Shanely, A. Robert, Presidential Influence and Environmental Policy (Westport, CT.: Greenwood, 1992.)
- Minger, Terrell J. ed. Greenhouse Glastnost: The Crisis of Global Warming, (New York: Ecco Press, 1990)

- Porter, Gareth and Brown, Janet Welsh, Global Environmental Politics (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1991)
- Close, Arthur C., Steele, J. Valerie, and Buckner, Michael E. eds. Washington Representatives 1995, 19<sup>th</sup> edition (Washington D.C.: Columbia Books, 1995)
- Stoel, Thomas B. "Public Engagement in International Environmental Policy" Chapter 11, in Yankelovich, Daniel and Destler, I M eds., Beyond The Beltway (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1994)
- Dunn, J. R., and Kinney, J. E., Conservative Environmentalism, (Westport, CT: Quorum Books, 1996)
- Ornstein, Norman J. and Elder, Shirley, Interests Groups, Lobbying And Policy Making (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1978)
- Olson, Mancur, The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Social Rigidities (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982)
- Cairncross, Francis, Costing The Earth: The Challenge To Governments, The Opportunities To Business (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1991)
- D. Harvey, Global Warming: The Hard Science. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001)
- M. Oppenheimer, Dead Heat: The Race against the Greenhouse Effect (New York.:New Republic Books, 1990)
- Michaels, P. J., and R. C. Balling Jr. The Satanic Gases: Clearing the Air about Global Warming. (Washington: Cato Institute, 2000)
- Nakicenovic, Emissions Scenarios. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Oberthur, S. and Ott, H.E., The Kyoto Protocol. (Berlin: Springer, 1999)
- Harvey, D., Climate and Global Environmental Change. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001)
- Schneider, S. and Londer, R., The Coevolution of Climate and Life. (San Francisco.:Sierra Club Books, 1984)

- Spiro, T. and Stigliani, W., Chemistry of the Environment (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996)
- T. Graedel and P. Crutzen, Atmosphere and Climate: an Earth Systems Perspective. (New York: WH Freeman, 1993)
- Gelspan, Ross, The Heat is On: The Climate Crisis, the Cover up, the Prescription, (Boston: Perseus Publishing, 1998)
- Appadurai, Arjun. Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of Globalization. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1996)
- Beatley, Timothy, and Manning, Kristy THE ECOLOGY OF PLACE: PLANNING FOR ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND COMMUNITY Island Press, 1997. 225p.
- Shabecoff, Philip, A New Name for Peace: International Environmentalism, Sustainable development and Democracy (Hanover, NH: university press of New England, 1996)
- McCormick, James M., American Foreign Policy and Process (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1998)
- Keohane, Robert O., After Hegemony: Cooperation And Discord In The World Political Economy (Princeton: Princeton University press, 1984)
- E. Claussen, ed.: Climate Change: Science, Strategy, and Solutions, (Boston: Brill 2001)
- E. Claussen, ed., The Social Learning Group: Learning to Manage Global Environmental Risk, vols. 1 and 2. (Cambridge: MIT ,2001)

## ARTICLES

- Hardin, G. The Tragedy of the Commons, Science (vol 162) (1968), pp.1243-1248
- Brown, L., "Save the Planet", The Ecologist, (Dec 2001/Jan 2002, Vol 31, No 10), pp.26-31
- Harper, Scott, "Being Green Will Be Profitable", The Virginian pilot, jan20, 2000, Norfolk, Virginia, p15
- Finnmore, Martha and Sikkink, Kathryn, "International Norm Dynamics and Political

- Change”, International Organization, vol. 52, Autumn-1998, pp 895-900
- J.M Diamond, “Ecological Collapse of Ancient Civilizations: The Golden Age That Never Was” in Journal Bulletin of American Academy of Arts and Sciences, XLVII (5), (Cambridge: AAAS, 1994),pp37-55
- Cushman, John H., “Senate Approves Deep Cuts in Environmental Spending”, New York Times, Dec15, 1995, A14
- Associated Press, “Nations Urged to Pass Law on Emissions”, NY Times, 19 July; 1996, A5
- Balling, R. C. Jr., Michaels, P. J., and Knappenberger, P. C. “Analysis of Winter and Summer Warming Rates in Gridded Temperature Time Series.” Climate Research vol.9 (1988) pp- 175– 81.
- Karl, T. R., R. W. Knight, and N. Plummer. “Trends in High-Frequency Climate Variability in the Twentieth Century.” Nature 377 (1995): 217– 20.
- Michaels, P. J., et al. “Analysis of Trends in the Variability of Daily and Monthly Historical Temperature Measurements.” Climate Research 10 (1998): 27– 33.
- Lean, J., and D. Rind. “Climate Forcing by Changing Solar Radiation.” Journal of Climate, 11 (1998): 3069– 94.
- Fialka, John J., “Environmental Group Lobbies Businesses on Global Warming - Environmental Defense”, Wall Street Journal, Nov22, 2000
- Harte, J. Consider a Spherical Cow. (Sausalito, California: University Science Books, 1988)
- Trenberth, K., Climate System Modeling. (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1992)
- Dotto, L. and Schiff, H. The Ozone War, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978)
- Lerner, Steve ECO-PIONEERS: PRACTICAL VISIONARIES SOLVING TODAY'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS, MIT Press, 1997.
- Paterson, Samuel C. and Caldeira, Gregory, “Standing up for Congress: Variations in Public Esteem since the 1960s” Legislative Studies Quarterly Vol.15 (1990)

