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1. Where did/does the author work, what else has s/he written about, and what are her/his credentials?

Weiss graduated from Williams College in 1968 with a BA in Political Economy, and a PhD in Economics from Standford University in 1977. He is the founder and CEO of Weiss Asset Management and a Professor Emeritus at Boston University. His focus in in economics.

1. What are the topics of the text?

The chapter focuses on the idea of using causal stories in the absence of scientific consensus to draw out a shift in policy through the use of persuasive stories that link a cause and effect.

1. What is the main argument of the text?

The text argues that the use of causal stories in the Ozone Controversy in the United States allowed for the regulation of CFC’s to happen before there was conclusive scientific evidence that said that CFCs were indeed linked to the creation of the Ozone hole.

1. Describe 3 ways the argument is supported.

The argument supports itself by first laying out the framework of creating a causal story and then using that story to create a new status quo of policy.

The chapter uses a case study of the Ozone hole controversy to show how the use of a causal story argument was used to drive the policy shift towards a more precautionary approach.

1. What three quotes capture the text?

“…the science that favored the political consensus … .was used to justify proposed action, and the science that opposed the political consensus… was largely ignored.” Page 236.

“The role of science in this controversy was extreamely limited. As noted previously, the first stage of political action, the regulation of aerosols, was only loosely connected to scientific conclusions.” P. 234

“The lack of agreement within the scientific community during the political consensus illustrates how limited the conditions are under which the impact of science on policymaking is significant.” P. 236

1. Three questions about environmental risk and precaution?  
   What is the significance of the role of science in the convergence and divergence of US-EU policy regulation?

Does one superpower value science more than the other, and what are the results?

Would an emphasis on the authoritative role of science create for more or less progressive regulations of risk?