1. Full citation.  
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.)  
3. What are the topics of the text?

The topic of this particular chapter is the transatlantic divergence of food safety and agricultural regulation. Vogel compares some of the food safety regulations enacted in the US and EU before 1990, then goes on to highlight the lack of public confidence in food safety within the EU. Next, he gives three specific examples of stricter European regulations enacted after 1990, and concludes with an analysis of US food safety regulation since 1990.

4. What is the main argument of the text?

Before 1990, the United Sates’ stance on food safety regulation was generally stricter than that of the European Union. This was due in large part to a fear of the suspected carcinogens and additives which were allowed in Europe. The EU’s banning of beef hormones marked a shift in policy-making, however, and since then the EU has enacted a series of more stringent food-safety and agriculture regulation.

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

Specific examples (DES, Cyclamates, Alar, and pesticides for example) of differing policies leading up to 1990, and the forces that drove them.

A lot of time is spent analyzing the strict regulation of beef hormones in the EU, and the ways in which this highlighted the differences between the EU and the US. Vogel uses this specific example to show the difference in the levels of public concern regarding food safety in the two countries.

Vogel also relies on examples of specific food safety concerns that arose in Europe, which led to stricter regulation, as evidence of the evolution of regulation in the EU.

An analysis of the policy differences regarding genetically modified organisms (GMOs) also contributes to the chapter’s main argument. Vogel uses these differences to highlight the different political atmospheres, and the way in which they affected regulatory policy-making.

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

*A second key factor influencing the divergence in regulatory stringency was the criteria employed to make risk management decisions. The earlier stringency of many American food safety regulations reflected the application of more conservative scientific standards for assessing risks to public health* (p. 44)

*. The regulatory policy frameworks developed by the United States in 1986 and the EU in 1990 differed at the outset; the United States initially acted to facilitate the rapid commercial introduction of GM crops and the foods grown from them, while the EU initially subjected them to greater scrutiny. Subsequently, the divergence between American and European regulations steadily increased as the EU imposed progressively more stringent regulatory requirements, including mandatory labeling, and approved far fewer GM varieties than the United States.* (p. 73)

*Prior to around 1990, American regulations were typically more stringent than those adopted in Europe. American regulatory authorities adopted more precautionary regulations for suspected carcinogens in the food supply and banned food additives and pesticides which were permitted in Europe. The EU’s decision to ban the use of beef hormones prefigured a progressive tightening of European standards vis-à-vis those of the United States*. (p. 102)

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

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.)

I decided to look for more details concerning the Delaney Clause. I found a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report recommended several key changes to the clause, calling for the EPA to make several adjustments to its enforcement policies. (source: <http://psep.cce.cornell.edu/issues/delaney-negrisk.asp>)

I also looked up one the articles referenced in the chapter, regarding the negative impacts organic farming standards. (See my annotation of the article for more information). Source:

Allen, Terry J. "The Cruel Irony of Organic Standards." *In These Times*. In These Times and The Institute of Public Affairs, 31 Aug. 2010. Web. [http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/6330/the\_cruel\_ irony\_of\_organic\_standards/](http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/6330/the_cruel_%20irony_of_organic_standards/) 11 Feb. 2013

Another article reference by Vogel caught my eye. I googled, “’Food Registry,” Washingtion Post Weekly Edition”, and found the article mentioned in the footnotes of page 101. While the article applauds the FDA for implementing the rood registry, it calls for more “tools” in regulating American food safety. Source: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/14/AR2009091402783.html>