

Analyzing the Welfare System

THE EXCESSIVE INFLUENCE OF GOVERNMENT

By WALTER BLOCK, *Senior Research Fellow, Fraser Institute*

Delivered to the School of Social Work, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, October 29, 1988

THANKS for the kind introduction. Much as I hate to begin on a quarrelsome note, I have one reservation with regard to the remarks of the master of ceremonies. She has stated that capitalism creates a group of people who are poor. My reaction is, poor compared to what? As I see things, the poor under capitalism are usually richer than the middle class or even some of the very rich people in alternative systems. Further, it is not capitalism that creates the poor. It is, rather, the vestiges of socialism we still have in the society that create poverty, not the capitalist system itself.

Now to my prepared remarks. I have been asked to address the question of the welfare state. In my view, the ideal situation would be one where we had no welfare state at all. Welfare is demeaning to recipients, it creates dependency, and it reduces self-reliance. Further, it is morally suspect because the money used is derived through force, through the compulsory tax system.

A large part of the perceived need for the welfare state is created by the excessive influence of government itself. For example, minimum wage laws create poverty by creating unemployment, especially for teenagers and unskilled workers. Rent control promotes homelessness, by reducing incentive to supply low cost rental housing. Tariffs, quotas, international and interprovincial barriers to trade all make consumer purchases more expensive. But these are only the tip of the iceberg. Other unwise government interferences with the market that create poverty include: occupational licensure; taxi medallions; central planning and control of the economy; government ownership of industry, such as the post office, Air Canada, ferries, PetroCan, CBC; the Agricultural Land Reserve; marketing boards; regional "development" policies.

In all of these cases, government creates or exacerbates poverty in the first place. People of good will then expect government to come riding in on a white horse to rescue the poor created by its own policies. Surely it is more sensible to ask government to stop creating the poverty in the first place. Then, we would have little or no need for its "solution:" the welfare system.

However, even if government wasn't out there busily creating poverty, there would still be unfortunate people such as the mentally handicapped, the halt, the lame, the blind, the sick, quadriplegics, mothers with infant children, etc. A caring compassionate society would still have to have some sort of welfare system.

Given that we have to have some sort of welfare I would put forth for our consideration three principles. The first principle is that private welfare, or charity, is vastly preferable to the government variety. When you give to charity, you give on a voluntary basis. Nobody forces you at the point of a gun to contribute. When we do this through the tax system the individual is told in effect that if he doesn't pay his taxes he will go to jail. That is coercive.

Further, most of the money in the private system goes to the poor. General Arnold Brown of the Salvation Army estimates that only three to seven percent of the amount of money that

is collected by his organization does not go to the poor, and is instead used for administrative purposes, such as the cost of collecting and disbursing the money. The rest, the overwhelming majority, goes to the poor. This is a record that many people in the public sector would find hard to meet. Thomas Sowell estimates that if the entire social welfare budget of government were just given to the poor instead of being administered by government, the average poor family would have some \$70,000 a year. The fact that they don't have it shows that there are great leakages when the welfare function is not privatized.

A phrase that articulates this idea is "corporate welfare bums." In our mixed economy, it is the richer and better organized who get the lion's share of the welfare funding. Millions of dollars are spent for bailouts of rich corporations, their stockholders. Very well organized unionists and artists, likewise, receive prince's ransoms, while literally pennies go for the really poor. So, if you are in favour of the poor, if you are in favour of the underdog and you have the same goals as I share, then you should look very much askance at the public means of channelling money to them, if for no other reason than that these means do not succeed. All too often, the money is diverted to the people who need it the least.

In addition, private charity, or private welfare is much more efficient than the state counterpart. The emphasis is on getting people back on their feet. Not on instilling dependency for four or five generations or more, as is done in some advanced welfare states.

Traditionally private charity was a task of the churches and other civic minded organizations. Churches such as the Mormons, the Hutterites, the Catholics, the Dutch Church, synagogues, Christian churches of all denominations have established estimable records of helping the poor. Yet the main objections to privatizing welfare come from, paradoxically, the churches.

In virtually every case where private citizens compete with government, or try to, they do so whole-heartedly. They are anxious to show that they can do a better job at a lower cost. This applies, for example, to private sanitation, private bus lines and even the private competitors for mail delivery and police and fire protection when such private alternatives have arisen.

