

‘The Biggest Business in the World’:
The Nestlé Boycott and the Global Development of Infants, Nations and Economies,
1968-1988

By

Bryan V. Knapp

B.A., University of California Santa Barbara, 2006

M.A., Washington University in St. Louis, 2009

A.M., Brown University, 2010

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of History at Brown University

Providence, Rhode Island

May 2015

© Copyright 2015 by Bryan V. Knapp

This dissertation by Bryan V. Knapp is accepted in its present form
by the Department of History as satisfying the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date _____
Robert Self, Advisor

Recommended to the Graduate Council

Date _____
Seth Rockman, Reader

Date _____
Elizabeth Borgwardt, Reader

Approved by the Graduate Council

Date _____
Peter M. Weber

VITA

Bryan Knapp holds a B.A. from the University of California, Santa Barbara in History (Honors, 2006), an A.M. in History from Washington University in St. Louis (2009), and an A.M. in History from Brown University (2010). He was born in Mons, Belgium in 1968, and grew up in Heidelberg, Germany. The Schlesinger Library at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies awarded research funding for his dissertation, as did the Pembroke Center for Teaching and Research on Women, and the Dirksen Center. He also was named the W.M. Keck Foundation Fellow at the Huntington Library in 2015. Bryan has taught and mentored undergraduates at Washington University and Brown University. He has delivered conferences papers, and received grants for travel and research at the undergraduate and graduate levels. His first son, Lincoln, was born the first week Bryan started graduate school at Washington University, and his second son, Haven, was born his first spring at Brown. In the fall Bryan will be Visiting Assistant Professor at Brown and also teach at Connecticut College in New London.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

They say the best dissertation is a done dissertation, or that a dissertation is an imperfect document. In my case, there would be no dissertation without the substantial and unstinting help, support and patience of Robert Self. As my mentor, chair and advisor he went beyond the call of duty to help me make something out of this project. Without him there would be no doctorate, nor could I call myself a historian or a scholar. I know that at times I tested his patience as I hacked my way through this process, asked for an unreasonable number of recommendations, and obliterated deadlines. Robert believed in this project from the beginning, still believes in it at the end, and stunningly, believes in my career after this. Thanks, Robert, for showing me how it's done. And I'm sorry I kept handing you 70-page chapters and that I took baths in abstractions.

Seth Rockman at Brown and Elizabeth Borgwardt at Washington University in St. Louis read drafts of every chapter of this dissertation, and seminar papers before that. Their support and kindness humbles me, and makes me want to be a decent historian and do good in the world. Liz showed immediate enthusiasm for my developing project, and her support has remained unflagging. She introduced me to international law, corporate culpability, and human rights. Because of Liz, I am situated in that global conversation. Without diminishing anyone else here or elsewhere, Seth really is the sharpest mind in the humanities. His tenacious, critical work on my scholarship has improved it beyond

my own capabilities. I promise to pay attention and bring that same persistence, focus and analytical skill to my next book. Convincing Seth to work on this project is one of the smartest things I've ever done. Next to Seth I feel like a dull former president who needs some serious minds around. Thanks Liz and Seth!

The Nestlé project officially began with a research paper in Howard Brick's social movements seminar at Washington University. Howard pushed me farther to the left by introducing me to some of the best books I have ever read. He sharpened my critical thinking and tried to focus my writing. He corrected me when I thought the term was "Trotskyite." He asks some big global questions himself, and thinks hard about justice and equality in the world. Without him I would not have been able to frame the project the way I did, thinking about social movements and social theory. Iver Bernstein holds a special place in my intellectual and professional genealogy, as he brought me to St. Louis, met me at Kaldi's that first time, and proceeded to, for the next three years, introduce me to the study of race and history in a way that has not been matched. Liz Borgwardt ran the human rights and globalization research seminar in which I wrote the second Nestlé paper, most of which did not make the dissertation. But it has become a worthy article in its own right. Guy Ortolano, now at NYU, ran the best methods and theory class, and I hope to follow his footsteps when introducing graduate students to the discipline. Also at Wash U, Jean Allman introduced me to gender, colonialism and commodification, and agreed to be on my committee. Peter Kastor prepared me for exams with his feet up on the desk; Tim Parsons familiarized me with world history; Maggie Garb opened up the twentieth-century for me; and Tony Ballantyne expanded my world to transnational thinking and teaching. The Americanist Group at Wash U read

some of my early material, and I appreciate our meals at the dining room table. Thank you Jacob Labenz and Janek Wasserman, too, for showing me that the life of the mind could be fun, provocative and meaningful. I really miss you guys, and it has not been the same since.