- Healy, John, "Clinton Success Rate, Declined to a Record Low in 1995," Congress Quarterly Weekly Report, Jan 7, 1996, p193
- Morrisette, Peter, "The Evolution of Policy Responses to Stratospheric Ozone Depletion," Natural Resource Journal, Vol 29, Summer 1989, pp-793-820
- Raustiala, Kal, "States NGOs, and International Environmental Institutions", International Studies Quarterly, Vol41, 1997, p-719
- Hillman, Bette., "Case Grows For Climate Change", Chemical and Engineering News. 9 August 1999; pp 16-23
- Annez, Patricia, "Livable Cities For The 21st Century" Society, Vol. 35, No. 4, May/June 1998, pp. 45-50)
- Farrell, Alex, and Hart, Maureen "What Does Sustainability Really Mean?" Environment, Vol. 40, No. 9, November 1998, p. 4-9)
- Katz, Bruce, and Bradley, Jennifer "Urban Affairs: Divided We Sprawl" (The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 284, No. 6, December 1999, pp. 26, 28, 30, 38-42)
- Knopman, Debra S., Susman, Megan M., and Landy, Marc k. "Civic Environmentalism: Tacking Tough Land-Use Problems With Innovative Governance" Environment, Vol. 41, No. 10, December 1999, pp. 24-32)
- Gelbspan, Ross, "ExxonMobil emerges as major Funder of greenhouse skeptics", The Economist, December 2000 pp 78-81 Online edition on [www.heatisonline.org](http://www.heatisonline.org)
- Newell, Peter and Paterson, Mathew, "A Climate for Business: Global Warming, the State and Capital", Review of International Political Economy, Vol 5, 1998 p-680
- Holdren, John P., "Scientists' Statement on Global Climatic Disruption", Ozone Action, Washington, DC: 1997 also available online at <http://www.ozone.org>.
- Rosewicz, Barbara, "Bush Proposes Revision of Clean Air Law that Would Cut Acid Rain by 2000", Wall Street Journal, June13,1989,A3
- Weisskopf, Michael, " With Pen, Bush to Seal Administration Split on Clean Air Act", Washington Post, Nov15, 1990,A23



- Molina, M., and Rowland, S., "Stratospheric Sink in Chlorofluoromethanes: Chlorine Atom Catalyses Destruction of Ozone" Nature {249}, June 1974, p 810
- Smith, Todd, "Big Oil, Big Three Argue with Clean Air Act." Washington Times, 13 June 1991. Sec. C, p.3
- Harrison, N. E., "From the Inside Out: Domestic influences on Global Environmental Policy" in P. G Harris, ed., Climate Change and American Foreign Policy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p95
- Davis, R. E., et al. "Decadal Changes in Summer Mortality in the United States." Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Applied Climatology, Asheville, N.C., 2000
- Wines, Michael, "The Earth Summit", New York Times, June 14, 1992, Sec.1, 10
- Watson, R. T., Prather, M. J. and Kurylo, Michael G., Present State of Knowledge of the Upper Atmosphere 1988: An Assessment Report, NASA Report Publication 1208, (Washington D.C.: USGPO, 1988)
- Dunn, J. R., and Kinney, J. E., Conservative Environmentalism (Westport, CT: Quorum Books, 1996)
- Hayed, Thomas, "The Case For Environmental Morality", Journal Environmental Ethics, Spring 2003, vol.25, no.1, (Denton, Texas: environmental philosophy inc.), p-5
- Krishnakumar, Asha, "Unfinished Agenda" in Frontline, Oct 11, 2002, p-48

## **WEBSITES**

- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, [www.ncdc.noaa.gov](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov)
- [www.worldsocialism.org](http://www.worldsocialism.org)
- [www.atlasusa.org/highlights/archives/1997](http://www.atlasusa.org/highlights/archives/1997)
- <http://infoserver.ciesin.org>

- <http://www.unep.ch/ozone/home.htm>
- <http://www.clubofrome.org/>
- <http://www.cites.or>
- <http://www.imos.com>
- [www.exxonmobil.com/contributions/public\\_info.html](http://www.exxonmobil.com/contributions/public_info.html)
- <http://www.ourplanet.com>
- <http://www.transnationale.org>
- [www.opensecrets.org](http://www.opensecrets.org)
- <http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr/>
- [www.sierraclub.org](http://www.sierraclub.org)
- <http://www.codewan.com.ph/CyberDyaryo>
- [<http://www.iisd.ca/2002/PC3/html.>](http://www.iisd.ca/2002/PC3/html.>)

### **U.S. Government Sites**

- [U.S. Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Environmental Security](#)
- [U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Environmental Network and Information Exchange](#)
- [Arms Control and International Security](#)
- [U.S. State Department, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs](#)
- [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of International Activities](#)
- [Center for Environmental Security, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy](#)

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION SITES**

- Institute of Development Studies, Rural Poverty, Food Security & the Environment, <http://www.ids.org>
- International Development Research Centre, (Tenure, Security & Economic Development, South Africa)  
<http://www.idrc.org.za/research/97890301.htm>
- International Rivers Network <http://www.irn.org>
- Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development  
<http://www.nautilus.org>
- Sierra Club, SIERRA CLUB SPRAWL REPORT Sierra Club, 1999. 25p.  
available on the Internet at  
<http://www.sierraclub.org/sprawl/report99/>)
- World Resources Institute; WORLD RESOURCES 1996-97: THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT; World Resources Institute, 1996. 365p.  
(available on the Internet at <http://www.igc.org/wri/wr-96-97/96tocful.html>)
- <http://www.sei.se/>

