

Kuzembayeva A.¹, Baikushikova G.²

¹candidate of historical sciences, acting Associated Professor, e-mail: akuzembayeva@bk.ru

²PhD in International Relations, acting Associated Professor, e-mail: gulnara.baikushikova@gmail.com

International Relations and World Economy Chair,
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

**CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY:
AN ASSESSMENT OF US FOREIGN POLICY**

In this article the problem of global climate changes as the one of the main current environmental problems was analyzed. The United States is the most important actor in on-going climate change negotiations. It is the greatest emitter of greenhouse gases (GHGs) and has the financial resources that can be used to address climate change on a global scale. In this article, there is attempt to answer the question of the extent the United States has taken on its fair share of the burdens associated with climate change. With this in mind, the article endeavors to answer this question through the making analysis of current (D.Trump), and previous (G.W.Bush and B.Obama) administrations' policies in this field. The impact of domestic forces were analyzed. It describes the opposing stances on climate change taken by Republican and Democratic leaders. Their policies continuity and essential features were revealed. The authors argue that the strong relationship between natural resource dependence (coal and oil) and opposition to climate policies is a constant feature of the U.S. climate policy debate.

Key words: environmental problems, the problem of climate change, foreign policy, greenhouse gases, international cooperation, the Paris Agreement.

Күзембаева А.Б.¹, Байкүшікова Г.С.²

¹тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент м.а., e-mail: akuzembayeva@bk.ru

²PhD докторы, доцент м.а., e-mail: gulnara.baikushikova@gmail.com

халықаралық қатынастар және әлемдік экономика кафедрасы,
әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

**Климаттың өзгеруі саласындағы саясат:
АҚШ сыртқы саясатына талдау жасау**

Мақалада қазіргі таңда экологиялық мәселелердің кешеніне кіретін климаттың ғаламдық өзгеруі проблемасы қарастырылған. Соңғы онжылдықта әлемдегі экологиялық жағдайдың ушығуы жылыжай газдарының атмосфераға шығуымен тікелей байланысты. Америка Құрама Штаттары әлемдегі жылыжай газдардың шығарылымдары бойынша алдыңғы қатардағы ең ірі мемлекет және өзінің қомақты қаржы ресурстарын жаһандық ауқымда климаттың өзгеруімен күресуге жұмсай алады. Мақалада климаттың өзгеруі салдарларын жеңілдету мен бейімделу бойынша шығындар ауыртпалығын мемлекеттер арасында әділетті түрде үлестіру қажеттілігі туралы АҚШ-тың ұстанымы айқындалған. Осы зерттеуде АҚШ-тың экология саласындағы саясаты қарастырылған, АҚШ-тың сыртқы саясатындағы климаттың өзгеруі мәселесіне қатысты ұстанымына ықпал ететін ішкі факторларға талдау жасалған. АҚШ климаттың өзгеруі мәселесі бойынша келіссөздерде маңызды рөл атқарады. Мақалада Дж. Буш-кіші, Обама және Трамп әкімшілігі тұсындағы климаттың өзгеруіне байланысты саясатқа сараптама жасалған. Республикалық және демократиялық әкімшіліктердің доктриналық көзқарастарындағы сабақтастық пен айрықша белгілер айқындалған. Климаттың өзгеруі проблемасына қатысты ұстанымға ішкі акторлар тобының ықпалы негізделеді. Республикалық және демократиялық партиялар көшбасшыларының климаттың өзгеруіне байланысты қарама-қайшы көзқарастары белгіленген. Көрнекті және айрықша ерекшеліктерді басқа мемлекеттерде және демократтарда байқалады. Климаттың өзгеруіне байланысты тұрақты түрде жүргізілетін талқылаулар табиғи

ресурстарға (көмір мен мұнай) бағыныштылық пен климаттың өзгеру салдарларын елемей саясаты арқылы айқындалады.

Түйін сөздер: экологиялық проблемалар, климаттың өзгеруі проблемасы, сыртқы саясат, парниктік газдар, халықаралық ынтымақтастық, Париж келісімі.

Кузембаева А.Б.¹, Байкушикова Г.С.²

¹кандидат исторических наук, и.о. доцента, e-mail: akuzembayeva@bk.ru

²доктор PhD, и.о. доцента, e-mail: gulfara.baikushikova@gmail.com

кафедра международных отношений и мировой экономики,
Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

Политика в области изменения климата: анализ внешней политики США

В статье рассматривается одна из составляющих комплекса экологических проблем современного мира – глобальное изменение климата. Ухудшение экологической ситуации в мире в последние десятилетия связано с выбросами в атмосферу парниковых газов. США являются крупнейшим в мире источником выбросов парниковых газов и располагают финансовыми ресурсами, которые могут быть использованы для борьбы с изменением климата в глобальном масштабе. В этой связи в исследовании уделяется внимание политике США в области экологии, анализируется влияние внутренних факторов на формирование внешней политики США в области изменения климата. Соединенные Штаты являются самым важным актором в переговорах по проблеме изменения климата. В статье делается попытка осветить позицию США по вопросу справедливого распределения между странами бремени затрат, связанных со смягчением климатических изменений. В статье представлен сравнительный анализ политических мер в области изменения климата при администрациях Джорджа Буша-младшего, Барака Обамы и Д. Трампа. Анализируется влияние внутренних групп акторов на решение проблем в области изменения климата. Рассмотрены противоположные позиции, высказанные лидерами республиканцев и демократов в вопросах изменения климата. Выделены преемственные и отличительные особенности отличие во взглядах республиканцев и демократов в США. Наблюдаются постоянные дискуссии вокруг проблем изменения климата и в основном они сконцентрированы на таких вопросах, как зависимость от природных ресурсов (уголь и нефть) и противостояние климатической политике.

Ключевые слова: экологические проблемы, проблема изменения климата, внешняя политика, парниковые газы, международное сотрудничество, Парижское соглашение.