At the University of California, Santa Barbara, I was lucky to resume my undergraduate degree with incredible scholars and practitioners of the craft. I am indebted to Ken Moure, Stephen Humphreys, and Richard Hecht for their inspiration and their specific help in propelling me to graduate school. Pat Cohen, who taught me women's history, about social movements and oppression, is responsible for my love of teaching. I would like to thank Nelson Lichtenstein for his support of my work in labor history; Jonathan Glickstein, who was my honor's thesis advisor; and J. Sears McGee, who ran the honors seminar and who tried to end my habit of using long lists within sentences, which I still have not corrected. Richard Corum blew my mind with his Marxist and psychoanalytic readings of Shakespeare, and he showed me Raymond Williams, whose ideas influenced my work since, and whose call for compassionate justice closes this dissertation.

At Brown and Harvard, two year-long seminars brought my research to the next level. Working with the incredibly smart and sophisticated Fellows at the Pembroke Center Research Seminar and the Political Economy of Modern Capitalism Workshop demonstrated the collaborative and interdisciplinary approaches that make this work so fulfilling. Thank you to the Harvard workshop for reading some drafts and hammering me in the process. Thank you, especially, Christine Desan and Sven Beckert for reading early drafts and papers that became the corporation chapter. Thank you Kay Warren,

Debbie Weinstein and everyone at the Pembroke Center for loving my project, and for supporting my Big Ideas. Working with anthropologists, political scientists and economists showed the promise of multidisciplinary work, and its limitations. But at least these workshops pushed the boundaries of the possible. It was in the Pembroke seminar that I knew I could enlarge the scale of the project from infant to planet, from bodies to markets to the commodification of life itself. Plus, reading all that theory, which fatigues many historians, was awesome. Thank you Mike Vorenberg and Kerry Smith for reading my chapter on the multinational moment. Thank you Naoko Shibusawa for opening my world to Silvia Federici, to modernization and development writ large, and to all things “am-civvy.” Nancy Jacobs, there is no way I could have known Stephen Hymer or Shula Marks or Richard Sklar or Fred Cooper or Timothy Burke without working with you, both in your class, with the field in postcolonial Africa, and with our inspiring conversations. I will always have your reading list from UCLA, by the way, and am still working my way through it. Plus, that 67-page “collage essay” I wrote for you is a masterpiece of pile-as-art. But this dissertation holds some of those paragraphs and they are important.

Generous financial support made the research, writing and completion of this project possible. A Schlesinger Library Dissertation Grant at the Radcliffe Institute of Advanced Studies helped me connect the women’s health movement in the United States to Geneva, and reach far into the Boston Women’s Health Book Collective archives (and meet an activist doula in Somerville). A Steinhaus/Zisson Pembroke Center Research Grant allowed for travel and, more importantly, time to make repeat trips to the Action for Corporate Accountability Collection at the Minnesota Historical Society. Thanks to

the Dirksen Center for generous funds for trips to Boise, Idaho and Washington DC for my work on Congress – I got a chapter and an article from these resources. Additionally, the McLoughlin Travel Grant, the William F. Church Overseas Research Travel Grant, International Affairs Travel Fund, and the Anthony Molho Research Grant made this work possible; and the History Departments at Washington University and at Brown University, and each respective graduate school, helped support this project, my professional training and my intellectual development. Thank you.

All librarians and archivists were indispensable. In Minnesota, even during the age of digital photography, archivists helped find sources and photocopy way more pounds of paper and knowledge than I ever actually used. Those at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and the Presbyterian Historical Society, Albertsons Library in Boise, the Hay Library at Brown, the Baker Library at Harvard Business School, and the Schlesinger Library literally made the research for this project happen at all. When you bring a box on a cart into a reading room you are helping to create knowledge. Also, thanks should go out to the people responsible for collecting the incredible, indispensable, impressive ACA Records Collection. An entire universe, from infant to planet, contained there in St. Paul.

I would also like to thank three of the founding activists of the boycott. Thank you Leah Margulies, Doug Johnson and Mark Ritchie for your time and conversations, for answering questions, for responding to emails. Mark, as Minnesota's Secretary of State, talked with me on the phone during an hour-and-a-half drive from Minneapolis to Fargo, when I first began this project. He tempered my more radical conclusions with some excellent pragmatic thinking. Doug and his wife Kathryn Sikkink are true activist-

scholars of the best kind and have dedicated their lives to making the world a better place. Leah, thank you for your time, our phone conversations, dinners and lunches, your connections, and your offer to let me sift through the gold mine of personal papers, INFAC and ICCR materials, the Bristol-Myers court case, preparations for hearings and much more down in your basement. There will be even more to do for the book project.

