1. Full citation.

Vogel, David. The Politics of Precaution : Regulating Health, Safety, and Environmental Risks in Europe and the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012. Ebook Library. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.

2. Where did/does the author work, what else has s/he written about, and what are her/his credentials?  (This question only has to be answered once for Vogel.)

David Vogel is the Solomon P. Lee Professor in the HAAS School of Business at the University of California, Berkely. His research is focused on business-government relations, but he has also written about corporate social responsibility, and religion and environmentalism. He has published a number of books, including *The Dynamics of Regulatory Change: How Globalization Affects National Regulatory Policies,* and *Barriers or Benefits? Regulation in Transatlantic Trade.* He earned his Ph.D. from Princeton University in 1974.

3. What are the topics of the text?

This chapter focuses on the transatlantic policy divergence associated with air pollution. Vogel describes the policy decisions of Europe and the United States, highlighting three specific examples: mobile source pollutants, ozone depleting chemicals, and global climate change.

4. What is the main argument of the text?

Vogel makes the argument that the three explanatory factors discussed throughout the book have played an important role in shaping the air-pollution policies in the US and Europe. These factors (public risk perception, preferences of policy makers, and differences in risk assessment) can account for the different ways in which air pollution has been regulated within the two.

5. Describe at least three ways that the argument is supported

Vogel begins his argument by describing the initial controls put on mobile source air pollution, both in the US and the EU. He then outlines major issues and legislative measures put into place up until the end of the twentieth century. The argument is further strengthened by a comparison of the policies in the EU with those of the US, as well as an analysis of how each of the three explanatory factors can be used to describe policy differences concerning mobile source air pollution.

Vogel follows this format for his other two examples: ozone depleting chemicals and global climate change.

6. What three quotes capture the message of the text?

*Differences in public risk perceptions,one of my explanatory factors, played an important role in affecting these policy decisions. During the 1970s and through the mid-1980s, public pressures to address the risks of air pollution from vehicles were stronger in the United States than in many member states of the European Union. Public concerns about the health risks of ozone depletion were much more widespread in the United States than in Europe, especially during the 1970s. On the other hand, public concern about the risks of global climate change and support for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to address them have consistently been stronger in Europe than in the United States. (p. 103)*

*…the initial political preferences of influential policy makers differed substantially. while the member states of the Council were sharply divided as to whether the EU should move to restrict CFCs, the TSCA was passed with bipartisan support. While the Reagan administration’s first EPA director opposed additional restrictions of CFCs, the administration subsequently reversed its position and played a critical role in the negotiations that led to the Montreal Protocol. (p. 128)*

*Public preferences played an important role in shaping differences in European and American policy approaches to the risks of global climate change. The survey data cited in this chapter reveal the scientific evidence that human activity is contributing to global climate change as more conclusive than do many Americans; the also perceive its risks as more threatening…Public attitudes in the United States have also been shaped by partisan politics, with Democrats more likely to support restrictions on GHG emissions than voters who identify with the Republican Party. (p.151)*

7. What three questions about environmental risk and precaution does this article leave you with?

The chapter discusses how shifts in power (between Democratic and Republican presidents) affected air pollution regulation in the U.S.; have there been similar scenarios in the EU?

President Obama’s recent State of the Union Address discussed a bipartisan effort on climate change; to what extent was his speech influenced by public preferences? Are Americans more aware of/concerned about climate change than they were in the past?

Large corporations clearly have a strong impact on the American government; will it ever be possible to enact and enforce legislation (environmental or otherwise) that is strongly opposed by these groups?

8. What three points, details or references from the text did you follow up on to advance your perspective on environmental risk and precaution? (Provide citations, with a brief explanation of what you learned.  One of these should be fully annotated, as your second required reading for each week.)

1. Crook, Clive. "Action on Carbon Is Down the Drain." *Financial Times*. The Financial Times, 25 June 2010. Web. 24 Feb. 2013 (see annotation)
2. For the sake of comparison, I decided to look into an article on the same topic as Crook’s, but by an American author (Vogel provides a few to choose from). In an article for the NY Times, Ross Douthat. I found it interesting that although Douthat does seem to hold conservative policy-makers at least partially responsible for the gross inaction on the climate change front, he justifies their point of view, saying that , Not every danger has a regulatory solution, and sometimes it makes sense to wait, get richer, and then try to muddle through.” (<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/26/opinion/26douthat.html>)
3. Vogel discusses the changes in climate change policy due to different presidents being in office. I decided to look into public opinion on climate change, and I found a number of interesting polls. One that I found particularly relevant, a breakdown of *who* in America is concerned about the environment, showed that young people, democrats and liberals are the most likely groups to prioritize the environment (even over economic growth). (<http://www.gallup.com/poll/153515/Americans-Prioritize-Economic-Growth-Environment.aspx>)