But there is one glaring exception to this rule. The ideologically inspired "new class" run private poverty centres which are in the business of providing food for the needy. They are, however, highly ambivalent about their role. According to spokesmen from such groups at the Vancouver Food Bank, the Richmond Food Bank, the First United Church in Vancouver, the New Westminster Unemployment Action Centre, and the Federated Anti-poverty Groups of B.C., giving food to the poor should really be a government enterprise. This whole issue arose you will remember when former Premier Bill Bennett inaugurated his government restraint program, and called for the private sector to make up for any public shortfalls.

In the good society, in the view of these people, there would

be little scope for private initiative such as their own. The public sector should do the job. Reverend Allen Bush of the St. Alban's Richmond Food Bank even goes so far as to claim that the B.C. government in its cutbacks was taking advantage of the kindly and loving people ministering to the poor. According to Sylvia Russell of the Vancouver Food Bank, they have no intention of expanding their base of operation to take up the slack left by government.

All this is in sharp contrast to the views of the old-time long-term private groups in B.C. which had been on the scene for decades. Groups such as the Salvation Army Harbour Light Centre, the Union Gospel Mission, and the Sisters of Atone-ment Mission. Said one of their spokesmen, "our main purpose is to feed the hungry and spread the gospel. That's what Jesus Christ was all about. It doesn't depend upon what government does or does not do."

But suppose that needs are so high even under free enterprise, and in the absence of a government causing poverty on a mass scale, and so that even with an unstinting church and private effort, there are still needs that are not met. Then I would introduce for our consideration, a second principle of welfare.

In this perspective state welfare should be parsimonious, not generous to a fault, as at present. Welfare of whatever kind should be as low as possible consistent with maintaining adequate financial support. Specifically, it should not be competitive with low wage employment, otherwise, incentives decrease.

Perhaps the greatest example of the deleterious effects of welfarism run amok has to do with the black family in the United States. And here I quote from the *American Spectator*. The facts about the black family are brutal. More than half the black children born in the U.S. today are illegitimate. Almost half of these, 23 percent of all black children, are born to unwed teenage mothers. Every year more black girls drop out of high school to have a baby than graduate from college. Over 50 percent of all black children are now being raised in single parent households, meaning by unmarried black women. About 75 percent of all poor black children are in these families. This is a social tragedy of truly frightening proportions. It has never happened before in history. Mao Tse Tung's deliberate efforts to break up the nuclear family on the Chinese-ruled communes didn't have even a fraction of the effect that contemporary American social policies have had on black Americans.

The welfare system makes an irresistible offer to every eligible female over the age of 16. It says to every black female teenager, you may be poor, you may have family problems and you may be discouraged about your future, but if you have a baby, right now, we will give you your own apartment, free medical care, food stamps and a regular income over the next 20 years. If you have another baby soon after, we all increase your allotment. How many black men, poor or even affluent, can match this offer? How many teenage girls anywhere, black or white, poor or affluent, can afford their own apartment at age 16? These teenaged girls who dropped out of school and have babies are not ignorant. They are not morally weak. They are not sexually lascivious. They are simply rational human beings making the most intelligent choice on how to improve their economic condition.

Black families are not really breaking up at all. Instead, black families are no longer forming. When women start fam-

ilies, they no longer look for a husband, they simply marry the state.

Some commentators attempt to deny the view that black families have been savaged by government welfarism run amok by charging that blacks never had much of a family structure anyway. That is false. The black family was more than strong enough to survive the ordeal of slavery. There were cases of black men and women walking up and down the countryside after the Civil War searching for wives, husbands or children from whom they had become separated during the chaos and the conflict. Advertisements for lost spouses and children were still appearing in the black newspapers as late as the 1880s, 25 years after the Civil War.

This survival continued right through the 1930s. One study of ethnic groups in Boston in the early part of the century revealed that the rate of broken families among blacks was actually lower than among most other ethnic groups. Only around ten percent at a time when illegitimacy in Irish families was running over 30 percent.

Black social patterns were ruined only when liberals arrived on the scene in the 1930s with their aid to families with dependent children and other blandishments to let the state do for people what they aren't capable of doing for themselves. The tragedy occurred because blacks trusted the system. They didn't have the inherent suspicions to resist government assistance and avoid sympathetic bureaucrats like the plague as many ethnic groups did then and still do today. No, the black family was more than strong enough to survive slavery. It was just not strong enough to survive the welfare system.

