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Bush's global-warming policy will be unveiled during trip

By Traci Watson
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — President Bush's preliminary plan to arrest global warming, which he's expected to lay out today, is unlikely to satisfy the European leaders he'll meet during his first trip overseas later this week.

According to administration officials familiar with Bush's plan, the president will acknowledge that his administration is still working out the details of its climate policy. But the officials, who asked not to be named, said he'll also announce new programs to fund research on global warming and technologies to overcome it.

They say the president will reiterate his opposition to the Kyoto Protocol, the 1997 treaty on global warming, because he deems it too costly for the U.S. economy and it puts lesser demands on developing nations. The treaty has wide support from other nations.

The treaty calls for mandatory limits on industrialized nations' emissions of greenhouse gases, which come from fossil-fuel use and other industrial processes. Many scientists tie greenhouse gases to the Earth's climbing temperature during the past century.

Bush is expected to be vague on whether he'd support measures other than the Kyoto treaty that require mandatory emission controls. Some members of his administration, such as Environmental Protection Agency chief Christie Whitman, favor such controls. Others, including Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham, favor voluntary ones.

European nations are so desperate for mandatory cutbacks that they're willing to make major concessions on practically every other element of the Kyoto treaty, says Eileen Claussen, head of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change and a climate-treaty negotiator during the Clinton administration.

"They're totally flexible on everything else," she says. "But I'm not sure people will have very great hopes for (U.S. policy) in Europe" after Bush's speech.

Asked whether the White House will develop a replacement for the Kyoto Protocol, national security adviser Condoleezza Rice told USA TODAY on Saturday, "We're not ruling that out. There is at this point an attempt to do that."

Other White House officials were on the defensive Sunday about Bush's rejection of the Kyoto treaty. Speaking on Fox News Sunday, White House chief of staff Andy Card noted that European countries that profess to support the protocol have also failed to ratify it. "So I think it's a little bit of a game that they're playing," he said.

Claussen say a reason the Europeans haven't ratified the treaty is because all the details have not been completed.

For the same reason, President Clinton never asked for ratification from the Senate, which would've almost certainly rejected the treaty. In 1997, the Senate voted 95-0 on a resolution calling for a treaty that wouldn't collapse the U.S. economy and would require participation from developing countries.

An international meeting to fill in the protocol's details, held last year in the Netherlands, collapsed after disagreements between the United States and Europe.

The countries agreed at the time to meet again this year to reconcile their differences. But administration officials have said they might not be done crafting their policy in time for the next meeting, in July in Bonn, Germany.

Contributing: Mimi Hall

Bush trip to Europe, 1A

June 11, 2001
A new report from America’s National Academy of Sciences confirms the reality of global warming

THREE months ago, George Bush’s fledgling administration dropped two public-relations bricks over the issue of global warming. First, Mr Bush refused to stand by his campaign pledge to regulate emissions of carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas that is widely believed to be a big cause of global warming. That sparked a backlash from American environmentalist groups. Second, he annoyed a lot of people overseas by trumpeting, in undiplomatic terms, his long-standing opposition to the Kyoto Protocol. This is a United Nations treaty agreed to (though not yet much ratified) by most industrialised countries, that calls for binding cuts in greenhouse-gas emissions.

To defuse the rows over these two dropped bricks, the Bush team promised to come up with a credible alternative policy that was more than mere Kyoto-bashing. And to help form that policy it called, on May 11th, on the services of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to provide guidance on the matter as soon as possible. America’s most prestigious scientific body hastily organised an expert panel under the chairmanship of Ralph Cicerone of the University of California, Irvine, to meet that request, and the results of its deliberations have just been released. The first paragraph of the report says it all:

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 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. Human-induced warming and associated sea level rises are expected to continue through the 21st century.

Now will you believe it?
The NAS’s conclusions, which include no new data, will come as no surprise to those working in the field. They more or less confirm a recent report from the United Nations’ Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that laid out the scientific case for taking global warming seriously. What they do provide is political cover, if Mr Bush wishes to use it, for a graceful retreat. Many Americans were, for various reasons, unwilling to accept the authority of a UN-sponsored study. A home-grown one is not subject to any such political caveats.

The administration left itself remarkably little wiggle-room in the mandate that it gave Dr Cicerone. The panel was asked not only about the certainties and uncertainties surrounding the science of climate change, but also about the worth of the UN report and its conclusions. In particular, it was asked explicitly whether there were substantive differences between the IPCC’s scientific reports (lengthy tomes detailing the state of climate science) and the summary for policymakers (which suggests that there is enough scientific evidence to warrant action now). Critics of the Kyoto treaty have long argued that this summary can only have been the result of political sleight of hand.

