

EDITORIAL COMMENTARY

As indicated in the general statement about the topical coverage of this journal, its pages are not intended for the presentation of polemic debates. However, sometimes aspects of such debates are partly rooted in or dependent upon research findings or the scientific interpretations of data. In that light, we present in the following pages a review symposium on a book by Professor Perry which addresses some possible linkages between natural hazard disaster research findings and public policy implications of such studies for crisis relocation or evacuation planning for nuclear war. The book is separately reviewed by Professor Kreps and Professor Platt, and Professor Perry was then allowed to respond to their comments. This review symposium is part of a plan to have different kinds of book reviews in the journal; planned for example, are reviews of films relevant to disasters, reviews of famous or important disaster studies of the past (what might be called the "classics" in the field), and reviews of how disaster findings have been incorporated into general social science or behavioral texts.

The rest of this issue contains a variety of articles illustrating again major foci of the journal. The article by Seitz and Davis is another in the series of cross-societal studies we have already published. The Neal article attempts to build upon and test some of the ideas advanced in the literature about blame assessment in disasters. The other two articles, one by Wyner and the other by Petak, both examine some of the public policy implications of disaster studies for mitigation and planning.

In an attempt to fully capture all the topics implied by its title, the 1986 special issue of the journal will be devoted exclusively to articles on conflictive types of mass emergencies not usually thought of as disasters, that is, riots, demonstrations, civil disturbances, and similar crowd like behaviors.

E.L. Quarantelli
Örjan Hultåker