

HOME

SEARCH [Go to Advanced Search/Archive](#)[GO TO MEMBER CENTER](#) [LOG OUT](#)[JOB MARKET](#)[REAL ESTATE](#)[AUTOMOBILES](#)

NEWS

International

- Africa
- Americas
- Asia Pacific
- Europe
- Middle East

National

Politics

Business

Technology

Science

Health

Sports

New York Region

Education

Weather

Obituaries

NYT Front Page

Corrections

OPINION

Editorials/Op-Ed

Readers' Opinions

FEATURES

Arts

Books

Movies

Travel

Dining &amp; Wine

Home &amp; Garden

Fashion &amp; Style

New York Today

Crossword/Games

Cartoons

Magazine

Week in Review

Multimedia/Photos

College

Learning Network

SERVICES

Archive

Classifieds

Personals

Theater Tickets

Premium Products

NYT Store

NYT Mobile

E-Cards &amp; More

About NYTDigital

Jobs at NYTDigital

Online Media Kit

Our Advertisers

MEMBER CENTER

Your Profile

E-Mail Preferences

nytimes.com/realestate

Sign up now [ [click here](#) ]

With our new Real Estate e-mail alerts.

## Goals Clash at the Summit Meeting on Global Warming

By RACHEL L. SWARNS

**J**OHANNESBURG, Aug. 30 — The photograph appears in a full-page advertisement in The International Herald Tribune under the headline "Put a Face on Global Warming and Forest Destruction."

It is a picture of President Bush, whose country is accused by protesters and some delegates at an international conference here of derailing any hope of progress at the talks to reduce poverty and protect the environment.

Advertisement



**HARRISdirect**

**Barron's gave us**  
★★★★★

► We'll give you \$100 credit

**Invest today!►**



"Corporate criminals!" the protesters shout as they assail American officials for opposing targets and deadlines intended to promote development while preserving the environment.

But in the private negotiating rooms at the United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development here, the United States is far from the only country balking at approving a strong, ambitious agreement.

Saudi Arabia, Canada, Japan and Australia, for instance, also oppose deadlines for the conversion from oil and gas power to windmills, solar panels and other forms of renewable energy. The European Union objects to eliminating subsidies for activities that threaten natural resources, like commercial fishing.

Developing countries have joined the United States in pressing to water

down language that would have committed nations to significantly reducing the threat that dangerous chemicals pose to health and the environment.

Welcome, [tweiskel](#)

-  [E-Mail This Article](#)
-  [Printer-Friendly Format](#)
-  [Most E-Mailed Articles](#)
-  [Reprints](#)

ARTICLE TOOLS  
SPONSORED BY

STARBUCKS.COM



Associated Press

In Johannesburg, a poster for a newspaper criticized President Bush's absence from the environmental talks.

### MULTIMEDIA

**Video:** [Greenpeace Accuses US of Shirking Their Responsibilities](#)

### RELATED ARTICLES

[U.S. Shows Off Aid Projects at U.N. Development Meeting](#) (August 30, 2002)

[Summit in Johannesburg: At Development Talks, U.S. and Its Allies Clash Over Issues of Energy and Pollution](#) (August 29, 2002)

[Summit in Johannesburg: Diplomat Tries to Bring Together Rich and Poor](#) (August 28, 2002)

[World Development Forum Begins With a Rebuke](#) (August 27, 2002)

- [News Tracker](#)
- [Premium Account](#)
- [Site Help](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)

**NEWSPAPER**

- [Home Delivery](#)
- [Customer Service](#)
- [Electronic Edition](#)
- [Media Kit](#)
- [Community Affairs](#)

[Text Version](#)

Advertiser Links:  
[Discover New Topics in Depth](#)

[Find More Low Fares! Experience Orbitz!](#)

The large number of countries opposed to various targets and time frames is the main reason why negotiators have struggled this week to complete the summit meeting's plan, which is meant to be an ambitious blueprint for the world.

On one hand, the United States has been almost alone in refusing to support an agreement to reduce the number of people who lack sanitation by half by 2015. Australia also opposes that time frame.

But on the other hand, the American decision to accept timetables for restoring depleted fisheries and for reducing the risk of hazardous chemicals has been nearly lost in the storm of criticism.

