

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

---

Volume 4  
Number 2 *RISK: Issues in Health & Safety*

Article 2

---

March 1993

## Table of Contents, Volume Four, Number Two, Spring 1993

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 Four, Number Two, Spring 1993*, 4 RISK [v] (1993).

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 4

1993

NUMBER 2

### TWENTY-FIVE YEAR RETROSPECTIVE ON THE SCIENCE COURT: A SYMPOSIUM

INTRODUCTION . . . . . 95  
*Thomas G. Field, Jr.*

ELITISM VS. CHECKS AND BALANCES IN COMMUNICATING SCIENTIFIC  
INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC . . . . . 101  
*Arthur Kantrowitz*

The "father of the Science Court" describes his objective in proposing the institution as it has come to be known, his efforts to get a major public test of the concept, and insights gained since the initial proposal was made in 1967.

SCIENCE COURTS, EVIDENTIARY PROCEDURES AND MIXED SCIENCE-POLICY  
DECISIONS . . . . . 113  
*Carl F. Cranor*

This paper analyzes the potential for science courts to address the social need to regulate human carcinogens and concludes that, on balance, it is not high. From this vantage point, Professor Cranor suggests desiderata for application in other areas where science courts might be used.

CONSENSUS DEVELOPMENT AT NIH: WHAT WENT WRONG? . . . . . 133  
*Itzhak Jacoby*

A close observer identifies the Science Court concept as inspiring consensus development conferences at the National Institutes of Health and describes the extent to which they have followed the model. Professor Jacoby also argues that, if the model were more closely followed, conference objectives would be better realized.

PROCEDURAL CHOICES IN REGULATORY SCIENCE . . . . . 143  
*Sheila Jasanoff*

This paper compares four approaches to using science in regulatory decision making — one very similar to the Science Court proposal. Professor Jasanoff argues generally that that proposal would be less useful than procedures more sensitive to the distinctive characteristics of regulatory science.

THE SCIENCE COURT: REMINISCENCE AND RETROSPECTIVE . . . . . 161  
*Allan Mazur*

A self-described “agnostic” on the merits of the Science Court proposal describes how he independently arrived at a similar notion and played a role in efforts to secure a major test of the proposal. Professor Mazur also analyzes university-based experiments structured around that model and concludes that the controversial “judges” are probably unnecessary to achieve his original objectives.

THE SCIENCE COURT: A BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 171  
*Jon R. Cavicchi*

This bibliography lists articles that focus specifically on the Science Court as proposed by Professor Kantrowitz in the mid-sixties. In a separate part, Mr. Cavicchi also collects articles casually mentioning that proposal in assorted contexts.

THE SCIENCE COURT EXPERIMENT: AN INTERIM REPORT . . . . . 179  
*Task Force of the Presidential Advisory Group  
on Anticipated Advances in Science and Technology*

So that this symposium may largely stand on its own, the formal proposal that appeared in SCIENCE in 1976 is reprinted here with permission.