That always looked unlikely. After all, the evidence was alarming enough as long ago as 1992 for Mr Bush’s father to sign a UN treaty in Rio de Janeiro that was in
Bush to world: Global warming is not just an American problem

By Bill Sammon
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

President Bush last week tried to pre-empt European criticism of his wait-and-see approach to global warming by blaming the rest of the world, including Europe, for creating most greenhouse gases.

Hours before embarking on his first presidential visit to Europe, the president delivered his most stinging indictment yet of the Kyoto Protocol, which would force the United States to dramatically reduce emissions while exempting many other countries. In place of Kyoto, he called for further study of global warming.

"The world's second-largest emitter of greenhouse gases is China," Mr. Bush told reporters on the South Lawn of the White House. "Yet China was entirely exempted from the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol."

"India and Germany are among the top emitters," he added. "Yet India was also exempt from Kyoto."

Mr. Bush singled out Germany because German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder is a staunch supporter of Kyoto and has publicly voiced his opposition to the president's stance.

While Mr. Bush acknowledged that the United States creates almost 20 percent of the world's man-made greenhouse gases, he hastened to add that the country is also responsible for 25 percent of the world's economic output.

"We recognize the responsibility to reduce our emissions," he said. "We also recognize the other part of the story: that the rest of the world emits 80 percent of all greenhouse gases."

Mr. Bush also took a swipe at the European Union (EU) as he prepared to hold a summit last week with EU leaders. Of all regions in the world, Europe has been the most critical of the president's opposition to Kyoto.

"The United States has spent $18 billion on climate research since 1990 three times as much as any other country, and more than Japan and all 15 nations of the EU combined," he said.

The president is particularly irked by the fact that Kyoto exempts developing nations from limits on emissions.

"Many of those emissions come from developing countries," the president said. "Our approach must be based on global participation, including that of developing countries whose net greenhouse gases emissions now exceed those in the developed countries."

The global warming treaty, which was hammered out in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997, would require the U.S. to reduce greenhouse emissions to below 1990 levels by 2012. Conservatives argue the treaty would severely curb the U.S. economy, throwing workers out of jobs and creating energy price spikes.

Although the Clinton administration signed the treaty, it never submitted it to the Senate for ratification. In 1998, the Senate voted 95-0 on a resolution of opposition to Kyoto.

"The Kyoto Protocol was fatally flawed in fundamental ways," Mr. Bush said last week. "Kyoto is, in many ways, unrealistic. "Many countries cannot meet their Kyoto targets. The targets themselves were arbitrary and not based on science."

"For America, complying with those mandates would have a negative economic impact, with layoffs of workers and price increases for consumers," he added. "And when you evaluate all these flaws, most reasonable people will understand that it's not sound public policy."

The United States is not alone in declaiming at Kyoto. Of the more than 100 nations that have signed the accord, only Romania has actually ratified it.

Mr. Bush's criticism of Kyoto and its advocates was couched in more conciliatory language about alternative approaches to global warming. The president called for more research and study into the science of measuring changes in the earth's climate.

"America's unwillingness to embrace a flawed treaty should not be read by our friends and allies as any abdication of responsibility," the president said. "To the contrary, my administration is committed to a leadership role on the issue of climate change."

He announced the creation of two government programs to study global warming: the U.S. Climate Change Research Initiative and the National Climate Change Technology Initiative. He also said the United States will work more closely with the United Nations to learn more about the subject.

Although scientists 30 years ago were warning about global cooling, the president has endorsed the theory that the globe's temperature is rising.

"We know the surface temperature of the earth is warming," Mr. Bush said. "It has risen by 0.6 degrees Celsius over the past 100 years."

"There was a warming trend from the 1890s to the 1940s, cooling from the 1940s to the 1970s, and then sharply rising temperatures from the 1970s to today," he added.

Some environmentalists dismissed the June 11 speech by Mr. Bush as political cover on the eve of his arrival in Europe. But Mr. Bush was defended by Richard Lindzen, a member of the National Academy of Sciences panel on climate change. Mr. Lindzen was one of 11 scientists who prepared a report on the topic for the White House last week.

In an op-ed column for the June 11 Wall Street Journal, the MIT professor of meteorology said the report was erroneously "deemed in the press as an implicit endorsement of the Kyoto Protocol."

"There is still a vast amount of uncertainty far more than advocates of Kyoto would like to acknowledge," Mr. Lindzen wrote. "The NAS report has hardly ended the debate. Nor was it meant to."

see KYOTO, page 22
Warming Threat Requires Action Now, Scientists Say

By ANDREW C. REVKIN

In his speech on climate yesterday, President Bush said that a basic problem with the Kyoto Protocol, the proposed international pact for curtailing global warming, was that it laid out a timetable for cutting releases of heat-trapping gases before the threat posed by a buildup of those gases was clearly understood.

