

**1. Full citation:**

Vogel, David. "Chapter Four: Air Pollution." *The Politics of Precaution*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2012. 103-152. 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 fourth chapter in Vogel's book, *The Politics of Precaution*, discusses regulation in regards to air pollution.

**4. What is the main argument of the text:**

The main argument of the third chapter continues with the overall trend that the United States went from more to less risk adverse during the early 1990s while the European Union went from being less to more risk adverse during the same period of time. There is also a discussion of one important exception, being automotive emissions in which the United States continues to remain more risk averse than the European Union. Vogel utilizes examples pertaining to air pollution to present his evidence throughout the fourth chapter.

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

- a) Vogel gives an example of the regulation of lead content in gasoline to show how the US was more stringent.
- b) Vogel argues that this exception occurs in part because the tightening of regulation did not require additional legislation.
- c) Vogel gives examples of the US being first to address the depletion of the ozone layer due to chlorofluorocarbons.

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

- a) "Regulations governing the lead content of gasoline/petrol reveal a similar pattern: while European standards became progressively more stringent, they remained weaker than those of the United States."
- b) "The Times editorialized, "We should not have to wait until the very last mathematical correlation has been established to announce proudly that there is final proof that children

have continued to be blighted while the research was concluded. The balance of risk is clearly such as to justify the maximum control on the emissions of lead poisons.”

- c) “What explains this unusual case of regulatory policy path dependency in the United States? One important reason was that progressive tightening of American regulations did not require any additional legislation. Because they could be issued administratively, they were not affected by the increased partisan polarization and Republican control of Congress after 1994.”

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

- a) While certain states might be dependent on coal production, would they still be in favor of emissions regulation?
- b) What is the price that consumers would say is too high for environmental regulation?
- c) What is the status of the ozone layer now?

**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 polls regarding emissions regulation. However, I would imagine that states would do what cost them the least amount of money.
- b) Catalytic converters cost ~\$100 on average. With this cost, I can see how consumers are not completely opposed to having them because to them, the cost would merit the end result.
- c) The ozone layer is still healing itself and is in much better shape than 20 years ago.