Introduction

Climate change is one of the main considerable and central issues facing the world community. During recent decades it has gained increasing attention due to the emerging consensus around scientific evidence.

According to the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fifth Assessment Report, Earth is warming and it is caused by emissions resulting from human activities are substantially increasing the atmospheric concentrations of the greenhouse gases carbon dioxide, methane, chlorofluorocarbons and nitrous oxide (Fifth Assessment Report, 2009). Moreover, consequences would be disastrous by affecting poor populations and future generations. The vast bulk of greenhouse gas concentrations originated in the world's economically developed regions like North America, Europe, Japan and Australia. In order to prevent extreme catastrophe, there might be industrial nations' unanimous decision in substantial

reducing the use of fossil fuels, the largest source of human contribution to contemporary GHG releases. Therefore large industrialized nations are key actors to addressing the problem.

Climate change issues have been addressed at various international forums and multilateral negotiations. Attempts to reduce greenhouse gases concentration have led to the signing multilateral frameworks like the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol, Copenhagen and Cancun Agreements and Paris Agreement. Although the Paris Agreement calls for all countries to make ambitious emission reduction pledges and a transparency framework to monitor such pledges, it failed to arrive at a legally binding instrument.

The United States is one of the largest emitter of these gases. The United States has been burning coal, oil and natural gas far longer, and today the country, with just over 4 percent of the world's population, is responsible for almost a third of the excess carbon dioxide that is heating the planet. During the 2008 elections campaign candidates advocated actions

against climate change, both Obama and John McCain took positive positions regarding enacting federal regulations on carbon dioxide emissions. Shortly after winning, Obama reaffirmed his promise by calling for a federal 'cap-and-trade' policy that would place mandatory limits on carbon dioxide emissions, auction permits for such emissions, and allow for the buying and selling of these permits. But partisan polarisation have impeded sustainable environmental decision-making, including at the international level (Brewer, Paul R., 2012: 7). In 2015, the White House issued large-scale EPA regulations, known collectively as the Clean Power Plan, which set carbon-emissions limits for the first time on existing power plants. The president Obama also blocked completion of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, a massive energy infrastructure project supported by most Republicans and opposed by environmental groups, and committed the United States, along with nearly two hundred other countries, to reducing global carbon pollution by joining to Paris agreement. However, new US President Donald Trump had declared his decision to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement and thereby reducing the international efforts to address dangerous global warming.

These opposing stances mean that climate change policy, and its relationship with US foreign policy, needs to be evaluated for the previous and current administrations.

Divergent approaches between administrations can in principle be rationalized on the basis of theoretical arguments within the foreign policy analysis (FPA). FPA provides the necessary tools to explain and predict human political choice, much of it happening through the behavior of collectivities (Hudson, V. M., & Vore, C. S., 1995: 209-238). FPA affords to assess foreign policy decisions and the role of human beings as the source of change in international politics. Thus, FPA could evaluate recent developments in US about climate change policy, and its relevant relationships with foreign policy.

The main purpose of the article is to examine the role that climate change policy within the US foreign policy during the Bush, Obama and the present Trump administrations. Assessment was based on the analysis of US national government policy pertaining climate-energy issues. For US politicians, economy is much more important than climate change at the national and international levels because environmental regulation is too expensive, reduces economic growth, hurts international competitiveness, and causes widespread layoffs and plant closures.

This article leads to discussion on whether environmental issues remain integral part of the foreign policy despite recent changes under the current administration.

Literature review

There is a vast literature on the US climate change policy that examines the impact of the United States has on climate change. The literature also discusses the US resistance in taking part in international agreements and influences of domestic policies on these decisions.

There are a lot of empirical based group literature that has focused on how vested interest and influential interest groups in blocking GHG emission reduction legislation. Gragg, M.I. and others have discussed that US Congress members would most probably vote against measures to restrain greenhouse gas emissions if they represent districts with high levels of emissions per capita (Cragg, M.I., Zhou, Y., Gurney, K. & Kahn, M.E., 2013: 1640-1650). Naomi Klein has highlighted that 70–75% of Democrats and liberals are much more confiding in scientists' arguments regarding climate issue. In sharp contrast, conservative Republicans much less tend to recognize negative consequences from climate change or to consider proposed solutions in order to mitigate any effects (Klein, N., 2011). Jonas Meckling has studied major role of business in the emergence of global environmental governance and more particularly, in the rise of carbon markets. (Meckling, J., 2011: 26-50). Robert MacNeil has argued that the institutional setup in the US policymaking regime is designed to favor status quo and inaction. (MacNeil, R., 2013: 259-276).

A large group of authors focuses on relating climate change policies to other problems or benefits, such as security, economic growth. Guri Bang has considered difficulties of modifying the existing energy policy status quo in the United States due to the design and structure of the US political institutions. He has discussed that Republican majority in both houses of Congress enabled to enact the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which promoted continuing domestic oil and gas production, and neglected renewable energy development. The domination of the Democrats after the elections in 2006 offered the opportunity to include energy security and climate change issues for a joint decision making agenda. The voting procedures and other rules in the House and the Senate create many veto players thus making it difficult to pass laws that change the current institutional setup (Bang, G., 2010: 1645-1653.).

Paul Harris has analyzed the US policy evolution in environmental sector. He has discussed the US climate change-related policies and diplomacy, recounting significant events during the presidential administrations of George HW Bush, Bill Clinton and George W Bush (Harris, P.G., 2009: 966-971). Matthew Nisbet has argued that the tremendous difference between the factual reality of climate change and citizens' perception is partly connected to the interest groups' activity in framing this issue (Nisbet, M.C., 2009: 12-23). Sevasti-Eleni Vezirgiannidou also has analyzed the discourse and frames in climate and energy policies. They both argue that the current discourse where climate change is framed as pollution creates a divide between Democrats and Republicans. Instead they argue that climate change policy needs to be linked to energy independence, i.e. securitized, or linked to the economic growth that would stem from green investments (Vezirgiannidou, S., 2013: 593-609).

