

June 1998

Table of Contents Volume Nine, Number Three, Summer 1998

RISK Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <http://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 Nine, Number Three, Summer 1998*, 9 RISK [vii] (1998).

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the University of New Hampshire – 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.

Table of Contents Volume Nine, Number Three, Summer 1998

Abstract

Table of contents for the journal *RISK: Health, Safety & Environment* (ISSN: 1073-8673)

Keywords

TOC, Table, Contents, RISK, UNH Law, Franklin Pierce Law Center

RISK

Health, Safety & Environment

Volume 9

1998

Number 3

Articles

Immaculada de Melo-Martin, *Ethics and Uncertainty: In Vitro Fertilization and Risks to Women's Health*

Dr. de Melo-Martin examines the risks, uncertainties and public policies surrounding *in vitro* fertilization and women's health issues.

201

M. V. Rajeev Gowda & Doug Easterling, *Nuclear Waste and Native America: The MRS Siting Exercise*

Drs. Gowda & Easterling provide cross-cultural perspectives on issues of risk perception, equity and policy as they affect nuclear waste storage on Native American sites.

229

Richard M. Lynch & Mary S. Henefin, *Causation in Occupational Disease: Balancing Epidemiology, Law and Manufacturer Conduct*

Drs. Lynch & Henefin examine evolution of disease causation theory and its impact on public health, as well as how these relate to the courtroom admissibility of expert opinion evidence.

259

Joakim Ramsberg & Lennart Sjöberg, *The Importance of Cost and Effectiveness for Attitudes toward Lifesaving Interventions*

Drs. Ramsberg & Sjöberg present the results of a study that evaluates Swedish attitudes about risks and corresponding lifesaving interventions.

271

Book Reviews

Charles R. Bennett, *Risks in the Environment: How to Assess Them*

Penny Dean 291

Leonard W. Doob, *Sustainers and Sustainability*

Courtney J. Merrill 293

Allan Mazur, *A Hazardous Inquiry: The Rashomon Effect at Love Canal*

Thomas G. Field, Jr. 296

To Submit Abstracts for the March 1999 RAPA Meeting

Please send by December 15, 1998

- Three copies of an abstract: 150-200 words, single-spaced; see Sample below.
- Three copies of author contact information. Please use the form below.
- Two self-addressed legal-size envelopes (with at least first class postage) to:

Professor Vern R. Walker
Hofstra University School of Law
121 Hofstra University
Hempstead, NY 11549-1210

Please follow these forms. *Abstracts will be reproduced as submitted.*
Plan for no more than twenty minutes to present.

Sample Abstract

Process Alternatives in Technological Controversies

Thomas G. Field, Jr., Franklin Pierce Law Center
2 White Street, Concord, NH 03301; *email* tfield@fpplc.edu

Many alternatives, such as the so-called Science Court, to common mechanisms for resolving policy disputes have been advanced over the past quarter century. Yet, where Machiavellian motives are involved, more than the mere threat of protracted litigation is often needed to encourage their use. Even when such motives might not have a controlling effect, unfamiliarity strongly interferes with parties' seriously considering, much less adopting, novel processes. Also, inclinations to try new things have been shown strongly, and negatively, to correlate with the stakes involved.

Issues at the frontiers of science and technology must be carefully framed to minimize, if not avoid, giving decision makers the capacity to resolve issues outside their technical or political competences. Also, to foster trust, proceedings must be public, and decisions must be subject to court review.

Those who advance novel institutions or processes must start with small stakes. Only after the bugs are worked out and shibboleths put to rest will they be seriously considered as a way to resolve major policy disputes.

Author Contact Information

Title of paper _____

Name (title, first, last) _____

Professional affiliation _____

Professional address _____

City/State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

The most appropriate topic categories (as numbered below) for your paper are — by descending preference: a) _____ b) _____ c) _____.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Economic Perspectives on Risk | 6. Risk Communication |
| 2. Ethical Implications of Risk | 7. Risk from Physical Agents |
| 3. Evidence, Measurement &
Data Analysis | 8. Risk Perception |
| 4. Public Participation & Alternative
Decision Processes | 9. Toxicology & Risk Assessment |
| 5. Risk Characterization &
Historical Epidemiology | 10. Statistics & Decision-Theory
Models |