

1. Full citation:

Vogel, David. "Chapter Seven: Public Risk Perceptions and the Preferences of Policy Makers." *The Politics of Precaution*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2012. 219-251. 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 seventh chapter in Vogel's book, *The Politics of Precaution*, further explains the split in policy approach in the EU and US in 1990. Vogel focuses on changes in public opinion and the preferences of policy makers.

4. What is the main argument of the text:

The main argument of the seventh chapter is providing evidence to support Vogel's claim that there has been a regulatory shift between the European Union and United States starting in 1990.

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

- a) Vogel discusses how in 1992, bipartisan cooperation was decreased.
- b) Vogel gives an example of how Bill Clinton faced opposition from Congress.
- c) Vogel gives some examples of policy changes in the EU.

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

- a) "Those groups strongly supported the Democratic presidential candidate, which served to further confirm the views of the Bush administration and many Republicans that their political party had little to gain by supporting environmental legislation."
- b) "Following the 1992 election results, the Democrats controlled the White House and both Houses of Congress for the first time since 1976. But the high expectations of environmental activists were quickly dashed: during the first two years of the Clinton administration, Congress refused to adopt any of the president's environmental legislative agenda. It denied his request to raise livestock grazing fees, impose new royalties and environmental standards on mining companies, or establish an energy tax based on the energy potential of fuels—the so-called BTU tax. It also rejected two of the administration's major environmental legislative priorities, namely the elevation of the EPA to cabinet status and an overhauling of Superfund, which would have continued to

fund hazardous waste site cleanup through a tax on oil and chemical companies. Nor did it renew the 1972 Federal Pollution and Water Control Act. The 1993–94 legislative session produced what was arguably one of the weakest environmental records of any Congress in more than two decades.”

- c) “The 1994 midterm congressional elections produced Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress for the first time in more than four decades. The four hundred-page “Contract with America” that served as the policy blueprint for the midterm Republican congressional campaign did not mention the word “environment,” and just one of its ten planks indirectly addressed environmental issues, namely, the one calling for regulatory reform.”

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

- a) What is the perception of environmental risk in the United States?
- b) What is the perception of environmental risk in the European Union?
- c) What is the environmental record of both parties in the United States?

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) Perception of environmental risk is not as strong in the United States and the economy should take precedent according to most Americans. (Source: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1615/environment.aspx>)
- b) I could not find specific sources dealing with environmental concern in the European Union but due to the large amount of environmental policy they are passing, it can be safely inferred that they care a great deal about the environment.
- c) Both parties don’t really have a stellar environmental record and only do things when it is politically important to do something. This is why progress in environmental policy goes so slow.