Amy Lynn Fletcher has emphasized that climate skeptics or climate deniers are prevalent in the US and several high ranking politicians have been skeptical about anthropogenic climate change. This debate has led to the no ground for cooperation (Fletcher, A.L., 2009: 800-816.).

Kari De Pryck and François Gemenne (Pryck K. D., Gemenne F., 2017: 119–126) have provided a brief analysis of President Trump discourses on climate change and have discussed them in light of reflections about post truth politics. Paul R. Brewer (Brewer, Paul R., 2012: 7–17) has explored the polarised nature of climate change politics in the US by describing the opposing stances on climate change taken by Republican and Democratic leaders. His study relies on survey data to show that Republican and Democratic citizens hold widely differing views on climate change.

Elizabeth Bomberg and Betsy Super (Bomberg E., Super B., 2009: 424–430) have examined the role environmental issues played in the election campaign of 2008. The other researches like Maurie J. Cohen & Anne Egelston find that the most significant obstacle to US participation in an international agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions is the increasingly oppositional relationship between the USA and China (Cohen M.J., Egelston A., 2003: 315–331).

Methodology

This article seeks to arrive at a theoretical framework appropriate to the study of normative underpinnings guiding US foreign policy decision-makers. FPA is conceptualized as a subfield of

IR, and as a distinct perspective to the study of world politics. Foreign policy analysis offers an actor-specific focus underpinned by reflection that international affairs should be examined through the lens of human decision makers acting singly or in groups. Thus, decision-making processes that encompass perception, goal prioritization, option assessment, and problem recognition would become the focal point of research. People with the authority to commit resources, usually the legitimate authorities of nation-states, make these decisions (Hudson, V. M., 2005: 2).

The process and outcomes of human decision-making are examined proceeding from various influencing factors, which are overlaid by multilevel, interdisciplinary, integrative, agent-oriented and actor-specific explanations (Hudson, V.M., 2005:2-3).

Most FPA scholars works share the view that 'all that occurs between nations and across nations is grounded in human decision makers acting singly or in groups' (Hudson, V. M., 2005: 1-30). «States are not agents because states are abstractions and thus have no agency. Only human beings can be true agents, and it is their agency that is the source of all international politics and all change therein» (Hudson, V. M., 2005: 3).

Therefore, in this case, domestic foundations could explain events and policies that are too specific to be addressed by an actor-general theory like classical realism. This is the approach promoted by FPA. FPA gave emphasis to the non-equivalence between human decision makers and the states. They are also not interchangeable. Thus, in order to understand human beings' decisions we need reliable information. These decisions could impact on various policy outputs. Policy outputs and the norms emerging from them should be observed as dependent variables that are developed within the context of domestic and international politics, implying a «two-level» game that frames decisions according to certain context.

This article examines policy outcomes of two presidential terms, providing insight about foreign policy preferences and their relationship to climate change. Furthermore, it considers internal changes within the country that can affect preferences and behavior. The two-level approach means that preferences and interests could play a key role in foreign affairs. There is an indispensable connection between FPA and constructivism which considers actors' decisions in connection with their own ideas, values, and norms. But focusing on individual beliefs to examine state's foreign policy behavior may not

be enough. Thus, decisions taken via small groups, organizational processes, or bureaucratic politics should also be considered. It will allow to highlight certain foreign policy decisions and actions.

Foreign Policy of the George W. Bush administration

Shortly after taking office in 2001, Kyoto protocol has been rejected by the George W. Bush administration, declaring it had «no interest» in its implementation and taking the first steps towards withdrawing from it. G. Bush was especially reluctant to undertake any action that may harm the U.S. economy, and has instead proposed alternate market-based approaches. Interestingly, he made explicit reference to ‘the incomplete state of scientific knowledge of the causes of, and solutions to, global climate change’ when he withdrew the US commitment to the Kyoto Protocol and its binding targets (US u-turn on emissions fuels anger, 2001).

Climate change played a peripheral role within this foreign policy framework, since United States is significantly dependent on fossil fuel. Furthermore, the US is concerned about the potential loss of sovereignty which could result from international climate treaties. In this context, it must be emphasized that the fossil fuel lobby plays a more active and front-line role in the US by promoting such activities like reverse researches that aim to bring into question the validity and reliability of the IPCC findings. His supporters of his party as Senator James Inhofe argued that ‘the claim that global warming is caused by man-made emissions is simply untrue and not based on sound science’, that ‘CO₂ does not cause catastrophic disasters—actually it would be beneficial to our environment and our economy’, that ‘Kyoto would impose huge costs on Americans, especially the poor’, that ‘proponents [of Kyoto] favour handicapping the American economy through carbon taxes and more regulations’, and that ‘man-made global warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people’ (Congressional Record, 2003). Energy security was indicated as a priority issue: speeches and documents on energy security continually emphasized survival and urgency, and national security was connected with energy supply and price security. National Energy Policy Report of 2001 had sought to address an energy ‘crisis’ by diversifying and increasing the supply of energy, and oil and gas were seen as central to this (Report of the National Energy Policy Development Group, 2001). This report also called for supporting drilling

in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) which reflects the substantial influence of the fossil fuel and automobile industries.

The Administration’s stance to Kyoto protocol provided the basis for global disputes on climate change mitigation activities since the world’s largest source of GHG emissions refused to ratify the Protocol (e.g., European Commission, 2001). This decision aroused resentment, notably from European Union states that had been more focused on shaping coordinated perspectives on climate change issues. Margot Wallstrom, the European Union’s (EU) commissioner for environmental affairs pointed out the United States’ disregard for this issue would impact on external relations including trade and economic affairs.

The US did not ratify the Kyoto protocol in 2001 and instead launched a number of multi-lateral regimes—including the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development established in 2005 and the Major Economies Process on Energy Security and Climate Change established in 2007—that conflict with the UNFCCC.