My family, to whom this dissertation is dedicated – all of them, naturals, steps, in-laws – helped support this project in multiple ways. Thanks to my mom, Sue, who would not let me, nor my brothers, drink Nestlé Quick any longer, who removed all Nestlé products from the household, and who searched packaging and small print as company labels got smaller and smaller. Thank you for planting the seed for an idea that rose to the surface in Howard Brick’s social movements seminar. Thank you mom and dad for everything, always and forever. Thank you, Dad, Richard, for those precise underlines in blue or black ink in all of your excellent books. I have Fromm on my bedside as I write this; I look at those underlines and think of you thirty years ago, working on your doctorate, and go, damn. Thank you, Mom, Anne, for giving me your creative talent, and your love for poetry. Your still life of the eggplant, cucumbers and summer squash guides my work at my desk, as do your poems. Thank you, Leo, for being a historian, for having such a sharp mind, and for making me clarify when I begin talking smack. George and Phyllis, thank you all for your love, help, and support, especially when we were in St. Louis. Betsy and Charles, you have shown through boundless love, assistance and encouragement how to inspire and care for an extended clan. Your example is without equal. And do not forget the Tadich Grill in San Francisco.

Haven and Lincoln Knapp, my sons, were born during this swing through graduate school. With them along for the ride, anything is possible. Thank you, Haven, for making me laugh every day, and for helping me improve my singing at three in the morning while you rested on my fistula. Thank you, Lincoln, for making my magic dissertation-writing necklace in kindergarten, which I wore through all creating and revising and rewriting stages. I even wore it when I officially filed. Thank you both for helping me improve my soccer skills, and for keeping me sane through some grueling moments. The sparkle in your eyes when we walk in the woods keeps my heart open to the world.

And, my goodness, Katie, will you look at this? All the love and power in the world, the oceans and the stars, cannot express the depth of my thanks, my admiration and my love. Katie read every word of my undergraduate papers at UCSB, my graduate school applications Round One for Wash U, my applications Round Two for Brown, my research papers and articles, cover letters and teaching statements for the hugely successful stint on the job market, rough drafts, crap drafts, piles of notes even; and multiple chapter iterations of this dissertation. You were pregnant with Lincoln while doing a last-second bibliography for me at Wash U in the middle of the night bouncing on a yoga ball. And you were up on the night before filing this thing working on yet another bibliography. Really? Katie, you have helped make this dissertation what it is, and you have helped make me who I am, you even saved my life! This is a wonderful journey, and I could not do it without you. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction:

The Biggest Business in the World	1
---	---

Chapter 1:

"Capitalism Begins at the Mother's Breast": Infant Formula, the Rise of Scientific Motherhood, and the Politics of Hunger	24
---	----

Chapter 2:

"The White Man's Milk Powder": The Nestlé Boycott, Corporate Accountability, and Saving Underdeveloped Infants	85
--	----

Chapter 3:

"The Business of Life Itself": The Formula Industry Defends Corporate Morality and Grows the World's Children	160
---	-----

Chapter 4:

The Global Baby and America's Multinational Moment	229
--	-----

Chapter 5:

What is World Health? The WHO International Code	295
--	-----

Epilogue:

The Liquids of Life	363
---------------------------	-----

<u>Bibliography</u>	377
---------------------------	-----

INTRODUCTION

The Biggest Business in the World

*"The old hierarchies of protection and dependency no longer exist, there are only free contracts, freely terminated. The marketplace, which had long ago expanded to include relations of production, has now expanded to include all relationships."*¹

*"A nation grows out of its children."*²

*"Breast milk is a universal food."*³

The landmark global struggles of the twentieth century—capitalism vs. communism, imperialism vs. decolonization, traditionalism vs. modernity, the West vs. the Global South, scarcity vs. abundance, the so-called welfare state vs. neo-liberalism—converged in the competing images of two babies in the 1970s. In one, there is an emaciated African infant, ribs prominent, large skull too heavy for its body, severely malnourished and near death, lying on her back next to her brother's grave. On the grave, sticking out of piled dirt, rested a baby bottle, there because of its supposed magical powers that would accompany the dead infant into the afterlife. In the other image, a healthy white baby with fat, rosy cheeks, sits next to a canister of infant formula, smiling and ready to grow and develop according to proper growth charts. Anti-formula activists

¹ Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, 1978), 278. See also, The American Health Empire: Power, Profits, and Politics (New York: Vintage Books, 1971).