Principle three. Whatever the welfare system, however generous, whether it is private or public, it is economically more efficient to make the disbursements in the form of money rather than in the form of goods and services in kind. It is a basic axiom of economics that money gifts are more efficient than gifts in kind. Let me try to illustrate this in several different ways.

During the recent B.C. restraint program, the following government operations were closed down: Janice Child Care Centre, Consumers Association of B.C., Planned Parenthood, Health Collective, Rape Relief, Rape Crisis Centre, Family Crisis, Vancouver Transition House, Legal Aid and Post-Partum Depression Centre. What type of person was hurt by these closures: rich or poor? One hypothesis is that it was mainly the poor, the needy, the poverty stricken who were harmed. I claim that this hypothesis is untenable and I will try to prove it to you by means of a thought experiment.

My own hypothesis is that the people who benefit from such programs, and who are thus hurt by their elimination, are not the poor; rather, they are similar to the people in this room: white collar, highly-educated, articulate members of the new class, many of them Marxist or leftist intellectuals. Why do I say this? I quote here from Dwight Lee in the *Cato Journal*: "The poor are in the minority, are less likely to vote than more affluent citizens and are seldom organized into politically focussed groups. It is unlikely then that the poor will be very effective in the competition for political influence. Indeed, if the poor had the skills and attributes that are necessary for effective political action, they would not be poor. So while the political demands of the poor will no doubt push in the direction of increasing the funding for poverty programmes, the magnitude of this influence will probably be small.

"A more effectively organized and politically potent group

with a vested interest in expanding government programmes to aid the disadvantaged is made up of those whose employment depends upon these programmes. These people include the several million people who are employed either directly by government welfare agencies or who, as private contractors and academic researchers, assist and advise these agencies. With the job security and income of these people tied to the funding of poverty, and poverty-related, programmes, they have a common and dominant interest in the continuation and expansion of this funding. When this focussed interest is coupled with the relative ease with which people can organize for political action through their employee organizations, poverty professionals become much more effective at obtaining political funding for poverty programmes than the poor themselves."

These words of wisdom are, I contend, merely common sense, but finely honed.

In order to underscore the point even the more, consider the following mental experiment. We take all the money that used to be spent on Janice Child Care, Rape Relief, Legal Aid, Post-Partum Depression, etc. This comes to several millions of dollars. Now we calculate the number of people who formerly received the services paid for with this money, and divide the one by the other. Assume that we calculate that on a per capita basis each person got \$10,000 worth of services of this sort. Now, we do the following experiment. We go over to some recipient and say, "Look, Mrs. Jones, previously, before the down-sizing, you would have got \$10,000 worth of services. But now, you have a choice. We can give you the \$10,000 in cold hard cash. Here's a cheque. You can spend it on anything you want. You can spend it on a new car, a new hat, food, or vacation, or on rape relief, or crisis centres, or whatever it is. Alternatively, you can participate in the old system, where we give you not \$10,000, but services which cost us \$10,000 to provide. Is there anyone in this audience so besotted by self importance that he thinks the average person would prefer the services to the \$10,000? No? Good. That shows there is still a vestige of common sense floating around here.

Consider the \$10,000 now fervently clutched in the hand of Mrs. Jones. What proportion of this do you think this typical recipient would spend on these crisis centres? Ninety percent? No. Eighty? Sixty? Forty? Twenty? None? Whenever I have asked this question, the typical response I get is something in the neighborhood of three to five percent. Which is obviously true. The point is, then, that if the lady would only voluntarily spend five percent of the \$10,000 on these crisis centres, then she is only benefitting from them to the tune of five percent. If she would take the money on her own and spend it elsewhere, this shows that, at least in her mind, she values the other things more importantly than the crisis centres.

When these programs are eliminated, she only loses out to this small extent.

Other examples of the giving out of services instead of money would include health care, day care, and public schooling. These are also cases where we do not give people the money and let them choose for themselves, but rather give them the services themselves and we say, "here they are, go use them, they are 'free.'"

The only case where these services are worth as much as the money is if the poor would have taken the money and spent it on the identical services. To the extent they would spend less in this manner, they lose out.