The Bush administration post-Kyoto climate change policy plans were connected with encouraging supplemental funding technology upgrading aimed at reducing emissions and for studies to provide an opportunity for the United States to enhance its position in environmental protection through research. Members of Bush administration initiated the process of revising the highly controversial National Energy Policy Report of 2001. The revised interpretation intended to attract political attention and to relieve the document’s obvious supply-side emphasis and to establish measures to meet environmental challenges and mitigate climate change.

The Bush administration during this time intentionally started to reconsider important aspects of the international debate on climate change. It is defined by the White House attempts to shift the focus from US inaction to reduce its own greenhouse gas emissions to the advantages of this agreement for the developing European countries. President Bush objected to the exemption for developing nations. President Bush claimed that the treaty requirements would harm the U.S. economy, leading to economic losses of \$400 billion and costing 4.9 million jobs (Bush Outlines Clean Skies Initiative, 2003). Condoleezza Rice, the US president’s national security advisor, stated, «One would want to be certain that developing countries were accounted for in some way, that technology and science really ought to be important parts of this answer, [and] that

we cannot do something that damages the American economy or other economies because growth is also important» (Katharine Q. Seelye, Andrew C. Revkin, 2001).

The Bush administration has called for the necessity of agreement with comprehensive obligations that would extend on major developing emitter-countries like China. The USA currently leads the world in overall greenhouse gas emissions and China is in second position. According to forecasts, by 2025 the emission levels in China are expected to double or triple, equaling increase in the entire industrialized world. Meanwhile, China has become an increasingly powerful actor and a main opponent to the US in a wide range of issues. Thus, the Bush administration's opposition to the Kyoto Protocol could be determined by the impeding further growth of Chinese economy. The Bush administration stance towards the relationship with China was defined as the «strategic competition» by considering China as a rising regional and international power; that in turn had led to the policy on diminishing opponents capabilities to threaten US privileges.

Secondly, the Bush administration actively criticized European countries attempts to deflect attention from their impotence to meet Kyoto obligation by attacking the United States policy. This tendency was indicated as an planned European strategy in order to put the blame on the for the eventual fiasco of the Kyoto Protocol.

Finally, the Bush administration pursued policy to change stereotypes regarding the US 'donation' to the climate change problem by non-acceptance of general research concerning US culpability for almost 25 per cent of global CO₂ emissions and by putting emphasis on its economy's contribution to the world economic output.

However, in 2003, the Bush administration introduced its climate change strategy—the Clear Skies Act which is aimed to reduce power-plant pollution by approximately 70 percent. More specifically, this act would dramatically reduce and cap emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and mercury from electric power generation.» Clear Skies promised to «deliver unprecedented emissions reductions nationwide from the power sector without significantly affecting electricity prices for American consumers» and «deliver certainty and efficiency, achieving environmental protection while supporting economic growth.» (S. 1844 (108th): Clear Skies Act, 2003)

More specifically, the US strategy called for reductions in the rate of greenhouse gas production

(the so-called emissions intensity) relative to economic output by 18 per cent by 2012. This objective would be achieved by creating a pool of approximately \$US5 billion in tax credits to spur companies to improve their environmental performance. The Bush administration also proposed the expansion of a program to enable firms to report their greenhouse gas emissions to a federal registry on a voluntary basis.

The Bush administration has sought to mitigate the security implications of climate change effects through the nuclear power. Reviving nuclear power has been a priority for Bush since 2001, when the energy plan devised by Vice President Cheney advocated construction of hundreds of new nuclear plants. Bush's 2006 budget proposes reducing funding for the Energy Department by 2 percent even as nuclear funding increases 5 percent.

Despite several initiatives on reducing emissions of greenhouse gases via advancing science, the Bush administration put aside climate change as something marginal that could be also stemmed from possible serious consequences during a recession. President's Council of Economic Advisors stated that 'a fixed emission limit eventually means lowering economic growth' Thus, the White House policy focused more on maintaining a permissive system of compliance with environmental standards to generate the wealth that would led to the dynamic innovation process. However, due to the close alignment between the White House and such kind of industries like oil and coal, it is quite difficult for US policy makers to offer new perspectives and adopt advanced environmental strategies that would promote innovation. The Bush administration insisted that economic and environmental objectives were incompatible. The fate of The Lieberman – Wamer Climate Security Act of 2007 demonstrates this political reality. Senators Joe Lieberman and John Warner introduced legislation in October 2007 to establish a cap-and-trade system for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. President Bush himself criticized the bill by claiming that it would cost the U.S. economy \$6 trillion. His estimate drew quick denials from those who support the legislation, including Sen. Barbara Boxer, a California Democrat and longtime environmentalist (Analysis: U.S. may be entering age of political deadlock, 2011).

The Obama administration and updated Commitment to Climate Change Combat

Environmental and energy issues were one of the dominant domestic policy concerns during the

elections of 2008. Barack Obama advocated for active government involvement into the sphere of environmental protection. He pledged generous government support for scientific research by placing increased attention to renewables. As for the Republican John McCain, he actively promoted nuclear power by offering traditional fuel efficiency with the important exception of government support of nuclear energy and called for a certain government role in environmental protection programmes.

Obama's winning was greeted with optimism by US environmental groups. Rodger Schlickeisen, the president of the Defenders of Wildlife Action Fund, said: «For the first time in nearly a decade, we can look to the future with a sense of hope that the enormous environmental challenges we face... It is difficult to describe the damage done by the Bush administration's misguided and destructive environmental policies. For eight years, the special interests have ruled, virtually dictating our conservation, environmental and energy policies» (Obama victory signals rebirth of US environmental policy, 2008).