² George Newman, Infant Mortality: A Social Problem (1906), quoted in Nancy Woloch, Muller v. Oregon: A Brief History with Documents (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1996), 133.

³ Deborah Valenze, Milk: a Local and Global History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 288.

distributed the first image in order to gain support for a global boycott of infant formula sold in the Global South by multinational corporations. Food and pharmaceutical companies offered the second image as an advertisement for their scientifically manufactured baby foods.

Over the last century, a range of political agendas has focused on the nursing mother and baby in order to advance, or to challenge, feminism, capitalism, humanitarianism, and environmentalism. The most crucial intervention—and the one at the heart of this dissertation—was the commercial development of alternatives to breast milk. The very name “infant formula” suggests a techno-industrial approach to sustaining babies in ways that, depending on who was making the argument, liberated or devalued women, helped or harmed standards of living in the developing world, and promoted or impeded global environmental sustainability. The Nestlé Corporation invented powdered infant food in the late nineteenth century and immediately attracted the attention of maternalist organizations and consumer groups. The emergence of scientifically produced infant foods coincided with declining breastfeeding rates and alarming infant mortality worldwide, which created ideal conditions for a new kind of international social justice movement. Nearly a century of contest crystalized in the 1970s, in a conflict between global activists and corporate giants over the sale of infant formula in the so-called developing world.

This dissertation narrates the international boycott of Nestlé in the 1970s and 1980s in order to investigate concepts of growth and development, ideas of universal world health, and the problems of regulating multinational corporations. Its five chapters trace the rise of baby food politics from the birth of formula manufacturing in the late

nineteenth century to a World Health Organization code of conduct in the 1980s. The international politics of baby feeding involved governments, the UN, activist networks, and ordinary mothers around the world. The dissertation draws on archival sources such as congressional and UN documents, corporate records, health professional accounts and USAID research, church papers, court cases and an extensive activist archive. Its actors include NGOs, MNCs (Multinational Corporations), activists, and countless families in places like Nairobi and Bogota where Nestlé's efforts to sell formula coincided with the long process of decolonization. Nestlé's formula marketing was explosive for reasons having to do with domestic politics in the United States, as well as the concurrent (and often conflicting) agendas of the United States foreign policy and the developmental programs of groups like the UN and WHO.

The anti-bottle factions articulated a particular set of criticisms, and the formula industry spent millions countering them. Consumer groups blamed high infant morbidity and mortality rates in less developed countries (LDCs) on the multinational corporations. They amassed evidence that attempted to show how formula companies were marketing manufactured commodities to poor women who could not use the product properly or safely. Because of poor sanitation and unreliable water supply, and the high price of the formula, babies were contracting diseases and dying. Boycott activists maintained that breastfeeding was free, safe and healthy. The corporations, on the other hand, denied these charges and endeavored to show that their legal products were perfectly safe and that activists, the World Health Organization (WHO), and others were acting paternalistically. According to the corporations, women chose the products under their own free will, they were not coerced, and marketing techniques were necessary in order

to provide essential information. The formula manufacturers believed that they, contrary to the activists' claims, were making the world healthier. They portrayed activists as anti-capitalist and communist, and themselves as defenders of the free market and the right to choose.⁴

In the United States, three major developments focused attention on Nestlé and facilitated the boycott. The first development was the rise of feminism, and especially the women's health movement, over the course of the twentieth century, but particularly in the early 1970s. Whether knowingly or not for individual women, infant feeding had become a feminist issue and a highly charged political struggle. Anthropologist, mother, and activist Penny Van Esterik, who once debated the formula companies and worked for a USAID infant feeding study, considered infant formula in terms of "the sexual division of labor" and "women's productive and reproductive activities."⁵ For many in the women's health movement, breastfeeding confirmed "a woman's power to control her own body and challenges medical hegemony," Van Esterik claimed. Scientific motherhood, advice to women from men, and the rise of the expert discredited women, however, removed them from child-rearing and feeding decisions, and pathologized pregnancy, birth and motherhood. In contrast, some feminists argued that breastfeeding and its ideology existed as a form of social control – aimed to force women back into the

⁴ Fred D. Miller, Jr., Out of the Mouths of Babes: The Infant Formula Controversy (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1983), 5-15; S. Prakash Sethi, Multinational Corporations and the Impact of Public Advocacy on Corporate Strategy: Nestle and the Infant Formula Controversy (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1994), 1-25; Infant Formula Action Coalition, now Center for Corporate Responsibility, <http://www.stocorporateabuse.org/cms/page1128.cfm> (accessed May 15 2011); Senate Committee on Human Resources, Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations, 95th Cong., 2nd sess., May 2 1978.

