

1. Full citation:

Vogel, David. "Chapter Two: Explaining Regulatory Policy Divergence." *The Politics of Precaution*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2012. 22-43. Print.

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

David Vogel is a professor in the Political Science Department at the University of California at Berkeley. He has also written about food safety, corporate social responsibility, as well as various environmental ethical issues. In addition to being a professor at Berkeley, their credentials also include being the Solomon P. Lee Chair in Business Ethics, as well as a Ph.D. in Politics from Princeton University.

3. What are the topics of the text:

The second chapter in Vogel's book, *The Politics of Precaution*, reviews possible explanations for why there is such a gap in regulatory styles in regards to environmental regulation between the European Union and the United States after the 1990s.

4. What is the main argument of the text:

The main argument of the second chapter is that several factors contribute to this risk divergence between Europe and the United States.

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

- a) Vogel gives an example of the US not approving the Kyoto Protocol because it hurt the United States while it helped the European Union.
- b) Vogel also dispels the theory that environmental risks are what prompts this risk divergence because the EU and US have similar environmental risk.
- c) Vogel also gives an example of the EU playing "catch up" and that being motivation to enact stricter environmental regulation.

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

- a) "An important reason why the EU was a strong supporter of the Kyoto Protocol and the United States refused to ratify it was because of the fact that its percentage reduction requirements were structured in ways that disadvantaged American-based firms and advantaged their European-based competitors."
- b) "But more commonly there has been little or no relationship between the magnitude of actual harms or risks faced by citizens in either Europe or the United States and the response of policy makers to them."
- c) "A second explanation for this divergence has to do with historical differences in the expansion of regulatory authority across the Atlantic. Because many national European

regulations were weaker than American ones during the 1970s and 1980s, by around 1990 the EU arguably had to do more to “catch up.”

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

- a) What is the prevalence of mad cow disease in the US and EU?
- b) What is the perception of environmental risk in the US?
- c) What are some European environmental concerns?

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 looked more into the history of mad cow disease and found that it was the most prevalent in the United Kingdom.
- b) I looked more into environmental risk perception in the US and found that in general, there are little in the extremes and most people favor some action while opposing others in regards to climate change
(<http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/seagrant/ClimateChangeWhiteboard/Resources/Uncertainty/Mac1/GLSGNuncert49.pdf>)
- c) Europe seems to be particularly concerned with acid rain in Germany and air quality (<http://www.slideshare.net/kebrooke/europeenvironmental-concerns>).