Obama's choice of cabinet posts revealed a clear difference of Bush's environmental policy practice and tone. Obama preferred to appoint respected and prominent names to lead on environmental policy. And moreover a number of non-cabinet-level staff who has a great experience into the sphere of environmental protection was involved into the work. Also Obama has established a new Office of Energy and Climate Change Policy. President Obama insisted that for too long 'rigid ideology has overruled sound science ... My administration will not deny facts, we will be guided by them' (Obama aims for oil independence, 2009). Secretary of State Hillary Clinton pointed out that the new administration's ambition: 'we are sending an unequivocal message that the United States will be energetic, focused, strategic and serious about addressing global climate change and the corollary issue of clean energy' (Clinton climate change envoy vows «dramatic diplomacy», 2009). However, in terms of actual climate change policy, many argue that the Obama administration's first term was almost all talk, and no walk.

Obama stated in January 2009 a new role for the US: 'It's time for America to lead, because this moment of peril must be turned into one of progress. To protect our climate and our collective security, we must call together a truly global coalition' (The Irony Of President Obama's Oil Legacy, 2016). Obama administration launched specific programmes and executive orders devoted to the environmental

protection issues which are encompassed a more energy efficient automobiles, fostering special research and creating energy-saving jobs. As a first step, Obama ordered the Environmental Protection Agency to revise its decision not to permit California and other 13 states to impose stricter controls on auto emissions from new cars and trucks.

These early activities, president's engagement, creating green jobs, possible renovation of auto industries, and further developing renewables were highly assessed by environmentalists and supporters. However, enacting any sort of meaningful change in a polarized policy-making system was indeed tough one. Obama's appeal to electorate and his appointments were attempts to overcome that fragmentation. But success wasn't guaranteed. It was also linked to inability to overcome the climate legislation deadlock in Congress. Republican climate deniers and corporate lobbyists have made the US Congress a trap for any climate legislation. Domestically important legislation regulating carbon-dioxide emissions that could provide the catalyst for the US global leadership on climate action has not succeeded. For instance, the Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 was defeated by the House of Representatives in July 2010. The president supported this bill which was passed by the House of Representatives, 219–212, on June 26, 2009. This was the strongest climate bill ever supported by a US President. It mandated that utilities provide 20 % of electricity through savings and renewable sources by 2020, set up a cap-and-trade system for carbon emissions and authorize funds to help vulnerable communities adapt to such climate change as occurred. Many environmentalists criticized the cap-and-trade program, both because it gave emissions quotas—basically permits to pollute—free to the industry, and because it allowed quotas to be met by purchasing «carbon offsets,» which allow a company emitting greenhouse gas above its quota to continue to do so, provided that it pays someone else to take an equivalent amount of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere elsewhere. The earlier the same thing happened to Climate Security Act of 2007 blocked by Senate Republicans to prevent losses to economy.

In fact, the Obama administration policy confined to the traditional approach that implies focusing on energy security without active promoting renewable or clean energy. It is often emphasized in political circles that achieving energy independence can be possible through the following ways: diversification of import sources, diversification of fuel mix, and increased domestic production of fossil fuels. Clean

and renewable energy sources could contribute towards the diversification of the fuel mix. However, it is not the only means of ensuring energy security, but there are growing pressures and needs to develop and expand alternative clean energy sources to mitigate climate change. This means that the two goals do not have to be dealt with together, and solutions to energy security can be harmful to the climate.

Oil drilling and production has received a massive boost, despite the President's support for the environmental agenda and the Gulf Oil Spill in 2010. New oil rigs have been built, with the overall number of rigs in 2010 being double that in 2009 and 10 times higher than in the late 1990s. President Obama has presided over rising oil production in each of the seven years he has been in office. From that low point in 2008, U.S. oil production has grown each year to reach 9.4 million bpd in 2015 -- a gain of 88% during Obama's presidency. This is in fact the largest domestic oil production increase during any presidency in U.S. history (The Irony Of President Obama's Oil Legacy, 2016).

Interpretation of climate change as one of the most efficient and viable solutions to promote energy security will not be successful unless the concept of energy security is reframed and re-conceptualized itself in order to include climate objectives in the definition. In order to prioritize clean energy over domestic production of oil and coal, the urgent necessity to tackle climate change needs to be accepted. Opponents have criticized Obama for raising fossil fuel prices in order to make renewable energy more competitive in the power market. Such claims had revealed that there were a wide divergence of views in Congress regarding the importance and necessity of a green agenda. This means that the energy security concerns can be addressed by promoting more domestic fossil-fuel production and thus it could lead to the exclusion of urgency and magnitude of climate change. The question is then whether it offers a credible alternative to the pollution threats to promote more decisive action in connection with America's international commitments.

The Obama administration has attempted to connect climate action with economic benefits. Transition to the 'green economy' will be beneficial for the US economy by offering tremendous potential for technological innovation and put America back at the forefront of high tech. This approach has both a short-term and a long-term perspective. In the longer term, this approach related to American exceptionalism which is determined by the ability

to respond effectively to any challenge, and to lead the world on this front. Promoting green growth vision involves long-term trends in perceptions and infrastructure, and it requires a shift away from targets focused on short-termism of politicians and economists and this can be reached in the short and medium term through the governmental regulation and support, creating 'green jobs' and technological development. Obama emphasized a 'green' technological drive as the solution to unemployment and a way to economic recovery during his election campaign in 2008. Obama made the move toward green energy and environmental sustainability a cornerstone of his campaign. Promising to invest billions in green energy initiatives and a skilled clean technologies workforce, embark on the path to reduce carbon emissions 80% by 2050, expand locally-owned biofuel refineries, and restore US leadership on climate change, among many other initiatives, Obama set ambitious standards for his administration on this pressing topic. His Recovery and Reinvestment Act included \$16.8 billion for green-energy initiatives (David S. Lowman, Jr, Laura Ellen Jones and Ted J. Murphy., 2009).

