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1. Full Citation  
   <vogel chap 4>
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?  
   This chapter discusses regulatory differences between the US and the EU specifically in the regulation of vehicle fumes, the ozone hole, and climate change.
4. What is the main argument of the text?

Public push for policy was the major driving force behind increased action by the US pre-1990 (on leaded gasoline and Ozone damaging aerosols), and the lack of this push post-1990 in the US explains the lack of US regulation around climate change.

This is additionally explained by a strong bipartisan support in the US pre-1990, and a divided Council of Ministers in the EU until the late 1990s.

1. Describe 3 ways the argument is supported.

In the case of lead emissions from vehicles, the EU officials were less strict in regulation due to the desire of having more conclusive science before regulation was made. This was avoided in the US by the Clean Air Act, which allowed for a precautionary approach.

In the US, through the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act, the EPA could regulate based on “reasonable” risk to public health or the ozone layer, without a need for a conclusive scientific study.

The Montreal Protocol (1987), which strongly regulated CFC emissions, was pushed for strongly by the US, however after the Protocol was signed, the US proceeded to allow large exemptions and loopholes practically negating it.

1. What three quotes capture the text?  
     
   “Prior to around 1990, the United States imposed more stringent regulations for automotive emissions, including lead in motor fuels, than did individual European countries or the EU. It also acted earlier than most European countries to impose restrictions on ozone depleting chemicals. Automotive emission standards have since been progressively tightened on both sides of the Atlantic, but American standards remain stricter. However, the EU has played a much more active role in regulating GHG emissions than has the United States.” – pg. 152  
     
   “Clinton’s reluctance to take a strong public stand on global warming reflected a shrewd reading of the public, which was hardly clamoring for him to address the issue.47” – pg. 133  
     
   “In marked contrast to the intense political controversy and partisan polarization that has surrounded many of the more stringent risk regulations proposed or debated in the United States after 1990, the continued strengthening of automotive emission standards reflects what has been a strong political and scientific consensus that stronger pollution control standards are required to protect public health. “ –pg. 119
2. Three questions about environmental risk and precaution?  
     
   Does the geography of the US compared to the EU, where one has a singular national culture and the other is comprised of several different nations with motivation for individual regulation and rulings cause a significant discrepancy in policy?  
     
   What happened to the US EPA’s strength through “reasonable concern” and precautionary practices post 1990?

What needs to change in US culture to regain the strong bipartisan unison in terms of regulation?

1. Three follow points or details
2. Annotation 4-2 is on Andrew Weiss’s discussion of the use of “causal stories” in policy over risk, specially looking at the Ozone Controversy, and how the US was able to make a large policy shift by regulating without the need for strong scientific evidence.
3. Urbina, Ian. “As OSHA Emphasizes Safety, Long-Term Health Risks Fester.” *The New York Times*, March 30, 2013, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/us/osha-emphasizes-safety-health-risks-fester.html>.

This recent article by the New York times discusses some “unintended consequences” caused by the regulation of ozone depleting CFCs. Specifically the article places the blame of the use of a highly potent neurotoxin, nPB, in North Carolina textile factories as a glue. The article seems to describe industry and painted into a corner by the EPAs overzealous regulations concerning the ozone hole.

1. “New U.N. Treaty Ratified Quietly.” *WND*. Accessed April 1, 2013. http://www.wnd.com/2000/12/5447/.

This article claims that the US senate unknowingly signed on with the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in 2000, 6 years after it was signed by the Clinton administration.