Index

Accidental events, 2–3
Accidental hazard-making, 55
Accidents, 40–42, 83
  in reactor operation, 88–92
Act of God, 2–3
Act of Man, 2–3
Actors in the Mercury Pollution Controversy in Sweden (case study), 57–62
Adams, 28, 30, 32
Adaptations, 7–11
Adjustments, 7–11
Administrative process, 74–75
Administrative theory
  bureaucratic, 48–49
  rational, 48
Adversary process, 74–75
Agricultural worker, 40
Airline pilot, 40
Altouney, 50
Asbestos, 76–78
Asbestos workers, 77
Assessment, environmental impact, 66
Assessment, technology, 66–67
Assessors, 55, 57
Aversive risk, 12, 35–40, 49, 50

Balanced risk, 12, 40, 49, 50
Bangladesh, 49
Battelle Environmental Evaluation System, 66
Benefit–cost, *see* Cost–benefit
Benefit–risk, 12, 50
Benefit–risk analysis, 43–48
Benefit–risk biases, 50
Bias
  in probability assessments, 32
  in risk assessments, 50, 86
Boffey, 74
Bradley (case study), 50–53
Brown, 18
Brubaker, 4–5, 6, 8–9, 11
Bulloch, 41
Burton, 32–35 (case study), 37

Carter (case study), 75–78
Case studies
  Actors in the Mercury Pollution Controversy in Sweden, 57–62
  Chemical Substances in the Work Environment: Some Comparative Aspects of U.S.S.R. and U.S. Hygienic Standards, 68–73
  Choice of Water Source in East Africa, 51–53
  Iron Ore, Asbestos and Drinking Water, 75–78
  Risk Assessment of Nuclear Reactors: Three Views of the Reactor Safety Study, 87–97
  Risk from Nature in London, Ontario, 32–35
  Stratospheric Pollution and the Earth's Ozone, 21–25
Chemical Substances in the Work Environment: Some Comparative Aspects of U.S.S.R. and U.S. Hygienic Standards (case study), 68–73
Chemical worker, 41
Chemicals in work environment
  MPC-TLV values, 68–73
  national standards, 46, 47
  U.S.A.–U.S.S.R. comparison, 68–73
Choice, ordered, 50–53
Choice of Water Source in East Africa (case study), 51–53
Coal miner, 40
Coates, 67
Cognitive processes in risk estimation, 32
Cohen, J. J., 43–44
Cohen, John, 63
Commission of inquiry, 74–75
Commodity market, 75
Common mode failure, 94
Commoner, 100
Communication, 100
Compound hazards, 3–4
Consequences of events, 1–2, 4–7, 98
Coping actions, 1, 7–11, 13, 14
Cost–benefit, 12, 50, *see also* Cost effectiveness studies
Cost effectiveness studies, 40–43
Critical science, 15
Crutzen, 21, 23, 24
Czechoslovakia, 46, 47

Damage, 4, 6, 40, 43, 88, 90

Decision analysis, 64–65
Decision tree, 3, 64
Delphi technique, 64
Developed countries, *see* Industrialized countries
Developing nations, 6, 43, 68, 86, 99
Diagnosis of hazards, 19, 20–21
Disease, 37, 40, 43
Disruption, 4, 6
Divining, 63
Douglas, 36
Dworkin, 82, 83

Ehrlich, 28–29
Environment and society, 1–2
Environmental hazard, 12, 79
Environmental impact assessment, 66
Environmental monitoring, 65–66
Environmental Mutagen Society, 16, 17
Events
  accidental, 2–3
  analysis of, 3
  incidental, 2–3
  natural hazard, 1–4
Experience, in risk estimation, 31
Extrapolation, in risk estimation, 27–28

Fault tree, 3
Fault tree methodology in Reactor Safety Study, 93–94
Federal Republic of Germany, 46–47
Ford, 83
France, 100
Fundamental research, 14–15, 20

Gains, 4, 6
Gambling, in risk assessment, 75
German Democratic Republic, 46–47
Golant, 37
Goodman, 15
Group processes, 74–75
Guardians, 55, 56–57

Halverson, 79, 80
Hammond (case study), 21–25
Hazard
  different from risk, 87, 95
  greater than risk, 82–83, 93
  less than risk, 83–87, 90
Hazard awareness trends
  media reports, 79–80
  public opinion, 80–81
  scientific research reports, 79–80
Hazard consequences, 1–2, 4–7, 98
Hazard events, 1–4, 98
Hazard identification, 12–21, 98–99
Hazard-makers, 55–56
Hazards, catastrophic, 95–97
  compound, 3–4
  environmental, 12, 79
  intensive, 3–4
  natural, 1, 81, 82
  occupational, 46
  pervasive, 3–4
  routine, 95
  technological, 4
Health effects, 88–89
Health surveillance, 65–66
Hierarchy of risk consequences, 6, 7 and measurement scale, 38–39, 40
Hohenemser, 90, 95–97
Holmes, 37
Howard, 64–65
Hungary, 100
Hyman, 63

Illness, 37
Incidental adjustments, 11
Incidental events, 2–3
Incidental hazard-making, 55
Industrialized countries, 4, 43, 49, 68, 81
Inference (*see also* Extrapolation)
  in hazard identification, 19
  in risk estimation, 31–32
Information management, 99
Institute for International Social Research, 81
Insurance, in risk assessment, 75
Intensive hazards, 3–4
Intuition, in risk estimation, 26, 30–31
Involuntary exposure, risk, 43–45
Iron Ore, Asbestos and Drinking Water (case study), 75–78

Jahoda, 63
Jensen, 18
Johnston, 21, 24
Judgement processes, 63–65
Judicial review, 74