But while many scientists and experts on risk management agreed in interviews yesterday that much remained unknown about the potential impact of rising temperatures, they took issue with the idea that this uncertainty justified further delay in acting to limit climate change.

“There will be deep uncertainty in the climatic future for a long time,” said Dr. Michael E. Schlesinger, who directs climate research at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. “But if you wait until it’s diminished to some threshold that you assign and then learn that the problem is severe, it may be too late to do anything about it.”

Indeed, to many experts embroiled in the climate debate, the question of how much warming is too much — which has been at the center of international climate negotiations for a decade — now constitutes a red herring. They say it is more important to start from the point of widest agreement — that rising concentrations of heat-trapping gases are warming the atmosphere, and that adding to those gases is probably a bad idea. The next step, they say, is to adopt policies that will soon flatten the rising arc on graphs of global emissions while also pursuing more research to clarify the risks.

Many note that recent studies suggest a fairly high risk of significant ecological harm from a global temperature rise of less than 1 degree Fahrenheit and widespread coastal flooding and agricultural disruption if temperatures rise more than 4 or 5 degrees in the new century.

Global temperatures have risen 1 degree Fahrenheit in the last 50 years; since the last Ice Age, they have risen about 9 degrees.

The risks are clear enough to justify some investments now in emissions controls, they say.

They say that the general quandary is different from the kind faced by town officials who must judge how much road salt to buy based on uncertain long-term winter weather forecasts, or by countries deciding whether to invest in a missile-de-
Kill Kyoto to save it?

All this is not to say that Mr Bush should now fall meekly into line behind the Europeans in embracing Kyoto, warts and all. Indeed, there is much to criticise in the Europeans' hysterical and often hypocritical stance. Their posturing was the main reason why the previous round of Kyoto negotiations collapsed back in November. The EU rejected sensible proposals by the Clinton administration to use market mechanisms that

Climate change

A warm reception

George Bush needs to come up with a clearer policy on global warming

Why is George Bush so reluctant to do anything serious about global warming? Surely not, as some cynics suggest, because he is in the pocket of America's fossil-fuel industry. Yet his action (or rather inaction) in this area inevitably makes such scepticism harder to counter.

In his first few months in office, Mr Bush sparked huge rows at home by backtracking on a campaign promise to curb emissions of carbon dioxide, and abroad by reiterating his opposition to the Kyoto Protocol, a United Nations treaty on climate change that has been in the works since his father signed an earlier UN treaty in 1992. In defusing those rows, his advisers cooed that they were opposed only to Kyoto—not to all action on global warming. They promised to come up with a credible alternative quickly. Time is now pressing—the next round of negotiations on climate change will take place next month in Bonn—and yet the Bush team has not come up with even an outline of a plan.

This inaction comes even though the case for doing something to tackle global warming is growing stronger. Unwilling to accept the opinion of international scientists, Mr Bush asked his country's leading climate experts to produce a red-blooded, all-American analysis. That panel has just produced its report, and, despite the many uncertainties, its conclusion is crystal clear: global warming is real, man's role in it is real and the dangers it poses are serious (see page 77).

Mr Bush duly unveiled a new policy this week, but it was at once devoid of substance and full of contradictions. Although he acknowledged in passing the chief conclusion of that report, that the threat from global warming is genuine, most of his statement dwelt on the lingering uncertainties. Although he professed faith in a global approach under the UN umbrella, he repeated his view that the Kyoto pact was "fatally flawed" without offering ideas for how to fix it. And, although he accepted that the United States had some responsibility to act, he refused to do so unless India and China do too—even though his rich, energy-guzzling country has contributed far more to global warming than have those dirt-poor countries.

The most curious contradiction came on the question of whether to act now. The president declared that he is "committed to a leadership role on the issue of climate change", but the only concrete action he could come up with was a promise of more money for science and technology. There is indeed a need for continuing research into a problem as potentially catastrophic as climate change; but that does not justify demanding repeated scientific proof that the problem exists before being ready to take any substantial action to deal with it.

Kill Kyoto to save it?

All this is not to say that Mr Bush should now fall meekly into line behind the Europeans in embracing Kyoto, warts and all. Indeed, there is much to criticise in the Europeans' hysterical and often hypocritical stance. Their posturing was the main reason why the previous round of Kyoto negotiations collapsed back in November. The EU rejected sensible proposals by the Clinton administration to use market mechanisms that would have ensured that the pact was implemented as flexibly and cheaply as possible—and it did so despite knowing that Mr Bush was likely to be the next president.

Referring to the Europeans, Mr Bush declared this week that "we have a different approach, but we have the same goals." If that is true, the conclusion should be obvious: that the right policy is to fix the flaws in Kyoto, not to junk it. As an approach to global warming, Kyoto has compelling strengths that make it worth saving. It is global, its architecture is flexible and, like the GATT process of trade liberalisation, it is designed for continuous renewal and review. Such a robust approach can adapt as climate-change science improves.