⁵ Penny Van Esterik, Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press), 68-79.

home. Women challenged patriarchal and capitalist hegemony, inserting their bodies and voices into and sometimes against the rising neoliberal tide.⁶ Therefore, "the decision not to spend cash on breastmilk substitutes" constituted "a rejection of a consumption pattern forcing women to rely on delocalized, industrially produced foods." Breastfeeding became a radical choice, a rejection of the dominant paradigm, avoiding the "pressure to buy," and creating a true locavore movement.⁷

Second, the growth of corporate power transformed American life and the rise of the MNC became a heated issue for unions, consumer groups, and elected officials. Women's groups fought back against the incorporation of their bodies into male-centered capitalist markets. Echoing anthropologists Jean and John Comaroff, historian Linda Blum noted that there was no "noncommodified experience[s] of our bodies."⁸ In the 1970s, along with historian Harry Magdof's work and Marxist economist Stephen Hymer's, capitalism as imperialistic and directly leading to social and economic injustice,

⁶ My definition of neoliberalism is an international system of economic liberalization that has especially consolidated influence since the 1980s. I take it to mean policies such as deregulation, free trade and extensive privatization.

⁷ Linda Blum noted that "mothering promoted by late capitalist restructuring" created paradoxes in the imagination, and in social spaces such as workplaces, which were accompanied bodily disciplines and surveillance of normal, healthy people in the world. Linda Blum, At the Breast: Ideologies of Breastfeeding and Motherhood in the Contemporary United States (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999), 295-301. On capitalism and the body, see Michel Foucault: "But the body is also directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs. This political investment of the body is bound up, in accordance with complex reciprocal relations, with its economic use; it is largely as a force of production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination; but, on the other hand, its constitution as labor power is possible only if it is caught up in a system of subjection (in which need is also a political instrument meticulously prepared, calculated and used); the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body." Quote in Foucault, Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 24-7, see also 54-5.

⁸ Linda Blum, At the Breast, 297. See John L. Comaroff and Jean Comaroff, Ethnicity, Inc., Chicago Studies in Practices of Meaning (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

flourished.⁹ Capitalism was to blame for the world's ills, and burgeoning corporations demonstrated the worst kinds of abuses, leading, many imagined, to the destruction of bodies, environments and whole societies. America discovered global "Big Business" during Vietnam, when reports of Agent Orange and arms manufacturers circulated. The "code words Vietnam and Watergate" joined Big Business and Big Government - "in short the Establishment Power Structure" presented fearsome ideas of power and unhealth.¹⁰ Congress, the UN and the EU investigated MNCs for more than a decade, during what might be called the "multinational moment," most notably by Frank Church's Senate probe into their global operations. Many critics of entrenched, victorious

⁹ See Stephen Hymer, The Multinational Corporation: A Radical Approach, Robert Cohen ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979). Magdoff wrote prolifically during the 1960s and 1970s and joined many, including Howard Bell, in analyzing and dissecting the rising new regime that included the United States, the West, and global capitalist networks as a mappable geography of hegemony. See Magdoff's body of work for examples of this scholarship the prevailed throughout the academy and the popular press during the multinational moment: Harry Magdoff, Stagnation and the Financial Explosion (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1987); The Age of Imperialism; the Economics of U.S. Foreign Policy (Monthly Review Press, 1969); The Deepening Crisis of U.S. Capitalism (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1981); The End of Prosperity: The American Economy in the 1970s (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977). Add to this analysis of neoliberal market society, on "the private earth," Herbert Marcuse, One-dimensional Man; Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), and Ernest Mandel's work, which exemplified the literature on capitalism and disruption during the multinational moment, all of which asked, in so many words, what is going on? Ernest Mandel, Europe Vs. America: Contradictions of Imperialism (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970); Late Capitalism (London ; New York: Verso, 1999); Long Waves of Capitalist Development: a Marxist Interpretation: Based on the Marshall Lectures Given at the University of Cambridge (London: New York: Verso, 1995); Power and Money: a Marxist Theory of Bureaucracy (London ; New York: Verso, 1992); The Second Slump: a Marxist Analysis of Recession in The seventies (London: New Left Books, 1978).

