New Developments in Biotechnology: Public Perceptions of Biotechnology

May 1987

NTIS order #PB87-207544

New Developments in Biotechnology



Background Paper
Public Perceptions
of Biotechnology



Recommended Citation:

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, New *Developments in Biotechnology—Background Paper: Public Perceptions of Biotechnology, OTA-BP-BA-45* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1987).

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 87-619822

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402-9325 (order form on p. 127)

Foreword

Throughout its turbulent recent history, the benefits and risks of biotechnology have been scrutinized and discussed by experts in a wide range of fields. Today, biotechnology is perhaps best viewed as a growing cohort of technologies, each with its own scientific benefits and risks, and allied social, economic, legal, and ethical opportunities and controversies. Increasingly during debates on these concerns, the question is asked: "What does the public think?"

In this background paper, OTA reports the results of a nationwide survey of public knowledge and opinion about issues concerning science and technology in general and genetic engineering and biotechnology in particular. The survey, conducted for OTA by Louis Harris & Associates, measures the interest, knowledge, and concern of the public about scientific matters. The willingness of the American people to accept risks in return for benefits of scientific innovation is assessed. The public's reaction to testing genetically engineered organisms in their own community is reported, as is how the American populace feels about human gene therapy. The background paper also reveals the feelings of the American populace toward the future of biotechnology.

This background paper is the second in a series of OTA studies being carried out under an assessment of "New Developments in Biotechnology." Volume one in the series examined commercialization and ownership of human tissues and cells, and forthcoming reports will include evaluations of: U.S. investment in biotechnology; genetically engineered organisms in the environment; tests for human genetic disorders; and the impact of intellectual property law on biotechnology. The assessment was requested by the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

OTA was assisted in preparing this study by an advisory panel and reviewers selected for their expertise and diverse points of view. OTA gratefully acknowledges the contribution of each of these individuals. As with all OTA reports, responsibility for the content of the background paper is OTA's alone. The background paper does not necessarily constitute the consensus or endorsement of the advisory panel or the Technology Assessment Board.

JOHN H. GIBBONS

Director

New Developments in Biotechnology Advisory Panel

Bernadine P. Healy, *Panel Chair* The Cleveland Clinic Foundation Cleveland, OH

Timothy B. Atkeson Steptoe & Johnson Washington, DC

David Blumenthal

Brigham and Women's Hospital Corp.

Boston, MA

Hon. Edmund G. Brown, Jr.

Reavis & McGrath Los Angeles, CA

Nancy L. Buc

Weil, Gotshal & Manges

Washington, DC

Mark F. Cantley

Concertation Unit for Biotechnology in Europe

Brussels, Belgium

Alexander M. Capron

University of Southern California

Los Angeles, CA

Jerry D. Caulder Mycogen Corp. San Diego, CA

Lawrence I. Gilbert

The University of North Carolina

Chapel Hill, NC

Conrad A. Istock

The University of Arizona

Tucson, AZ

Edward L. Korwek Keller & Heckman Washington, DC

Tsune Kosuge

University of California, Davis

Davis, CA

Richard Krasnow Arlington, VA Sheldon Krimsky Tufts University Medford, MA

Joshua Lederberg

The Rockefeller University

New York, NY

William E. Marshall

Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.

Johnston, IA

Ronald L. Meeusen Rohm & Haas Co. Spring House, PA

Robert B. Nicholas Blum, Nash & Railsback

Washington, DC

Eric J. Stanbridge

University of California, Irvine

Irvine, CA

James M. Tiedje

Michigan State University

East Lansing, MI

Kunio Toriyama

National Federation of Agricultural Cooperative Associations of Japan

Tokyo, Japan

Pablo D.T. Valenzuela

Chiron Corp. Emeryville, CA

Thomas E. Wagner Ohio University Athens, OH

Luther S. Williams Atlanta University

Atlanta, GA

NOTE: OTA is grateful for the valuable assistance and thoughtful critiques provided by the Advisory Panel members. The views expressed in this OTA background paper, however, are the sole responsibility of the Office of Technology Assessment.

Public Perceptions of Biotechnology OTA Project Staff

Roger C. Herdman, Assistant Director, OTA Health and Life Sciences Division

Gretchen S. Kolsrud, Biological Applications Program Manager

Gary B. Ellis, Project Director

Luther Val Giddings, Study Director and Analyst

Robyn Y. Nishimi, Study Director and Analyst

Support Staff

Sharon Kay Oatman, Administrative Assistant Linda S. Ray ford, Secretary/Word Processing Specialist Barbara V. Ketchum, Clerical Assistant

Editors

Stephanie L. Forbes, Bowie, MD Richard A. Danca, Washington, DC²

Contractors

John M. Boyle and D. Matthew Knain, Louis Harris & Associates, Inc., Washington, DC

Acknowledgment to Other OTA Staff

Franklin M. Zweig, Visiting Scholar

Robert Friedman, Senior Associate, Oceans and Environment Program

Daryl Chubin, Senior Analyst, Science, Education, and Transportation Program

Robert M. Cook-Deegan, Senior Analyst

Kathi E. Hanna, Analyst

Kevin W. O'Connor, Analyst

Gladys B. White, *Analyst*

Patricia J. Hoben, Analyst

Blake M. Cornish, Research Assistant

Reviewers³

Lawrence Burton and Donald Buzzelli, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC

Jon Miller, Public Opinion Laboratory, Dekalb, IL

Barbara R. Williams, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD

^{*}Through January 1987.

^{&#}x27;During March 1987.

³OTA is grateful for the valuable assistance and thoughtful critiques provided by the reviewers. The views expressed in this OTA background paper, however, are the sole responsibility of the Office of Technology Assessment.