Europe and America should therefore build on the decade's worth of goodwill, hard-won compromise and intellectual capital poured into the Kyoto framework. They must use the talks in Bonn to reconsider the treaty's unrealistic and arbitrary set of emissions targets and timetables. That could produce a deal with more realistic targets, and a less front-loaded timetable. Extending the timetable for the first emissions targets, now only a decade, would hugely reduce the cost of meeting them. And it should also persuade developing countries to accept future cuts in emissions, which would make the pact more credible as well as more acceptable to the American Senate. Provided these changes are made, Mr Bush's blunt rejection of the Kyoto Protocol in March could even turn out to have been beneficial—but he does not have much time left in which to prove his case.
In Madrid, Bush stands firm on Kyoto and missiles

By Judy Keen
USA TODAY

MADRID, Spain — On the first day of his first official trip to Europe, President Bush refused to yield Tuesday on two points of contention with the allies he is visiting: his plans for a missile-defense shield and his objections to a global warming treaty.

Bush spoke at a news conference in the lush garden of Moncloa Palace here with Spain's prime minister, Jose Maria Aznar, who took note of Bush's efforts to speak Spanish. He said Bush gets "better and better every day."

Bush mispronounced the prime minister's name as "Anzar" in an interview earlier. He also mangled Spanish grammar. "If I don't practice, I am going to destroy this language," Bush told the interviewer.

Earlier Tuesday, the European Union rejected Bush's proposals to research scientific solutions to greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming. Environment Minister Kjell Larsson of Sweden, EU president, said Bush's abandonment of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on global warming would mean postponing action for years. "We are already late," he said.

Bush, who meets with EU leaders Thursday in Göteborg, Sweden, said the mandatory limits on emissions in the Kyoto treaty "would affect our economy in a negative way." The treaty is flawed, he said, because it sets "unscientific goals" and doesn't cover developing countries, including China and Mexico.

Bush has justified his opposition to the treaty by arguing that there is no proof it would help the environment. Asked how he can promote an untested missile shield, he blamed the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which he said bars testing the technology.

Bush said he won't back down on his missile-shield plan. "I believe we're going to make great progress on this issue. I truly do," he said. "It's going to require a lot of consultation, but I'm willing to listen."

Bush will get a chance to do that today when he meets with NATO leaders in Brussels. He will assure them the plan is designed to prevent attacks by rogue nations, not to give the United States a military edge over Russia.

Aznar defended the plan. He called it "an attempt to provide greater security for everyone." But German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and French President Jacques Chirac issued a joint statement calling on the EU to reinforce the need for nuclear non-proliferation agreements.

Bush also defended the death penalty, a punishment not used in Western Europe. The execution of bomber Timothy McVeigh has prompted plans for protests throughout Bush's five-day trip.

"The majority of the people, and our laws reflect the majority of the people, believe that if the death penalty is certain, just and fair, it'll deter crime," Bush said.

He also will visit Warsaw, and meet with Russian President Vladimir Putin in Slovenia before returning to Washington on Saturday.
SURPRISE: BUSH AND EUROPE MAY FIND COMMON GROUND

When George W. Bush left his Crawford (Tex.) ranch for 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. in January, European critics thought he took too many of his swaggering cowboy mannerisms with him. In no time at all, Bush dumped the Kyoto global-warming accord and vowed to build a National Missile Defense system (NMD) that allies fretted could spark a new arms race. To top it off, on June 5 the President signaled his intention to negotiate new limits on imports of steel from the European Union, Asia, and South America. The predictable reaction abroad: It was a return to Lone Ranger diplomacy, Reagan-style.

But as Bush prepares for his first official trip to Europe on June 11, signs are growing that behind the scenes the two camps are inching closer to some sort of consensus. Credit visits to the U.S. by European officials and a flurry of diplomatic consultations as Administration officials fanned out across Europe recently. To the Europeans' surprise, the talks were "not just cosmetic" but substantive, says Karl-Heinz Kamp, head of international planning at Berlin's Konrad Adenauer Institute.

LESS TROUBLE. Take missile defense, a likely topic for the NATO summit in Brussels on June 13. While allies are skeptical about cost and feasibility, they privately concede that the U.S. is correct in its analysis of new threats. "Europeans cannot deny that there is a real strategic rationale for NMD. There is a ballistic-missile threat from the Middle East and North Africa for Europe," says a European defense-industry official. Indeed, NATO has launched its own theater missile defense program—separate from the U.S. initiative—with five consortiums of defense contractors vying to do feasibility studies.