¹⁰ See for Vietnam Le Thi Nham Tuyet and Annika Johansson, "Impact of Chemical Warfare with Agent Orange on Women's Reproductive Lives in Vietnam: A Pilot Study," Reproductive Health Matters 9, no. 18 (November 1, 2001): 156–164. For business, oil, Vietnam and environmentalism and these convergences in the United States, see Hal Rothman, Saving the Planet: The American Response to the Environment in the Twentieth Century (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000).

capitalism after 1989 dreamed of radical alternatives to the world political economic status quo.¹¹

Third, the rise of the environmental movement created a new discourse about development, one that challenged post-World War II Western confidence in global industrialization. In the age of atomic destruction, oil crises, and Paul Ehrlich, environmentalists asked whether the planet could sustain additional decades if not centuries of industrial growth. Today's current climate change debates should help us appreciate apocalyptic thinking in the 1970s. For those concerned with baby food problems, politics and economics existed at the center of their anxieties, focused directly on "four spikes": "population growth, consumption of resources, carbon gas emissions, and the mass extinction of species."¹² The tone here resembled Ehrlich's Population

¹¹ For an excellent look at "neoliberalism" and the idea of 1989, see Johanna Bockman, "The Long Road to 1989: Neoclassical Economics, Alternative Socialisms, and the Advent of Neoliberalism," Radical History Review no. 112 (January 1, 2012): 9. Bockman argued "politicians and their economic experts presented a disembodied capitalist utopia - that the market freed from the state and the Communist Party would finally thrive - supported, in their minds, by neoclassical economics." C. L. R. James's idea of state capitalism, and even a recent Economist cover story and subsequent attention to "the crisis of Western liberal capitalism has coincided with the rise of a powerful new form of state capitalism in emerging markets," which detailed "emerging-market multinationals." See mapping the geographies of global capitalism: "Big Brother Is Back," The Economist (Accessed May 15, 2013), <http://www.economist.com/news/business/21565629-france-and-germany-lead-revival-state-intervention-big-brother-back>. "China's State Capitalism: Not Just Tilting at Windmills," The Economist, October 6, 2012, <http://www.economist.com/node/21564235>; "Economist Debates: State Capitalism," The Economist (Accessed May 15, 2013), <http://www.economist.com/debate/overview/221>; "Emerging-market Multinationals: The Rise of State Capitalism," The Economist, January 21, 2012, <http://www.economist.com/node/21543160>. For a vital discussion of this subject, note the essay by Christopher Phelps, "C.L.R. James and the Theory of State Capitalism," in Nelson Lichtenstein, Lichtenstein, Nelson. American Capitalism: Social Thought and Political Economy in the Twentieth Century. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006. See also C.L.R. James, C. L. R. American Civilization, (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1993).

¹² The apocalyptic visions of the 1970s and 1980s represented humanity's fear of itself. Cultural theorist Slavoj Žižek outlined the contemporary vision of apocalypse in Living in the End Times, writing with an eye on our collective "apocalypse at the gates." Slavoj Žižek, Living in the End

Bomb, where overpopulation outlined by true science spelled the end of days.¹³ Ehrlich's prescription, though, converged on total fascism, calling for sterilization for people with too many children. Ehrlich screamed the end of times, due to humanity's almost-unified propensity to procreate.¹⁴ Environmentalists and anticapitalist political activists, inside and outside the UN system, voiced the loudest alarm about saving the planet and questioning the impulses behind modernity and development.

All three of the foregoing gave significant impetus, and rhetoric, to the infant formula debates. However, the Nestlé boycott itself emerged as a global phenomenon for a number of quite specific reasons. During the Cold War, the US commitment to free market capitalism translated into a pledge to raising global standards of living. The Reagan Administration argued that it could not support the Code because it would be "an unwarranted invasion of the freedom of men and women to engage in peaceful exchange." At the United Nations, U. S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick explained that Americans wanted to "discourage the development by the UN of similar codes for other

Times (London: Verso, 2010), section "Apocalypse at the Gates," and the four spikes outlined by Ed Ayres, quoted in Holmes Rolston, "Four Spikes, Last Chance," Conservation Biology 12, No. 2 (2001): 584-5. Our current apocalypse surrounds us and is right in front of us: "ecological breakdown, the biogenetic reduction of humans to manipulable machines, total digital control over our lives. At all these levels, things are approaching a zero-point." Ayres wrote that, "we are being confronted by something so completely outside our collective experience that we don't really see it, even when the evidence is overwhelming."

¹³ Paul Ehrlich, The Population Bomb (New York: Ballantine Books, 1968).