Although climate change featured in the 2010 US National Security Strategy, the US was far behind other actors like the EU. Hurricane Sandy and the serious damage it caused along the east coast of the United States reawakened the topic of climate change consequences and the White House announced that Obama would present a new plan with mitigation and adaptation measures and policies regarding climate change. In June 2013 Obama introduced his latest climate action plan. This plan refers to more extreme meteorological conditions, increasing temperatures, greater incidence of natural disasters and the economic costs they entail for the treasury and sets forth a project with three main axes:

1. Cut carbon pollution in the United States by:
 - Reducing carbon pollution from power plants;
 - Promoting USA leadership in renewable energy;
 - Modernizing the transportation sector;
 - Cutting energy waste in homes, businesses and factories;
 - Reducing other greenhouse gas emissions (hydrofluorocarbons and methane);
 - Leading at the Federal level in clean energy and energy efficiency;
2. Prepare the United States for the impacts of climate change by:
 - Building stronger and safer communities and infrastructure;

- Protecting the economy and natural resources
- Using sound science to manage climate impacts.

3. Lead international efforts to combat global climate change and prepare for its impacts (President's Climate Action Plan, 2013).

Thus, the climate change was framed as a public health issue and an economic issue, in so far as natural disasters have cost the economy more than US\$110 billion in 2012 (Nicole Mortillaro, 2013).

Finally, the speech stressed that reducing carbon emissions and moving towards a greener society would reduce dependence on foreign oil, otherwise called energy security. The plan reiterated Obama's conditional pledge 'to cut emissions by 2020, [and that] America would reduce its greenhouse gas emissions in the range of 17% below 2005 levels if all other major economies agreed to limit their emissions as well', a target that amounts to 'only a 4% cut in emissions compared with 1990 levels' (Brad Plume, 2015).

In order to bypass a Republican dominated Congress, Obama issued an executive memo to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), enabling them to introduce new rules concerning emissions from power plants. The focus on the EPA also explains why there is such a heavy focus on public health in the speech and accompanying plan. The new rules came into force on 2 June 2014, but because states have until 2020 to implement these rules it is impossible to predict what the outcome of these plans is going to be at this stage (especially considering that there is a lot of opposition from coal-burning states).

The President Obama's Climate Action Plan also demonstrated the US approach towards the climate diplomacy, namely adopting a relatively positive energy policy to reply the criticisms from the EU members and other countries. Obama's Climate Action Plan has generated considerable geopolitical influences on new economic powers. On the one hand, it has promoted the adoption of new energy and infrastructure in overlapping areas that encouraged such countries like China, and other countries to upgrade their technologies in this regard; on the other hand, it has resulted in lower prices of conventional fossil fuels worldwide due to oversupply. It not only dealt a fatal blow to the conventional energy sector and its affiliated areas but also exerted more pressure on electricity and other sectors that still rely on traditional fossil fuels. On the other hand, Obama's Climate Action Plan benefited from the advantages brought by the energy revolution to integrate energy and

climate in order to bring about new changes in such aspects as the world's industrial structure, trade structure, and technical standards. Obama's new climate policy was assessed as an effective tool to increase its energy-based industry's international competitiveness.

During this time, there was significant activism in different scenarios. The US and China are the two most essential players in reducing carbon emissions, accounting together for approximately 45% of 2012 emissions. These nations have historically been antagonists on climate change, with the US refusing to move forward without China agreeing to binding emissions limitations, and China asserting that the principle of 'common but differentiated responsibilities' precludes this arrangement. However, amid intense internal discord in China over the country's worsening air quality, the countries' interests in addressing climate change domestically appear to be converging. In spring 2013, the US and China issued a Joint Statement on Climate Change, leading to a working group that set out five (non-binding) cooperative initiatives:

- reducing emissions from heavy-duty and other vehicles;
- promoting CCS;
- increasing energy efficiency in buildings and industry;
- improving GHG data collection and management; and
- promoting smart grids.

The countries have also agreed to work together to phase down the production and consumption of HFCs, using the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. These initiatives signal a new attitude of cooperation between the two major emitters that could bode well for global progress (China-U.S. Joint Presidential Statement on Climate Change, 2016).

At the multilateral level, the Obama administration has also played a more constructive role in recent international climate negotiations, at least in certain respects. Obama's promise to work out a climate change agreement with the United Nations came to fruition at the December 2015 climate change talks in Paris. The Paris Agreement commits parties to 'holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 C°. The Paris Agreement also includes a long-term emissions goal, a key demand by civil society groups and developing countries. Article 4(1) states that 'Parties aim to reach global peaking of greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible' and to achieve 'a balance between anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals

by sinks of greenhouse gases in the second half of this century' (Paris Agreement, 2015). The notion of emissions balance, which was referred to in an earlier draft of the treaty as 'emissions neutrality', suggests that GHG emissions will need to come down to a 'net zero' level between 2050 and 2100; UNEP had previously called for this to be achieved for CO₂ emissions by 2070. In contrast to the Kyoto Protocol, which lacked long-term targets, the Paris Agreement thus sends an important signal to global markets, and especially to institutional investors, though it is weakened by the lack of a specific timetable and uncertainty over the future use of carbon sinks.

China and the United States are the world's two largest polluters and account for just under 40 percent of global emissions. Together, they formally joined the Paris agreement in September 2016, with the United States pledging to cut emissions between 26 and 28 percent from 2005 levels by 2025. The United States, too, has indicated a greater willingness to work with the international community to achieve significant emissions reductions (U.S. and China Formally Commit to Paris Climate Accord, 2016).

Thus, Obama administration was keen to promote United States as a trendsetter in environmental and climate change issues and took several different actions to achieve this purpose. While Obama administration statements and policies were understandably often couched in terms of US national interests, they were nevertheless a substantial shift by the US government toward an acceptance of international fairness and equity as important objectives of US climate change policy. This is especially evident when such statements and policies are compared with the posture of the US government during previous administrations.