Similarly, on environmental issues Bush may also be heading for less trouble in Europe than thought just a few weeks ago. True, he may run into public protests, since the environment is a sensitive issue. But European officials seem more alarmed at Bush's peremptory approach to the Kyoto Protocol than to his core contention that it is unenforceable and lets developing countries off easy. Bush's outright rejection of the treaty "looked like the U.S. does what it likes, when it likes, and how it likes," complains William Hopkinson, an associate fellow at London's Royal Institute of International Affairs. Still, "Europeans know hardly anyone will be able to fulfill the Kyoto guidelines," concedes the Adenauer Institute's Kamp. The trick now is coming up with a new approach that will be both politically and economically acceptable to all parties. That will take time. To disarm his critics, Administration sources say Bush may concede global warming is a problem and offer general ideas for new ways to address it.

Bush will probably face his most critical test when he meets Russian President Vladimir V. Putin on June 16 in Slovenia. Both sides have a stake in improving relations, which started out with a U.S. spy scandal reminiscent of the cold war. NATO's plans for expansion as far as the Baltics is still a sore point. But Moscow and Washington both want deep cuts in their nuclear arsenals. And they may avoid a confrontation over missile defense if Bush says he'll consider talks to amend—the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. "I don't think there is any possibility of any deal" on NMD at the meeting, says Vyacheslav A. Nikonov, president of Polity Foundation, an independent Moscow think tank. The best outcome, he says, would be a decision to appoint Russian and American experts to discuss NMD and defer decisions while the two sides improve relations in other areas. Such a compromise would advance Bush's goal of keeping NMD alive—and allow the President to enjoy his European trip after all.

By Stan Crock in Washington, with bureau reports

GLOBAL WRAPUP

INDIA'S NEPAL WORRIES

JOSPIN'S LATEST PROBLEM
Bush set to clash with European leaders over carbon emissions

Irwin Goodwin, Washington

On his first visit to Europe as president, George W. Bush will tell European leaders this week that he will not accept mandatory limits on carbon emissions. He remains unmoved on the issue despite fresh confirmation from the US National Academy of Sciences that such emissions are probably responsible for global warming.

On 11 June Bush announced that he would support a new research initiative "to study areas of uncertainty and identify priority areas where investment can make a difference." He also proposed "a joint venture with the European Union, Japan and others to develop state-of-the-art climate modelling".

But Bush sought to shift the blame from the United States, which has 5% of the world's population but produces about 25% of all carbon emissions. "Our approach must be based on global participation, including that of developing countries whose net greenhouse-gas emissions now exceed those in developed countries," he said.

The academy study was requested by the White House last month (see Nature 411, 255; 2001), and was chaired by Ralph Cicerone, chancellor of the University of California, Irvine. It found that the conclusion of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) — that the global warming over the past 50 years is probably the result of increases in greenhouse gases — "accurately reflects the current thinking of the scientific community".

But the academy said that the summaries of IPCC reports placed less emphasis on uncertainty than the reports themselves, and suggested changes to the IPCC process.

The White House has been trying to ease worries about the official US stand on global warming. After rejecting the Kyoto Protocol on climate change in March, Bush set up a cabinet task force on the issue, headed by Vice-President Richard Cheney and Bush's national security adviser, Condoleezza Rice.

Just before the academy released its report on 6 June, Cicerone and panel member Sherwood Rowland briefed White House and state officials on its contents. Cheney and Rice then met with environmentalists to sketch out their plans for addressing climate change.

Warning up: cabinet members look on as Bush confronts climate change ahead of his visit to Europe.

"They are weighing very heavily what to do at home before deciding what to do abroad," says Eileen Claussen, president of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, who attended one of these meetings.

A Bush spokesman says the academy report provided "a basis of sound science on which decisions can be made", adding that "the president agrees action has to be taken".

Labs seek share of NIH spending

Meredith Wadman, Washington

Senior advisers to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) have called for a billion dollars a year to be spent on construction and renovation of biomedical research labs.

The proposed investment would dwarf the $75 million that Congress earmarked for construction from the biomedical agency's 2001 budget of $20 billion. But advocates of the change say that a boost in such spending is needed if research infrastructure is to keep pace with the doubling of the overall NIH budget between 1999 and 2003.

The recommendation was delivered in a report to acting NIH director Ruth Kirschstein on 7 June by a group commissioned in 1999 by outgoing NIH director Harold Varmus.

The group says that existing construction funding cannot keep pace with recent large increases in NIH funding for researchers.

"We wanted...a people [to] understand you can't do research in a garage," says William Brody, president of Johns Hopkins University, who chaired the group.

But NIH officials fear that Congress may respond to the request with money that the NIH could otherwise spend on grants to researchers. "If there was to be interest in putting more money in construction...then they might try to find it somewhere else [in the NIH]," notes Kirschstein. She deferred a decision on the group's findings until the committee meets again in December.