Kates (case study), 32–35
Kendall, 90, *see also* Sierra Club-Union of Concerned Scientists
Kenya, ordered choice of water source, 50–53
Kirkby, 55

Lake Superior, taconite pollution, 75–78
Lamb, 74
Lave, 43
Lawless, 80, 84–85, 86, 87
Leopold Matrix, 66
Levels of tolerance (Starr), 10

London, Ontario, risk estimation of natural hazards, 32–35
Lowrance, 31, 50
Lundqvist, 57–62 (case study), 79, 86

McDonald, James, 21
McHarg Overlays, 66
Mack, 63
Magnuson, 68, 73
Manufacturing worker, 40
Masuda, 37
Maugh (case study), 21–25
Mazur, 32
Media distortion, 86
Mercury pollution in Sweden, 57–62, 79, 86
Mesabi range, 76
Mirabito, 18
Moglewer, 90, *see also* Sierra Club-Union of Concerned Scientists
Monitoring
  environmental, 65–66
  of hazards, 18, 20–21
Morbidity, 4, 40
  data base, 49
Mortality, 4, 40, 42
  data base, 49
Multiple attribute utility methods, 48
Munn, 18, 66

'Natural base' (Starr), 49
Natural disasters, 43, 82, 83
Natural events, 1–4
Natural hazards, 1, 81, 82
Nature (journal), 79
Nuclear fuel cycle, 95–97

Organized modes of assessment
  group processes, 74–75
  methods, 62–74
  roles, 55–57
Otway, 12, 37, 41–42, 43–44, 55
Ozone layer, 21–25
  researchers, 22–25

Panel on Assessing Potential Ocean Pollutants, 16, 18, 19, 20
Pathway analysis, 3
Pervasive hazards, 3–4
Pijawka, 79, 80
Practical science, 15
Processes of assessment
  administrative, 74–75
  adversary, 74–75
  commission of inquiry, 74–75
  judicial review, 74
Public alarm over technology, 80, 84–85, 87
Public interest science, 15
Pure science, 14–15

Qualified probability, *see* Subjective probability
Quantification, in risk estimation, 28–30

Rapoport, 83
Rasmussen, Norman C., 88, 91
Rasmussen Report, *see* Reactor Safety Study
Ravetz, 15
Reactor Safety Study
  critique of, 93–95
  excerpt, 90–92
  summary, 87–90
Reduction
  of damages, 7
  of risks, 40–43
Regulation, 48, 74
Research
  critical (public interest) science, 15
  practical science, 15
  pure (fundamental) science, 14–15, 20
Reserve Mining Company, 75–78
Revelation, in risk estimation, 26
Risk acceptability
  in drugs, 46
  individual preferences in, 46, 49
  national differences in, 45–47
  societal preferences in, 43–45
Risk assessment attitudes, 81–87
  media distortion, 86
  of public, 86–87
  worry bead hypothesis, 87
Risk assessment methodology, 12–14, 98–100
Risk Assessment of Nuclear Reactors: Three Views of the Reactor Safety Study (case study), 87–97
Risk assessment sequences, 54
Risk aversion, 35–40, 48–49
Risk balancing, 40, 41, 49, 99
Risk–benefit, *see* Benefit–risk
Risk estimation, 12–14, 26–35, 98
Risk evaluation, *see* Social evaluation
Risk from Nature in London, Ontario (case study), 32–35
Risk-takers, 55, 56
Risky shift, 50
Roschin (case study), 68–73
Rowe, 6, 7, 38–39, 40, 43

Safety judgements, 50
Scenarios, 28–29
Science
  critical, 15

fundamental, 14–15
practical, 15
public interest, 15
pure, 14–15
Science (journal), 79
Screening of hazards, 15–18, 20–21
Sierra Club-Union of Concerned Scientists, 93–95
Sinclair, 42, 49
Slovic, 3
Social evaluation, 12–14, 35–54, 99–100
Society and environment, 1–2
Standard-setting
as form of risk assessment, 67–68
in chemicals, 46
in drugs, 46
in U.S.S.R. and U.S.A., 68–73
in workplace, 46–47
international differences, 46, 47, 67–68
Standards and regulations, 48
Starr, 10, 40, 43–45, 49, 56
Statistical indicators of hazards, 81
Steel worker, 40
Stratospheric Pollution and the Earth's Ozone (case study), 21–25
Subjective judgement, in risk estimation 28–30
Subjective probability, in risk estimation, 28–30
Sweden, 46–47, 100
administrative officials in mercury debate, 57–62
environmental institutions, 57–62
scientists in mercury debate, 57–62
Surveillance, health, 65–66

Taboo, 35–36, 48
Taconite pollution, 75–78
Tanzania, ordered choice of water source, 50--53
Taxonomies, 98
Technological hazards, 4
Technology assessment, 66–67
Timofeevskaya (case study), 68–73

U.S.S.R., 46
comparative chemical standards, 68–73
Uganda, ordered choice of water source, 50–53
Uncertainty, 50
United Kingdom, 46
United States, 11, 20, 36, 40, 46, 66, 100
comparative chemical standards, 68–73
Utility
scale of, 46
theory, 49

Vogt, 63
Voluntary exposure, risk, 43–45
Voluntary–involuntary risk theory (Starr), 43–45, 56

WASH-1400, *see* Reactor Safety Study
Weinberg, Alvin, 87
Westcott, 26
White, A. U. (case study), 50–53
White, G. F. (case studies), 32–35, 50–53
Whyte, *see* Kirkby
Wiggins, 36–37, 40
Worry bead hypothesis, 87
Wraith, 74
Wyler, 37