The only possible objection to the foregoing analysis is one of paternalism. In this perspective, we the social worker bureaucrats know better than the poor what is best for them. So, in effect, the hell with them and their decisions. They want to buy a TV set. Well, a TV set isn't what they need. They need a counselling service of which we happen to be the providers. Notice the danger of this type of argument. For one thing, it is self serving. For another, it is an attack on our democratic institutions. This sort of paternalism is certainly incompatible with allowing the recipients of welfare the right to vote. If they are so stupid that they can't be trusted to spend their money intelligently, why allow them the vote? Why don't we put a leash on them and walk them like a dog. This is a very demeaning way to treat people. Notice, however, that this is the logical implication of the paternalistic argument.

Another point with regard to the welfare state that I am just itching to make concerns the internationalization of the welfare state. I speak in this regard of "foreign aid" which is a pejorative, in that it assumes that some sort of benefit is actually being created. A more neutral terminology would be "government-to-government transfers of funds," as Peter Bauer calls it.

Unfortunately, the usual effect of such expenditures, benevolent intentions aside, is to prop up dictators by undergirding their centrally planned Marxist economic systems. For example, in the Soviet Union, the 97 percent of the land that is farmed in the public sector accounts for only 75 percent of the crops. Private farming is allowed on only three percent of the land, but this accounts for fully 25 percent of the crops. There is famine in Ethiopia because of the Marxist dictatorship which imposes price and other controls on agriculture, not because of drought.

The best way to remember the effects of international welfare is with the three M's, which stand for Mercedes, monuments and machine guns. That's what the money really goes for. Those little kids, the starving children you see in the heart rending newspaper ads, they don't get the money. It is given to the Marxist dictatorships or the right wing dictatorships, the ones who ran their economies into the ground.

Further, these funds exacerbate conflict in the recipient nations. Foreign aid might only be one or two percent of the donor country's GNP, but this is a significant amount of money in the third world. There, it is a gigantic proportion of the GNP, because they are so poor. Many of these countries are tribal. If the state is limited to the night watchman role of Adam Smith, it really doesn't matter all that much who forms the government. But when the government is the be-all and end-all, making all sorts of life and death decisions, then it becomes crucially important to take over the reins of control. That's when you have masses of people killed in tribal warfare. In effect, tens of thousands of people dying because of well-intentioned foreign aid. Well, we all know what the way to hell is paved with. Good intentions. I want to conclude by discussing the question of whether welfare, education, health care, day care, etc., are rights. I think this is a perversion of language. In order to show this, I shall contrast the negative rights of classical liberalism with the new class idea of positive rights. The right to food, the right to clothing, the right to shelter, the right to medical care, the right to education, the right to day care, or what have you.

Traditionally, negative rights were the right to be free of violence. This was entirely consistent with a philosophy of pri-

vate property rights, and the non-aggression axiom. In this view, you can do anything you want as long as you do not invade anyone else's person or property. The philosophy undergirding this is democratic capitalism, which limits government to providing police, army, courts, fire protection, roads . . . and a safety net under income, as a last resort. In contrast, there are positive rights. The right to food, clothing, shelter, meaningful experiences, whatever. These are communal rights, for the enforcement of which is needed a socialist state.

Rights, no matter whether they are of positive or negative sort, operate in such a way that if I have a right, you have an obligation. If I have a right to be left alone, you have an obligation to keep your mitts off of me. If I have a right to food, you have an obligation to feed me. If I have a right to clothing, shelter, day care, you have an obligation to give them to me.

Here are six points of contrast which show that the classical liberal concept of negative rights are very different than the positive rights.

First is time. Negative rights are timeless. The caveman had a right a million years ago to be left alone. The spaceman a hundred million years from now will have an equal right not to be raped, murdered or pillaged. We nowadays here have a right to go unmolested as we walk down the street. So negative rights are timeless. But the same does not hold for positive rights. Does the caveman have a right to a 1988 level of food, clothing, shelter, medical care? It's absurd. A caveman has no right to running water, or electricity. It was impossible in those days to give it to him. So it cannot be a right.

Second point: realism versus utopianism. We could, with an act of will, if we all resolved to, keep our mitts to ourselves and not murder, rape or commit mayhem on other people. We could do this right now, if we all suddenly became so disposed. Then, we would immediately have a world with no negative rights violations. But could we, just like that, have a world where all positive rights obligations are being met? No. It is just impossible to immediately give everyone in the world, all the people in India, Ethiopia, and China, the same level of income that North Americans now enjoy. This would require vastly more resources than now available; it would take decades, even with the best will in the world, and with the full implementation of free markets, to accomplish this goal.