¹⁴ See Mahmood Mamdani, Citizen and Subject: Decentralized Despotism and the Legacy of Late Colonialism (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997); Define and Rule: Native as Political Identity (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2012); The Myth of Population Control; Family, Caste, and Class in an Indian Village (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973); Matthew Connelly, "Population Control Is History: New Perspectives on the International Campaign to Limit Population Growth," Comparative Studies in Society and History 45, no. 1 (January 1, 2003): 122–147; Matthew Connelly, Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008).

products."¹⁵ Developed countries, and organizations like the World Bank, saw nutrition projects as essential for both development and national security, especially during a time of postcolonial critiques emerging in the Global South. Healthy bodies and infant feeding were essential for this vision. With the rise of state observations of healthy children, organizations realized that health and cleanliness contributed to national development. Bodies required improvement, as did national economies. Contemporaneous critics like historian Anna Davin explored the importance of motherhood and infant health for national power within this particular framework.¹⁶ Her investigations uncovered "the connection between 'the health of the nation' and 'the wealth of the nation,'" and recognized that "population was power." The reproduction of the workforce within an international division of labor became a problem of inequality between developing and developed countries, according to many of the activists involved, and framed the biopolitics and geopolitics of the Nestlé boycott.¹⁷

Several major themes in twentieth-century global history emerge in this study.

First, the success of corporate entities in the commodification of nature, especially food

¹⁵ Charles S. Pearson, ed., Multinational Corporations, Environment and the Third World (Durham, 1987), 141-44; Miller, Out of the Mouths of Babies, 75-85.

¹⁶ Anna Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," History Workshop, no. 5 (April 1, 1978): 9-65.

¹⁷ These issues, as historians such as Odd Arne Westad have shown, surfaced during anticolonial independence movements after World War II. How to structure the economy and society lay at the heart of state, industrial and global concerns. See Odd Arne Westad, The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). See also books on modernity and development, such as David Ekbladh, The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order, *America in the World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Giovanni Arrighi, Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System, *Contradictions of Modernity*, v. 10 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); Anthony Giddens, The Consequences of Modernity (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990); Allan Pred, Reworking Modernity: Capitalisms and Symbolic Discontent, *Hegemony and Experience* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1992).

supplies, created a system in which human survival itself was a matter of market forces more than biology. When milk for babies became a consumer good, it signified the capacity of global capitalism to commodify the most elemental necessities of life. Formula companies made money on that early separation of baby from mother. Profits soared when bottles proliferated. Through this process, planned and materialized, companies and health professionals removed the baby from the mother, and the mother's alienation from the product of her own labors, that is, her own child. Many activists saw companies as producing babies for a system predicated on private property and the accumulation of wealth. Survival had become privatized. The infant formula industry universally believed that they helped babies grow and develop, provided proper nutrition, and solved scarcity through open markets. Bristol-Myers testified that they were in the business of life itself.

Second, there was always resistance to this development, whether on the part of American feminists, UN aid workers, or African mothers. Both Akira Iriye's Global Community and Margaret Keck's and Kathryn Sikkink's Activists Beyond Borders contribute to our understanding of the politics of this transnational resistance. Iriye sought to discover why there has been a dramatic increase in the number of international organizations after World War II."¹⁸ Keck and Sikkink, political scientists and Latin

¹⁸ Akira Iriye, Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 130. Iriye referred to Eric Hobsbawm's idea of the 1970s as a giving rise to a "'transnational economy' in the world, symbolized by the mushrooming of multinational business enterprise," a development that undeniably brought forth questions about "the diminishing role of the state." For a new study of multinational enterprises and the state from the perspective of arguing for a "complex understanding" of these relationships, see Vinnie Oliveira, "The United States, Multinational Enterprises, and the Politics of Globalization," in Niall Ferguson, Charles Maier, Erez Manela, and Daniel Sargent, The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010). For a recent scholarly lament for the diminution of U.S.

Americanists, instructed our understanding of what they call transnational advocacy networks (TANs), which are groups of activists "distinguishable largely by the centrality of principled ideas or values" that motivate their activism against various targets.¹⁹

Activists at the time, embodied by the Infant Formula Action Coalition (INFACT), hoped to reign-in MNCs and force them to recognize their responsibility and their "global citizenship."²⁰ International legal expert Sol Picciotto wrote about this era, "the pressures to adopt global standards of responsibility for TNCs were generally channeled into the formulation of non-binding guidelines or codes by intergovernmental organizations."²¹ Global corporations may have possessed vast power.²² But they operated without clear sovereignties, and not without challenges to corporate prerogatives.

Third, the problems of scarcity and abundance vis-à-vis environment became a pressing international issue that exploded in the 1970s. Increasingly, many studies

manufacturing capacity (especially a contradictory call for increased automobile manufacturing), see Judith Stein, Pivotal Decade: How the United States Traded Factories for Finance in the Seventies (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

¹⁹ Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1998).

²⁰ Sol Picciotto, Regulating Global Corporate Capitalism: International Corporate Law and Financial Market Regulation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 193-198.

