1. Full Citation  
   <vogel chap 6>
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 deals with the health and safety risk based regulation of pharmaceuticals, the chemicals in children’s toys, and cosmetics.

1. What is the main argument of the text?

This chapter argues that the regulatory policy divergence trend that has been seen in the previous fields does not hold for pharmaceutical regulation and phthalate softener regulation in children’s toys. The regulation of phthalates in cosmetics however, showed the divergent trend as the US FDA claimed they were safe and the EU’s EP banned them.

1. Describe 3 ways the argument is supported.

The policy failure of thalidomide in the 1960s, while predominantly affecting Europeans, resulted in more stringent risk regulations in the United States. The “alarm bells” theory fails to explain why the EU was so slow to respond with protective regulations.

Despite the lack of scientific backing, the EU banned all phthalates in children’s toys due to public pressures from NGOs stressing the potential health risks of including leaching toxins in toys. In the United States this was slowly matched with the CPSA due to a strong Democratic party and “alarm bells” from unsafe toys from China.

Although the regulation of chemicals in cosmetics was not as strong in the US federal government as it was in the EU, the state of California followed more closely the EU’s example. Additionally many US cosmetic businesses began voluntary banning of the controversial ingredients in order to better react to the public concerns.

1. What three quotes capture the text?  
   “By 2007, sixteen countries had adopted some kind of phthalate ban on children’s products—although the United States was not one of them.” –pg. 206  
     
   “More fearful of the political consequences of permitting the marketing of a drug that turned out to be unsafe, than in delaying approval of a drug that turned out to be both safe and effective, American regulatory officials regularly demanded extensive pre-market testing.” –Pg. 193

“In this case, as in many others described in previous chapters, “alarm bells” about insufficiently protective regulations and the risks of false negatives rang much more loudly in the United States than in Europe before 1990.” –Pg. 201

1. Three questions about environmental risk and precaution?

What makes “alarm bells” ring true in a culture? How was the incident in around pharmaceuticals different from the controversy over phthalates?

Is it possible for regulation to be enacted in a US government that does not have bipartisanship? What needs to happen to cause that bipartisanship?

Is the very nature of a 2 party system the greater issue with the Post 1990 trends seen in the US as compared to the more diverse EU “party” system?
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   This article discusses the potential downsides of new drugs being pushed through the FDA when an increased rate of drug recalls causes concern over the quality of these tests.