"The situation has been very polarized, but it's not a matter of singling out one country," said Gustavo Ainchil, the diplomat from Argentina who is leading the negotiations on energy. "You cannot simplify a problem that is very complex."

Everyone here supports the summit meeting's overall goals of protecting plants and wildlife, reducing pollution and bringing water, electricity and housing to the poor. But poor nations object to environmental targets or strong language that would require costly intervention on their part. Wealthy nations refuse to budge on subsidies that protect their industries.

Oil producers are reluctant to embrace commitments that promote alternative energy sources. Other countries, in many cases, view the deadlines as unnecessary regulation.

The result is that the plan, which officials hoped would be completed tonight, is still incomplete, with deadlocks on issues ranging from subsidies to renewable energy and from corporate accountability to globalization.

Washington has borne the brunt of the blame for the delay. The United States has the world's largest economy and is one of its largest polluters. Many leaders complain that it has been reluctant to eliminate the agricultural subsidies that make it difficult for poor nations to export to the American market. Other officials complain that it has failed to acknowledge and accept its obligations for cleaning up the environment.

Last year, Mr. Bush angered many leaders when he rejected a treaty negotiated in Kyoto, Japan, that set targets for reducing emissions of gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. Mr. Bush said such accords should also bind developing nations, especially China and India, that are also major emitters of such gases. Developing nations have refused, saying wealthy countries are among the largest polluters and should clean up first.

The European Union, which wants to set deadlines for resolving environmental problems, has been sharply critical of Washington's reluctance to make commitments to such agreements.

"On targets and timetables on the environmental issues, we haven't seen a concrete proposal, nothing at all except watering down the text, avoiding anything concrete," said Jos Delbeke, a senior member of the European delegation. "We cannot understand why the United States, being a world leader, is taking such a harsh stance."

Environmentalists agreed, saying the United States deserved the criticism because

TIMES NEWS TRACKER	
Topics	Alerts
Environment	
Summit Conferences	
International Relations	
<a href="#">Create Your Own</a>   <a href="#">Manage Alerts</a> <a href="#">Take a Tour</a>	
<b><a href="#">Sign Up for Newsletters</a></b>	

DID YOU KNOW?
You can solve today's New York Times crossword puzzle online. <a href="#">Click here</a> to learn more.

it had objected to so many critical aspects of the summit meeting's plan, including time frames for converting to renewable energy and for reversing the decline of endangered plants and animals.

Among the critics is the Rainforest Action Network, the advocacy group that placed the advertisement in The International Herald Tribune.

"Any progress is welcome," Paul L. Joffe, the director of international affairs for the National Wildlife Federation, said of the American agreement on fisheries and chemicals. "But what we've seen so far is very minimal compared to the enormous challenges here and the enormous lack of commitment to goals, timetables and funding."

But United Nations officials described the American concessions on fisheries and chemicals as significant. The Americans have agreed to restore depleted fisheries, where possible, by 2015, and to make commitments for sound management of chemicals with the goal of minimizing their adverse effects on health and nature by 2020.

Environmental groups complain that the wording is weak. But some officials warn that the intense criticism of the Americans has given a distorted picture of the negotiations, as if the rest of world were eager to embrace difficult decisions.

"They're always the focus because they have so much power," said Jon Pronk, the United Nations special envoy to the meeting.

"But it's necessary not only to be critical of the Americans," Mr. Pronk said. "You have to be also critical of the Europeans. Agricultural subsidies are outrageously high in Europe. It's complex. It's not only a north-south dispute."

**Forum:** [Join a Discussion on The Environment](#)

**Web Site:** [World Summit on Sustainable Development \(www.johannesburgsummit.org\)](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org)

---

Doing research? Search the archive for more than 500,000 articles:

- 
-  [E-Mail This Article](#)
  -  [Printer-Friendly Format](#)
  -  [Most E-Mailed Articles](#)
  -  [Reprints](#)

ARTICLE TOOLS  
SPONSORED BY 



Wake up to the world with home delivery  
of The New York Times newspaper.  
[Click Here](#) for 50% off.

---

[Home](#) | [Back to International](#) | [Search](#) | [Corrections](#) | [Help](#) | [Back to Top](#)

[nytimes.com/realestate](http://nytimes.com/realestate)

Sign up now [ [click here](#) ]

With our new Real Estate **e-mail alerts.**

[Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company](#) | [Permissions](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)