

A REPLY

Gilbert White

Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado

Let us hope the volume will not be regarded as a bible, or its authors as Jobs bemoaning the toll of woe, or as apostles preaching the one road to a new life. It was intended to lay the groundwork for commentary and prophesy, but to be neither.

Its selection of study areas, as noted, was somewhat fortuitous, and the intent was to encourage individual authors to have their say in a moderately coherent framework. The research method was first tested in a cross-cultural research station in Yucatan, and thereafter was suggested to workers elsewhere with the admonition that they feel free to modify or depart as local conditions seemed to warrant. This they did without apologies. An attempt then was made to examine through field discussion and

correspondence what went wrong and what brighter ideas emerged.

It was planned that “the results of the investigations of policy at regional and national and international levels” would be “contained in a companion volume (p. 4).” That volume has moved slowly but finally is in press. Likewise, since then a concrete examination of problems of translating hazard research results into specific behavior has been completed for one country (White and Haas, *Assessment of Research on Natural Hazards*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1975). The bridge for which James Lewis rightly calls will require a good many stones; the Bradford group hopes to place some of them.