The third point has to do with human agency. Consider ship-wrecks, drought, tropical storms, typhoons. Do these phenomena involve negative rights violations? No, not on your life. Nobody's rights were violated in the negative sense because a human agent is needed in order to have a violation of negative rights, and there was no person responsible. They were acts of nature. But people's positive rights were violated, and on a massive scale, by Hurricane Gilbert, for example. Houses were smashed to smithereens, people were killed outright, they had no food, they had no shelter, they had no clothing. Notice the ludicrous results implied by the doctrine of positive rights: we have to acquiesce in the notion that acts of nature can violate rights.

Fourth is gain theory. If I have more positive rights, you have less of them. If I have more food, you have less food. But it doesn't work that way with negative rights. If I have more peace and tranquility it doesn't mean necessarily that you have less. Notice how different the two concepts work.

The fifth point is charity. In a regime of negative rights it is logically possible for charity to exist. I give some money to a poor person, and that is properly called charity. But if there

are positive rights it is logically impossible for me to engage in a charitable act. If I attempt to do so, by offering someone some money, he could reply "What do you mean by offering me charity. How dare you. That's not charity, I have a right to it. You are morally obliged to give it to me. I'm collecting this money as a debt."

The point is that if you consistently carried through the philosophy of positive rights, charity will be impossible to give. We will have in one fell swoop, eliminated a perfectly good word from the English language. The very existence of the word "charity" is incompatible with the doctrine of positive rights. From this I deduce that since charity is indeed a meaningful word, the doctrine of positive rights is incorrect.

The sixth is Occam's Razor. Simplicity is revered in science. But we already have a phrase depicting the desiderata of the advocates of "positive rights." It's called wealth. Why create a synonym for this perfectly good phrase in the English language? The only reason people concoct this etymological monstrosity called "positive rights" is because we all subscribe to the view that if it is a right it has to be equal. Surely, we all have an *equal* right not to be molested, for example. The not-so hidden agenda of the new class intellectuals is to perpetrate egalitarianism upon our society, and how better to do that than by tying their doctrines onto something we all respect, namely "rights." But these people ought to have the courage of their convictions to come out and call for equalization of the wealth, if that is what they want, and not attempt to hide behind the doctrine of "positive rights."

Speaking of equality, there is an awful lot of hypocrisy that goes on with regard to this philosophy. The typical advocate is an owner of a late model automobile. Usually a Volvo. They live in homes that would be the envy of people around the world. These palaces are stuffed to the gills with furniture and knick-knacks. They have expensive wrist watches and clothing. They have color TVs, VCRs, home computers, compact disk music systems. All sorts of fripperies and frivolities. And they piously mouth off about the poor. Well, how do they reconcile their views with the fact that they still have that money? If they really seriously believed in their own professed ideology, why do they still have all this personal wealth? Why don't they give it away to the poor? This is certainly hypocritical.

Another element of hypocrisy is distinguishing between Canadians and people in India or Afghanistan or Ethiopia. Why is it that a Canadian is more deserving of welfare than any other person? If we are talking about human rights, surely the Bangladeshi is just as much human as is the Canadian. How can they justify a welfare system that would make the Canadian recipient a very rich person indeed were he to live in Bangladesh?

Here is another, related hypocrisy. Why just redistribute wealth? Why just money? Suppose we had a machine that could transfer beauty or IQ points or musical talent. Is it fair that Mozart exceeded me in musical talent, Einstein in intelligence and Tom Selleck in beauty? Certainly not! Suppose we had a machine that could transfer IQ or beauty or talent from one person to another. Should we force those who have "too much" of these attributes to share them, via this machine, with those of us who have too little? That would be real equality, compared to which the cry for transfers of money from rich to poor pales into insignificance. But such a nightmare vision is not compatible with negative liberty, to say the least. Rather, it is part and parcel of a brave new world of indistinguishable

interchangeable human parts. That's where the philosophy of forced egalitarianism leads us to, ultimately.

It is time to summarize.

What if any social services should the public sector provide? My own contention is little or none. In the classical liberal tradition, government is used for defence, judiciary, army, police. The Fraser Institute philosophy would add a safety net

of government as a last resort, but not as a first step.