The Trump administration: Rethinking the Debate

President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Climate Accord was strongly criticized by world community. This decision would be an unacceptable step backwards to address climate change. Trump's suggestion was determined by injustice of the Paris Accord and violation of its sovereignty. After the failed UN climate talks in Copenhagen in 2009, each country was able to put forward suggestions on establishing its own commitment to the global response. These commitments were voluntary; there were not expected to have any repercussions for countries who fail to meet their obligations.

Countries are only required to report on their efforts to meet these commitments. In comparison with the Kyoto Protocol, all of the major emitters have taken on commitments under the Paris Accord. Moreover, many world leaders have re-affirmed their Paris commitments in the aftermath of Trump's announcement (Betsill M.M., 2017: 189-191).

During his presidential campaign, Donald Trump states to pull out from the Paris Agreement once he was elected. Indeed, it could be determined by the following factors:

1. The Trump Administration is closely tied to the fossil fuel industry, and interest groups. So it's not surprising that Trump decided to repeal climate regulations to benefit energy companies like Koch Industries. EPA Administrator Pruitt, who led the legal fight against former President Obama's Clean Power Plan, repeatedly denied anthropogenic causes of global warming, and insisted withdrawing from the Paris Agreement.

2. Trump's skepticism regarding climate change. Trump stated that «the Paris Accord is very unfair at the highest level to the U.S. and compared China and India's mitigation obligations with U.S., taking no notice of the common but differentiated responsibility principle

3. Trump's excessive emphasis on economic consequences. Trump believes that the Paris Agreement undermined U.S. competitive edge and impairs both employment and traditional energy industries and could weaken the U.S. sovereignty. Trump stance is defined by focusing on mitigation's economic costs and neglecting ecological and economic benefits.

Thus, Trump's withdrawal decision was mainly driven by the U.S. domestic politics and his personal preferences rather than any burdens on the U.S. imposed by the Paris Agreement. It is uncertain what can be done with climate deregulation under the Trump Administration (Betsill M.M., 2017: 189-191).

In sum, Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Accord undermined the universality of the Paris Agreement, which is recognized as the cornerstone of global climate regime. The agreement is characterized by its universality due to the participation of both developed and developing countries that enhances the effectiveness of climate governance. The U.S. administration resolution considerably weakened treaty's essential feature..

The United States refusal demonstrated the leadership deficit in global climate governance since the coordinated leadership of the U.S., the EU, and China was critical in this case. So, implementing the

Paris Agreement will be frustrated in the absence of U.S. leadership.

U.S. would set an undesirable precedent for global climate cooperation. Although most countries reaffirmed their commitment to the Paris Agreement after Trump's announcement, it will not be surprising to see changes in these countries' climate politics. If other countries would pursue the same politics or cut renewable energy research, the target set by Paris Agreement would be unachievable.

Trump Administration's activity concerning America's Paris commitments is perceived by its allies as undermining common values. This could enable China to take leading position on the international arena and encouraging the European countries to built up closer relations with China. This rebalancing of the international order and the loss of «soft power» could affect on US efforts to advance other foreign policy interests in the future.

Cutting U.S. climate aid will make it more difficult for developing countries to mitigate and adapt to climate change and less likely for these countries to achieve the 2 °C target of the Paris Agreement. Financing is essential to implementing the Paris Agreement, and under the principle of common but differentiated responsibility, developed countries are obligated to provide climate financing to developing countries. The U.S. has been the top donor to the Global Environmental Facility, contributing around 21% of its total shares. The U.S. contributed US\$ 9.6 billion between 2011 and 2012. In 2014 alone, the Obama Administration pledged US\$ 3 billion to the Green Climate Fund and has appropriated US\$ 1 billion so far, accounting for 40% of the total US\$ 2.42 billion fund. The Trump Administration decided to terminate the donation to the Green Climate Fund, which will reduce America's share to 6.4%. The U.S. promised to significantly increase its climate funding for developing countries at the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Change Conference and appropriated \$15.6 billion for international climate aid for adaptation, clean energy, and other activities (Hai-BinZhang, Han-Cheng Dai, Hua-Xia Lai, Wen-Tao Wang, 2017: 222).

Trump's anti-climate action could penalize capacity-building measures on climate change mitigation. Studies show that the next ten years are critical to reduce anthropogenic emissions. Achieving this target also means that fossil fuel consumption will have to decrease to below a quarter of the primary energy supply by the year 2100 if negative emission technologies remain

technologically or economically unfeasible at a global scale.

At the very least, the Trump Administration will continue to face pressure from domestic constituencies to advance climate protection efforts at home and abroad; walking away from Paris does not mean they will be able to walk away from climate action. However, the U.S. withdrawal will considerably diminish the likelihood of achieving the Paris Agreement's target and may even render the target unachievable. The withdrawal undercuts the foundation of global climate governance and upsets the process of global climate cooperation.

Conclusion

If one assesses America's sharing of the costs of climate change, it is easy to be critical. Three different presidential terms have accepted the fact that protecting the environment should not hamper economic development, but in case of the Obama administration these two concepts should be complementary.

The US climate change policy could be analyzed within the FPA's agent-oriented and actor-specific perspective. Personal characteristics of leaders, argumentation and discourse, problem representation, and bureaucratic and legislative politics, as well as domestic political imperatives have shown their influence in foreign and domestic policymaking.

This perspective is strengthened by the role that individual beliefs play in presidential decisions. Collective action also frames the context and the manner in which decisions are made at this level. Different explanations of behavior in terms of climate change policy have multidimensional nature. The Obama Administration had many arguments to promote climate change policy, however, the current administration does not. During the Obama administration had made an effort to resist a largely hostile Congress and business community, has endeavoured to direct US foreign assistance toward this problem.

However, there is little likelihood that the United States will act more robustly in the very near future. Too many forces opposed to action are able to access the American policy process. Hence, because the United States is central to efforts to mitigate climate change causes, we should not expect adequate international efforts to address this problem in the near or medium term.

