

# RISK: Health, Safety & Environment (1990-2002)

---

Volume 3  
Number 1 *RISK: Issues in Health & Safety*

Article 2

---

January 1992

## Table of Contents, Volume Three, Number One, Winter 1992

RISK Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/risk>



Part of the [Law Commons](#), [Life Sciences Commons](#), [Physical Sciences and Mathematics Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

RISK Editorial Board, *Table of Contents Volume Three, Number One, Winter 1992*, 3 RISK [iii] (1992).

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the University of New Hampshire – Franklin Pierce School of Law at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in RISK: Health, Safety & Environment (1990-2002) by an authorized editor of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact [ellen.phillips@law.unh.edu](mailto:ellen.phillips@law.unh.edu).

# RISK

## *Issues in Health & Safety*

VOLUME 3

1992

ISSUE 1

### CONTENTS

#### ARTICLES

NOTHING RECEDES LIKE SUCCESS? RISK ANALYSIS AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL  
AMPLIFICATION OF RISKS . . . . . 1

*William R. Freudenburg*

Professor Freudenburg believes that there is room for improvement in risk analysis, particularly in drawing on systematic studies of human behavior in the calculation of real, empirical probabilities of failure. The need is argued to be especially acute where technological risks are associated with low expected probabilities of failure and are managed by human organizations for extended periods of time. This permits complacency to set in.

RISK AND VALUE JUDGMENTS: A CASE STUDY OF THE POISON PREVENTION  
PACKAGING ACT . . . . . 37

*William E. Hilton*

Mr. Hilton attempts to show why important choices presented in current proposals to amend child-resistant packaging regulations are fundamentally normative. He then argues that these choices should not be obscured by the technical issues.

#### COMMENTS

REPLY TO VALVERDE . . . . . 49

*Paul B. Thompson*

Professor Thompson responds to Valverde's argument, in the last issue, that his approach to risk puts too much emphasis on the distinction between risk subjectivism and risk objectivism. In doing so, he asserts, inter alia, that anchoring risk judgments in a probabilistic framework does not go far enough in rejecting reigning risk-analysis notions of "real risk."

THE RISK OF RELIANCE ON PERCEIVED RISK . . . . .	59
	<i>Frank B. Cross</i>

Professor Cross's comment is closely related to the debate between Thompson and Valverde. Using examples that do not commonly appear in the "risk" literature, he argues that: Giving weight to perceived risk may seem liberal insofar as it gives more say to the "little guy," but giving perceived risk too much weight could have distinctly illiberal social consequences.

**REPORT**

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP TO REVIEW AN OMB REPORT ON RISK ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT . . . . .	71
---	----

*John S. Evans, John D. Graham, George M. Gray, Adrienne Hollis, Barry Ryan, Andrew Smith, Mark Smith and Alison Taylor*

Summary of the results of an invitational workshop conducted to peer review the 1990 OMB report, CURRENT REGULATORY ISSUES IN RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT IN REGULATORY PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, APRIL 1, 1990 – MARCH 31, 1991.

**BOOK REVIEWS**

KRISTIN S. SHRADER-FRECHETTE, RISK AND RATIONALITY . . . . .	85
W. KIP VISCUSI, REFORMING PRODUCTS LIABILITY . . . . .	88

*Hugh H. Gibbons*