Joseph DiLuzio

1. Full Citation  
   <vogel, chap 3>
2. Where did/does the author work, what else has s/he written about, and what are her/his credentials?  
   <vogel>
3. What are the topics of the text?  
   The US and the EU differed in how they treated food and drug regulations. Pre 1990 the US was more overcautious in comparison, and post 1990 the EU increased the amount of bans and regulations beyond what the US had, while the US stayed level.
4. What is the main argument of the text?  
   Big events in the EU caused a larger public doubt in food safety, while the lack of these failures raised public confidence in the US. The authorities of the US through the Delany Clause were more trusting in animal testing to find potential threats, while the EU doubted the authority of these tests and erred on the side of precaution, mostly due to the public doubt.

Largely public opposition dictates policy direction, and explains the shift around 1990. Additionally, the shift in political cooperation and differing levels of trust in scientific testing methods account for the divergence of policy.

1. Describe 3 ways the argument is supported.

The Delaney Clause in the US accounts for the large cancer paranoia pre 1990, and after 1996, the Food Quality Protection Act ended this strict zero tolerance, adopting a more relaxed regulation around all foods.

Through the Office of Science and Technology Policy’s 1986 “Coordinated Framework for the Regulation of Biotechnology”, the US enabled American agri-business to retain a privileged position in the policy process.

The 1990 EU shifted away from decentralized regulations on GM crops due to a fear of failing to match the US biotech firms. This centralization of the regulations resulted in less business-friendly policy, reflecting a politically weaker biotech industry then in the US.

1. What three quotes capture the text?  
   “[Pre-1990] American regulatory authorities adopted more precautionary regulations for suspected carcinogens in the food supply and banned food additives and pesticides which were permitted in Europe.” Pg. 102

“The extent of partisan polarization in Congress has been somewhat less with respect to the policy area of food safety, which in turn has made it possible for three pieces of food safety legislation to be adopted after 1990. But the considerable delay in passing the 2010 legislation, and the extent to which it was weakened in the Senate, reveals how much more difficult it had become for even highly visible policy failures which resulted in actual illnesses and deaths to become “policy triggers” in the United States after 1990.” –Pg. 102

“Unlike in the United States, where the primary regulatory responsibility for GMOs was given to the business-friendly Department of Agriculture, in Europe regulatory authority was placed in hands of the recently created DG Environment, whose officials had successfully argued for an integrated system of regulation that addressed the environmental risks of GMO releases. “ – Pg. 75

1. Three questions about environmental risk and precaution?

Why is it that the US public seems to be unaffected by the scares that happen in other countries?

What caused the trust of US policy makers in the scientific studies to be so dominant?

Why was the US citizenry less reactive to the potential dangers of GM foods?

1. Three follow up points or details
2. The Delaney Clause – Followed up by reading the article “Food Safety Regulation: Reforming the Delaney Clause” by Richard A. Merrill (1997). See Annotation 3-2.
3. The Delaney Paradox

*Regulating Pesticides in Food:The Delaney Paradox*. The National Academies Press, 1987. <http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=1013>.

This study discusses how the Delaney clause used by the EPA would be too strict and result in the banning of high numbers of vital in-use pesticides. The study outlines alternative methods of regulating using a benefit/cost analysis rather than the zero tolerance Delaney clause which does not consider benefits.

1. Hindo, Brian. “Monsanto: Winning the Ground War.” *BusinessWeek: Magazine*, December 5, 2007. <http://www.businessweek.com/stories/2007-12-05/monsanto-winning-the-ground-war>.

This article details how Monsanto has dominated the market of agri-business and biotech by producing, amongst high opposition from the public, GMO seeds. The article discusses the simple fact that Monsanto is dominating the market, regardless of public outcry.