I would reiterate the three principles. Private charity is preferred to government welfare; limited state welfare is preferable to generous welfare; and third, welfare of whatever kind, is more efficient and effective if it is given in the form of money than if it is given in the form of objects.

Thank you for your attention.

The Biological Future of Pest Control

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE AND STRAIGHTFORWARD REGULATION

By DALE A. MILLER, *President and Chief Executive Officer, Sandoz Crop Protection Corporation*

Delivered to the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, Indianapolis, Indiana, November 15, 1988

AS I LOOKED over the program of your annual meeting I was struck by the wide variety of things you have on your minds. During these two days you are addressing subjects as sweeping as international trade, as practical as new software packages and as necessary as updates on the bankruptcy laws.

Your program brought to mind that old Chinese curse that we hear repeated now and again: "May You Live in Interesting Times." Our times, in twentieth century American agriculture, are certainly interesting. In fact, I believe that there may not be a group of people anywhere today who are living in such interesting times as we are. Not comfortable, perhaps, but definitely interesting.

You asked me to come here today to talk with you about the Biological Future of Pest Control. I will describe some of the biology-based tools that should be in your hands during the next decade, and why I believe they will be useful and important to you. But first, I want to talk to you about our times, the environmental movement and the biological revolution. And I want to point out how you, as leaders in American agriculture, *must* play a part in insuring that farmers continue to have the tools they need to keep American agriculture competitive with the rest of the world.

First, a perspective on the times and the biological revolution.

A quarter century ago, the chemical-based progress that had been driving U.S. agriculture was rudely interrupted by a naturalist named Rachel Carson. She called for the end of harsh chemicals and urged that agriculture seek out biological alternatives to control crop pests. At that time, my industry believed she was a wild-eyed radical. However, she and her book identified a concern for the environment that had been growing in this country. Ultimately, it led to the passage of early environmental laws, the update of FIFRA and the formation of the federal Environmental Protection Agency.

Since then, environmentalism has become part of mainstream American thought. It is no longer a fringe issue or a liberal Democratic issue. Contrary to what many will have you believe, President Reagan's administration has been more active in prosecuting environmental offenders than Jimmy Carter's was. Both candidates in last week's election took firm stands on protecting the environment. I'm sure this is one issue that will not be overlooked in the new administration. Nor should it be.

The concerns for the environment are yours — and mine as

well. My industry has spent years learning to make farm products that conformed to requirements of law and public sentiment. But even that is not enough. We no longer have the luxury of waiting for legislation to tell us what kind of products to make. We must be proactive in dealing with issues involving the environment. We must give you products that don't foul the groundwater, are not harmful to wildlife, do not leave residues and do not arrive in difficult-to-dispose-of plastic containers. Today, as we develop new products for agriculture, every go/no go decision is predicated as much — or more — on environmental and safety issues as on potential effectiveness, and this is not by accident. The people in my industry today grew up during the 1960s and 1970s. We listened to the early environmentalists and did our share of protesting and marching for causes we believed in. Inside my company are many men and women who work with the conviction that they are making an important contribution that will safeguard the environment for our children and for the generations that will follow.

Fortunately, the biological revolution of recent years offers us a way to meet the public's and our own growing environmental expectations. I don't believe crop protection chemicals will ever be totally replaced, but with our new biological understanding, we can find alternatives to many chemical technologies. We can offer you options never possible before and, with proper testing and regulatory control, we can offer environmental safety as well.

I'm convinced that this new biology will be the key to our agricultural success in the next century just as chemistry served us in the past. It's neither black magic as its detractors would have you believe, nor a panacea as others might tell you. But the shift of emphasis from chemistry to biology as the basis for crop protection research, development and commercialization is important enough to our future to deserve careful attention. This change, if it is successful, has the long term potential to streamline farming, upgrade crops and solve some of our worst environmental problems, all at the same time.

Let's talk about safety and environmental issues first.

You have heard, as I have, worries voiced by the likes of Jeremy Rifkin on the east coast, the Natural Resources Defense Council on the west coast, and the Green movement in Europe. These worries trace back to the 1970s when biologists raised legitimate questions about the effects of altered organisms loose in the environment. In those early days, no one was quite sure where the biotechnology discoveries would