Academic medical centres in the United States customarily pay for new laboratories themselves, hoping to recoup some of their costs from government grants.
‘Europe’ Doesn’t Hate Bush

By Bret Stephens

GOTHENBURG, Sweden — All week long, we’ve been waiting for the eruption, the boil-up, the blowout.

Did the president of the United States really call the prime minister of Spain “Anzar”? (It’s Aznar.) Did George W. Bush’s inadequate Spanish cause his hosts to cringe? Would the president fall on his face in his discussions with European statesmen? Would he even know who they were? And would an outpouring of millions of protesting Europeans steal the limelight and ruin the “Toxic Texan’s” maiden voyage?

On Tuesday I attended one of these protests, in Brussels. Actually, it was a collection of protests. A demonstrator from Oxfam wanted to “Stop the Israeli Occupation of Palestine.” The Ethics Vegetarian Alternative pledged Mother Earth’s revenge against the U.S. and American consumers pleased, “Dear Europe—We didn’t vote for him either.” Then there was Gordon Clark of Greenpeace, who’d flown in from Washington to shadow the president. Mr. Clark confided that he was planning something big for the president’s arrival, but wouldn’t say what. The next day, he and about 30 others chained themselves to a set of traffic lights near the airport to block Mr. Bush’s motorcade. Alas, it was the wrong set.

Fairly Tame

All in all, there were about 700 people at the protest, 1,000 tops. Here in Sweden, it’s a different story. An estimated 9,000 protesters, representing some 80 different groups, are in town—fewer than the 25,000 anticipated, but enough to shut down parts of the city center. Police have formed a line around the school where city officials—this being Sweden—have housed a contingent of anarchists, whom they will not let out. But despite some sporadic clashes between demonstrators and police, things are fairly tame. Many of the “protestors” are simply onlookers; others aren’t protesting Mr. Bush so much as the EU summit also taking place here.

So where is this fabled tidal wave of European anti-Americanism? Three places: in the media, among left-leaning nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and among a handful—albeit a much-quoted handful—of European politicians.

Perhaps not surprisingly, it’s the U.S. media that, as if seeking confirmation of their own political biases, lead the pack in denouncing Mr. Bush on behalf of “the Europeans.” “Across Europe,” writes Suzanne Hunt in the New York Times, “there is little love for America’s new president and a growing perception that the United States, under his leadership, is looking out only for itself these days, pol-

and the voice of “civil society”—and they exert a great deal of influence in the undemocratic ambit of European institutions in Brussels. Thus the constant attention devoted by the EU to depleted uranium, genetically modified foods, plastic softeners, greenhouse gases and other “issues” with an anti-U.S. tilt that resonates strongly on the left but leave most Europeans indifferent.

Then there are the politicians. Here too, the media have helped to create a miracle of selective denunciation, that the designated spokesman usually turns out to be the minister of France.

Raged Europeans so much that Washing
ton actually noticed.” In fact, Mr. Bush did precisely what he expected to do, given the U.S. Senate’s 95-0 rejection of the treaty in 1997. And the “rage” expressed by Europe’s leading political figures was mainly a feat of histrionics, not an expression of genuine concern for the environment.

The center-left governments of both Germany and France govern in coalition with the radical Greens; politically, they have no choice but to adopt a pious expression in the face of this environmentalist holy grail. Yet given last September’s fuel-tax protests, which succeeded in all but shutting down Britain, Belgium and France, it’s doubtful whether these governments will want to raise fuel taxes by further whoppings percentages in order to meet the emissions targets demanded by Kyoto. Having the U.S. do the dirty work of rejecting the treaty offers the ultimate political escape hatch.

Then, too, for all the European rhetoric about their environmental credentials and the need for “global leadership” on global warming, no EU country has yet ratified Kyoto. Currently, eight EU member states—France, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Ireland and Greece—have exceeded their emissions targets, some by nearly 100%.

True, large emissions reductions in Germany and Britain have allowed the EU as a whole to claim it has reduced carbon-dioxide emissions by 4% from 1990 levels—half of what Kyoto requires. But much of those gains have been achieved by one-time closures of coal-burning plants in the British Midlands and the former East Germany. Further reductions will be a lot more painful to achieve.

So in addition to offering Europeans an alibi for getting out of Kyoto, Mr. Bush’s rejection of the treaty conveniently deflected attention from Europe’s own environmental peccadilloes. And it handed Europe a moral victory.

Meanwhile, Mr. Bush cruises through Europe, to grudgingly good reviews. He acquitted himself well in Spain, winning an important endorsement from José María Aznar on missile defense. Journalists who covered him at the NATO summit in Brussels came away fairly impressed. In Gothenburg, the Swedish prime minister, Goran Persson, “agreed to disagree” with Mr. Bush over Kyoto. Even French and German leaders seem to be coming around to the notion that ballistic missiles in the hands of Middle Eastern crazies may pose a threat.

