

1. Full citation:

Sheeline, William E. "WHAT'S THE BEEF?" CNNMoney. Cable News Network, 30 Jan. 1989. Web. 11 Feb. 2013.
<http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/1989/01/30/71586/index.htm>.

2. Where did/does the author work, what else has s/he written about, and what are her/his credentials:

William Sheeline is a journalist for the publication, Fortune Magazine. While I could not find any of his credentials specifically, Fortune Magazine is a well-respected publication and as such, it can be reasonably inferred that William Sheeline's writing can be read with a certain degree of credibility.

3. What are the topics of the text:

The topic of this Fortune Magazine article is growth hormones in beef.

4. What is the main argument of the text:

The main argument of the article is that growth hormones aren't as harmful as they are made out to be.

5. Describe at least three ways that the argument is supported:

- a) Sheeline gives a comparison between growth hormone levels in steak and in soybean oil.
- b) Sheeline gives an example of a tariff war, so to speak, between the European Union and the United States
- c) Sheeline gives some values of the trade amounts between the EU and the US.

6. What three quotes capture the message of the text:

- a) "Three ounces of steak from a cow implanted with growth hormones contains 1.9 nanograms of estrogen. If that sounds like a lot, it's not. Three ounces of soybean oil has 1.68 million nanograms of the stuff, naturally grown at that."
- b) "To the Europeans, however, science alone does not public opinion sway. "No matter what the scientists say," notes Derwent Renshaw, an agricultural attache with the EC in Washington, "I'm afraid we Europeans prefer to eat our meat free of hormones.""
- c) "The ban, which took effect on January 1, shut the door on at least \$100 million of U.S. beef exports. A tit-for-tat response by the U.S. hit home on the same day -- 100% tariffs on imports from the EC valued at about \$100 million, including tomato products, boneless beef, hams, instant coffee, and wine coolers. The EC may counterattack this month with 100% tariffs on imports of walnuts and dried fruit -- valued at \$97 million -- from the U.S. Rumors abound that Washington would counter with a ban on \$450 million

worth of red meat imported annually from the EC, since growth hormones are used illegally by some cattle growers there.”

7. What three questions about environmental risk and precaution does this article leave you with:

- a) Have tariff wars been used in the past to ‘battle’ over environmental policy?
- b) What is European perception on growth hormones today?
- c) How much does trade play a role in deciding environmental policy?

8. What three points, details or references from the text did you follow up on to advance your perspective on environmental risk and precaution:

- a) I was unable to find specific examples of tariff wars being used to steer environmental policy. However, I believe it isn’t too much of a stretch to say that economic incentives can be often used to steer environmental policies of foreign countries.
- b) European perception on growth hormones is still negative to this day. This supports Vogel’s argument that they employ a more precautionous approach.
- c) Trade and the economy play quite a role in determining environmental policy. Also, many environmental policies try to employ economic incentives. One such example is Cap and Trade.