References

- 1 Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change // <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/>
- 2 Brewer, Paul R. (2012), *Polarisation in the USA: Climate Change, Party Politics, and Public Opinion in the Obama Era*. *European Political Science*, 11: 7–17.
- 3 Hudson, V. M., & Vore, C. S. (1995). *Foreign policy analysis yesterday, today, and tomorrow*. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 39(2): 209-238.
- 4 Bang, G. (2010), *Energy security and climate change concerns: Triggers for energy policy change in the United States?*, *Energy Policy*, 38(4):1645-1653
- 5 Cragg, M.I., Zhou, Y., Gurney, K. & Kahn, M.E. (2013). *Carbon geography: the political economy of congressional support for legislation intended to mitigate greenhouse gas production*, *Economic inquiry*, 51(2) :1640-1650.
- 6 Klein, N. *Capitalism vs. the Climate* // <http://www.thenation.com/article/capitalism-vs-climate/>
- 7 Meckling, J. (2011). *The globalization of carbon trading: transnational business coalitions in climate politics*, *Global Environmental Politics*, 11(2): 26-50.
- 8 MacNeil, R. (2013). *Alternative climate policy pathways in the US*, *Climate Policy*, 13(2): 259-276.
- 9 Harris, P.G. (2009). *Beyond Bush: Environmental politics and prospects for US climate policy*, *Energy Policy*, 37(3): 966-971.
- 10 Nisbet, M.C. (2009). *Communicating climate change: Why frames matter for public engagement*, *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 51(2): 12-23.
- 11 Vezirgiannidou, S. (2013). *Climate and energy policy in the United States: the battle of ideas*, *Environmental Politics*, 22 (4): 593-609.
- 12 Fletcher, A.L.(2009). *Clearing the air: the contribution of frame analysis to understanding climate policy in the United States*, *Environmental Politics*, 18(5): 800-816.
- 13 Pryck K. D. , Gemenne F. (2017). *The Denier-in-Chief: Climate Change, Science and the Election of Donald J. Trump*, *Law and Critique*, 28(2): 119–126
- 14 Bomberg E., Super B., (2009). *The 2008 U.S. Presidential Election: Obama and the Environment*, *Environmental Politics*, 18(3): 424–430.
- 15 Cohen M.J., Egelston A., (2003) *The Bush Administration and Climate Change: Prospects for an Effective Policy Response*, *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 5(4):315–331
- 16 Hudson, V. M. (2005). *Foreign policy analysis: Actor-specific theory and the ground of international relations*. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 1(1): 1-30.
- 17 *US u-turn on emissions fuels anger* // <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2001/mar/15/usnews.globalwarming>
- 18 *Congressional Record*, Volume 149 Issue 113 (Monday, July 28, 2003) // <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2003-07-28/html/CREC-2003-07-28-pt1-PgS10012.htm>
- 19 *Report of the National Energy Policy Development Group, 2001* // <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/energy/2001/index.html>
- 20 *Bush Outlines Clean Skies Initiative* // <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/020214/se.04.html>
- 21 Katharine Q. Seelye, Andrew C. Revkin. *Panel tells bush global warming is getting worse* // <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/07/us/panel-tells-bush-global-warming-is-getting-worse.html>
- 22 S. 1844 (108th): *Clear Skies Act of 2003* // <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/108/s1844/text>
- 23 *Analysis: U.S. may be entering age of political deadlock* // <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-debt-gridlock/analysis-u-s-may-be-entering-age-of-political-deadlock-idUSTRE76R43U20110728>
- 24 *Obama victory signals rebirth of US environmental policy* // <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2008/nov/05/climate-change-carbonemissions>
- 25 *Obama aims for oil independence* // <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/7851038.stm>
- 26 *Clinton climate change envoy vows «dramatic diplomacy»* // <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-obama-climate-envoy/clinton-climate-change-envoy-vows-dramatic-diplomacy-idUSTRE50P3U920090126>
- 27 *Obama asks India, China to do their part on climate change* // <https://www.hindustantimes.com/world/obama-asks-india-china-to-do-their-part-on-climate-change/story-4lo3RLdQLZRuiH1nzs4SdO.html>
- 28 *The Irony Of President Obama’s Oil Legacy* // <https://www.forbes.com/sites/rpapier/2016/01/15/president-obamas-petroleum-legacy/#60bf5ef2c10f>
- 29 David S. Lowman, Jr, Laura Ellen Jones and Ted J. Murphy. *Stimulating renewable energy — the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and beyond* // <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=f1958e5e-9e99-458f-9be5-790a58b8e9c2>
- 30 *President’s Climate Action Plan* // <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/image/president27sclimateactionplan.pdf>
- 31 Nicole Mortillaro. *Weather and climate disasters cost U.S. \$110 billion in 2012* // <https://globalnews.ca/news/643249/weather-and-climate-disasters-cost-u-s-110-billion-in-2012-2/>
- 32 Brad Plume. *Obama has vowed to cut US emissions 17% by 2020. He’s not on track yet.* // <https://www.vox.com/2014/12/8/7353877/obama-climate-goals>

33 China-U.S. Joint Presidential Statement on Climate Change. Washington D.C., March 31, 2016 // http://en.ndrc.gov.cn/newsrelease/201604/t20160401_797242.html

34 Paris Agreement, 2015 // https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/convention/application/pdf/english_paris_agreement.pdf

35 U.S. and China Formally Commit to Paris Climate Accord // <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/u-s-and-china-formally-commit-to-paris-climate-accord/>

36 Betsill M.M. (2017) Trump's Paris withdrawal and the reconfiguration of global climate change governance. Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment 15(3):189-191.

37 Hai-BinZhang, Han-Cheng Dai, Hua-Xia Lai, Wen-Tao Wang (2017). U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement: Reasons, impacts, and China's response, Advances in Climate Change Research, 8(4): 220-225