Not Going Away
Global Warming Debate Gets Hotter

As President Bush was about to leave for his first presidential trip to Europe, a panel of distinguished scientists issued a report affirming predictions of global warming. Amid rising international criticism of his policies on greenhouse-gas emissions, Bush acknowledged the problem but offered few specific proposals to counter it.

"We can make great progress in reducing emissions, and we will," said Bush at the White House this week, noting the panel's conclusion that Earth's average temperature has risen about 0.6°C since 1900.

The report, which the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) in Washington, D.C., produced with unusual swiftness, asserts a strong scientific consensus regarding climate predictions. The panel, headed by atmospheric scientist Ralph Cicerone of the University of California, Irvine, agreed that an accumulation of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases could heat the planet between 1.4° and 5.8°C in this century. That shift "could well have serious adverse societal and ecological impacts," according to the report.

President Bush had commissioned the report shortly after his March rejection of the Kyoto Protocol, an agreement signed in 1997 by negotiators for 167 nations, including the United States. The accord sets limits on the emissions of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide. Bush reaffirmed his rejection of the protocol but said he would continue to seek international solutions to the problem. "My administration is committed to a leadership role," he said.

The NAS report came to much the same conclusions as a longer scientific report that the United Nations compiled in January for nations still hashing out the Kyoto accord. The NAS panel called the U.N. report an "admirable summary of research."

Both the U.S. and U.N. reports conclude that human activity "very likely" has caused the increase in global temperatures since 1900. Both reports also concede that uncertainties remain about the role of human-generated gas emissions because of gaps in knowledge about natural climate variations.

In his White House statement, the President highlighted those uncertainties, while announcing plans to increase funding for research that could sharpen climate predictions and create new emission-cutting technologies. He offered no detailed proposals to reduce emissions now. He promised, however, to address the problem through voluntary market-based incentives, as well as through the use of nuclear energy and other technologies that yield little greenhouse gas.

"The President is helping to lead the world out of the Kyoto quagmire," said Glenn Kelly of the Washington, D.C.-based Global Climate Coalition, which represents fuel industries. In Kyoto, Japan, U.S. negotiators agreed to reduce greenhouse emissions to 7 percent below 1990 levels by 2012. Congress never ratified the proposal, however, and Bush has called the goals "unrealistic."

Environmentalists saw little substance in the President's proposals. "Where is the actual cut in pollution?" asks Kalee Kreider, global warming campaign director of the National Environmental Trust, also based in Washington.

Anders Jessen, the European Union's counselor for transport, energy, and environment in Washington, D.C., said he shares the skepticism of many in Europe who doubt that Bush can come up with a workable alternative to the Kyoto Protocol. "I think there is a lot of reluctance around the world to throw all that work out the window and start over," said Jessen. Adds Kreider, "Somehow he [Bush] thinks that 10 people in the White House are going to come up with something better."

While the European Union is on target to meeting its Kyoto-agreed goal of reducing greenhouse-gas emissions to 8 percent below 1990 level by 2012, U.S. emissions have increased more than 11 percent during the past decade.

—C. Schubert
Japan Promotes Treaty on Global Warming, but Keeps Its Options Open

BY HOWARD W. FRENCH

TOKYO, June 14 — Japan's foreign minister, Makiko Tanaka, said today that Tokyo would work "to the last moment" to persuade the United States to support the Kyoto Protocol to curb global warming.

Ms. Tanaka's comments, made on the eve of her first official trip to the United States, were the latest in a drum roll of remarks by senior officials here this week aimed at supporting European efforts to convince Washington to reconsider its opposition to the accords to limit greenhouse gas emissions.

On Wednesday, Japan's popular new prime minister, Junichiro Koizumi, called the Bush Administration position on the accords "truly deplorable," and also pledged to continue working to persuade Washington to change its position.

Ms. Tanaka is expected to take up the subject in her first meeting with Secretary of State Colin L. Powell on Monday in Washington, and Mr. Koizumi, who is scheduled to meet with Mr. Bush in their first summit on June 30, has already signaled his intention to follow up on the issue.

But even as Japan stakes out a position strongly in favor of the 1997 accord, which was named after this country's ancient capital and has inevitably become linked to national pride, Ms. Tanaka has carefully kept Japan's options open with regard to the agreement, saying that ratification "cannot go ahead with European countries while leaving the United States behind."

Japan's calculated ambiguity on the issue, strongly urging the United States to ratify the protocol, while hedging its own commitment in the case Washington refuses, reveals the complex political geometry behind the accord.

The 1997 protocol requires industrial countries to impose binding limits on emissions of carbon dioxide and other so-called greenhouse gases by an average of 5.2 percent below 1990 levels from 2008 to 2012.

