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1. Full Citation  
   <vogel chap 5>
2. Where did/does the author work, what else has s/he written about, and what are her/his credentials?  
   <vogel chap 5>
3. What are the topics of the text?  
     
   This chapter discusses the major regulatory laws passed in the US and EU for regulation of chemicals and electronic waste. The US has TSCA and the EU has REACH for chemical regulation. Additionally the EU has two regulatory policies, WEEE and RoHS, which are not mirrored federally in the US, however are mirrored in many US state level regulations.
4. What is the main argument of the text?

This chapter argues that the US national policy reflects a significantly less concerned political attitude towards the risks imposed by chemicals and electronic waste as compared to EU policy. However state level policy in the US has more closely converged with EU policy.

1. Describe 3 ways the argument is supported.  
   The chapter contrasts the ancient TSCA in the US with the more contemporary REACH in the EU, pointing out the lack of political will to update TSCA despite the public pressures.

The chapter goes into a discussion of the policies WEEE and RoHS in the EU, and how the official stance of the US EPA is that the toxic substances pose no serious public health risk.  
  
Over half the US states have enacted state level producer take back systems similar to the WEEE and RoHS policies of the EU, and MA, CA, and ME have toxic control policies that more closely match the REACH policy of the EU.

1. What three quotes capture the text?  
     
   “But congressional inaction my also reflect the political deadlock and partisan divisions that have made it much more difficult for statutory changes in federal risk regulation to be enacted since 1990.” – pg 177  
   “By contrast, in the United States, the federal government does not consider hazardous electronic wastes to pose any public health risks, and the criteria used to restrict or ban a chemical under TSCA are much more rigid than under REACH, as the asbestos case illustrates.” – pg. 188  
   “By 2007, more than half of all American states had enacted a total of more than fifty different ‘producer take backs.’” –Pg. 182
2. Three questions about environmental risk and precaution?  
     
   What made Sweden so much more active in the development of the strict regulation power of REACH compared to the other member states?  
     
   Why with over “half of all American states” enacting producer take back procedures is a federally mandated take back system in place?  
     
   Why do American politics treat risk of toxic exposure as an unimportant topic of discussion?
3. Three follow up points or details
4. “Technology Companies Make Last Stand on EU Electronic Waste Laws,” Business and the Environment 12, no. 1 (January 2002): 11.

Despite spending over 45 minutes looking on RensSearch, Google Scholar, and WorldCat, this article could not be located, nor could the journal/periodical/book “Business and the Environment”. I found this to be odd enough that I would follow it up.

The closest I could find was a similar article discussing the backlash to WEEE’s banning of flame retardants, as the reading says.

>Source: <http://business.highbeam.com/436071/article-1G1-76876840/weee-directives-only-proposals-not-law>

1. U.S. Government Accountability Office, Electronic Waste: Observation on the Role of the Federal Government in Encouraging Recycling and Reuse, GAO-05-937T (Washington, DC: GPO, 2005): 3, available at http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05937t.pdf, accessed February 2009.

This report concludes that there is a large and potentially hazardous, both environmentally and publicly, stockpile of electronic waste. This build up is due to economic and regulatory barriers that limit the actions of recyclers and refurbishers.

1. Ann Thyft, “Will RoHS Laws Go Global?” Nikkei Electronics Asia (May 2007), available at http://techon.nikkeibp.co.jp/article/HONSHI/20070424/131614/, accessed February 2009.  
   See annotation 5-2