For the protocol to take effect, a collection of countries that emit 55 percent of the world's industrial greenhouse gases would have to ratify it. And with Washington appearing set against the accord, and Europe set firmly in support of it, Japan, with the world's second largest economy, has emerged as the critical pivot.

If Tokyo adopted the protocol, the presence of Japan and Europe together would ensure ratification. Similarly, if Japan opted out because of the refusal of the United States to ratify it, the protocol would become a dead letter.

"Japan is key," said Svend Auken, Denmark's energy and environment minister, in a statement to the World Bank on Friday, according to Bloomberg News. "Russia, the Ukraine and the European Union account for about 53 percent. It is the last 2 percent that is difficult."

While Japan has made common cause with Europe in pressuring Washington to reconsider its position on the accord, Tokyo has carefully avoided tilting its hand about what it would do in the end.

In April, for example, Japan's Parliament strongly approved a resolution calling for ratification of the accord. Mr. Koizumi faced repeated questions from the Parliament this week urging him to submit the pact to the legislature for its approval. Some members of his cabinet, too, are known to be strongly in favor of ratification.

Mr. Koizumi, however, has avoided committing himself. "At the moment, we have not decided to make an independent decision," he told the legislature on Thursday.
President Bush tours the Continent, tries to persuade angry allies that he’s not a troglodyte and searches for the soul of Vladimir Putin

By JAMES CARNEY and MASSIMO CALABRESI WASHINGTON

GEORGE W. BUSH IS HUNGRY TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION this week on his first presidential tour of Europe, and no wonder. “This is the biggest trip of his life,” an adviser says, his chance to look a Russian President in the eye, his chance to persuade the allies that he isn’t the arrogant, missile shield-obsessed, execution-happy global warmer that so many Europeans take him to be.

How hungry is Bush? In late April, when former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, who had suggested to the President’s father that Dubya’s foreign policy was off course, stopped at the White House to meet with National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, the President dropped by for two minutes—and stayed for 20, pumping Gorbachy for advice. Bush has also heard from another old hand, the one whom Americans hope he consults but whom White House image-mongers are most sensitive about—his dad.
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a common pastime for world leaders, but it does not play to Bush’s strengths. He is better in less formal settings that let him put his personality to work. And though there are moments on the world stage when charm can carry the day, they aren’t likely to occur in Brussels or, for that matter, at the European Union conference in Göteborg, Sweden, which Bush will visit Thursday. These are places where talking policy is a treasured and complex art. There and elsewhere on his trip, Bush will face European Union members who are ideologically alien to him (11 of 15 E.U. governments are center-left) and wary of his reputation as a recklessly cowboy, a unilateralist with scant regard for his allies. And when he caps his tour Saturday with Putin, he’ll face his biggest challenge. The Russian is opposed to Bush’s plans for a missile-defense system, and Bush needs to change Putin’s mind. If Putin goes along, the rest of Europe—steadily opposed for now—will probably go along too.

If Bush’s sides seemed nervous last week, it wasn’t without cause. Their pupil has scant experience in foreign affairs, and when he has managed to work some in between selling his tax cut and his energy proposals, the results have been mixed. The spy-plane incident with China ended well, but in its early stages Bush was unsteady. Breaking off nonproliferation talks with North Korea, he contradicted his own Secretary of State and seemed dismissive of South Korea President Kim Dae Jung’s Nobel Peace-prize winning efforts at reconciliation with the North. Most of all, he infuriated allies across Europe by abruptly announcing that the U.S. would withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol on climate change. Bush had promised a “humble foreign policy,” but as far as Europe was concerned, he delivered the opposite in his first months as President.

A FEW WEEKS AGO, BUSH AND HIS advisers began preparing for his European tour by pulling back on some contentious issues. Last week they received the results of a report on climate change that indicated global warming is—surprise!—an indisputable reality. Suddenly the President was no longer casting doubt on the problem or calling for “sound science.” By Monday, he was expected to announce funding for new market-based initiatives aimed at reducing greenhouse emissions even if he remained deliberately vague on the issue of mandatory U.S. emission reductions, a key European demand. And to smooth ruffled South Korean feathers, the Administration last week announced it would offer to resume talks with the North on missile testing and development. Even the hard-nosed Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, who had previously argued for withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Balkans, conspicuously celebrated the righteousness of their mission on a visit there last week.

Those concessions produced a softening on the European side. Even the perennial Yank-bashers in Paris are trying to play nice. “Bush came in with big theories,” says a French diplomat, “but on all these questions the Administration has evolved.” Yet Bush is hardly rolling over on all issues. In response to American steelmakers’ allegations of “dumping” by foreign manufacturers, the Administration may impose import tariffs on steel, an idea protested across Europe and