²¹ See Picciotto, Regulating Global Corporate Capitalism, 50n. He noted that some of the agreements "had a broad scope, such as the International Labor Organization (ILO) Tripartite Declaration of 1977, the 1976 Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises of the OECD, and the aborted UN Code of Conduct for TNCs."

²² Raymond Vernon, in his long-running study of multinational enterprise at Harvard's business school, mentioned codes of conduct for industry in a report to the president. But he claimed that self-regulation rarely achieved the changes required in a world quickly becoming overcrowded with people, waste, and toxic chemicals. See his work on two reports to the president, collected in Raymond Vernon, The Economic and Political Consequences of Multinational Enterprise: An Anthology (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1972), Chandler Papers, Historical Collections, Baker Library, Harvard Business School, 188-89.

explore what some have called "species solidarity," a global consciousness, or even the "globalization of the world picture," according to historian Benjamin Lazier.²³ Indeed, activists, politicians and capitalists visualized the entire globe as a place for struggles over influence that required expert attention in order save the world from ecological destruction, famine, and intense poverty. Conceptions of the earth, like the changing conception of earth from an earlier era based images of our planet from space, explored in Donald Worster's "Vulnerable Earth" essay, contribute to an intellectual history of earth-centered thinking or global consciousness. Marxist geographer David Harvey studied the "geopolitics of capitalism" and outlined the structural problems of capitalism to human well-being.²⁴ For him and many others, the stakes of unsustainability were

²³ See Benjamin Lazier, "Earthrise: or, The Globalization of the World Picture," American Historical Review, 116, No. 3, 2011; for species solidarity, see Fredrik Albritton Jonsson, "Rival Ecologies of Global Commerce: Adam Smith and the Natural Historians," The American Historical Review 115, No. 5 (Dec., 2010): 1342-1363; and Sophus A. Reinert, "Lessons on the Rise and Fall of Great Powers: Conquest, Commerce, and Decline of Enlightenment Italy," American Historical Review 115, No. 5 (Dec., 2010): pp. 1395-1425. For the global vision of the activists, capitalists and politicians in my story and the impact of seeing images of Earth, note Donald Worster's influential essay "The Vulnerable Earth: Toward a Planetary History," Environmental Review 11, No. 2 (Summer, 1987), 87-103, but also Robert Poole, Earthrise: How Man First Saw the Earth (New Haven, Conn., 2008). Additionally, perhaps reflecting a renewed interest in business history, political economy and the structures of Big Capitalism, make special note of Joyce Appleby, The Relentless Revolution: A History of Capitalism, (New York, 2010); also review Frederick L. Kirschenmann, Cultivating an Ecological Conscience: Essays from a Farmer Philosopher (Lexington, KY, 2010); on implied cumulative impacts and global ecological integration, see Alfred Crosby, The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492 (Westport, CN, 1972); Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900 (Cambridge, 2004), and Crosby's account of people in a solar system, Children of the Sun: A History of Humanity's Unappeasable Appetite for Energy (New York, 2006).

²⁴ See for example Harvey's lecture course on Capital, <http://davidharvey.org/reading-capital/> (accessed May 1, 2014); and see David Harvey, "The geopolitics of capitalism," first published in Social Relations and Spatial Structures, 1985, in Harvey, Spaces of Capital (Edinburgh, 2001), 344. Harvey writing in 1985 urged a total "replacement of the capitalist mode of production, that expansionary and technologically dynamic process of circulation . . . as a necessary condition for human survival."

ecological destruction and threats to the existence of human life on this planet.²⁵ I situate my dissertation within this conversation by analyzing contemporaneous struggles over growth and ecological limits and the discourses that surrounded them, but problematize the conversation by claiming that “growth,” as rhetoric and practical strategy, was the dominant view that followed infant, corporations and entire nations.²⁶

One of the key strategies of this study is to place colonial and postcolonial African history, and its emphasis on capitalism and development, in conversation with both US and global history. To that end, this dissertation engages with historians like Timothy Burke, Fred Cooper and Richard Sklar, who focus on Africa, while simultaneously engaging with literatures on neocolonial exploitation and western development. Advertising and an understanding of product and brand identification reached into rural and urban areas, integrating villages and cities into the larger global economy. Cooper illuminated a particular node of the African experience within the complicated global economy when he presented a photograph captioned "Modernizing

²⁵ Studies not cited elsewhere that have influenced this essay in the fields of ecological history (including photosynthesis!), structures and cultures of capitalism, and the juncture of intellectual history, political economy and ecology are, Donald Worster, Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas (Cambridge, 1977); Rivers of Empire: Water, Aridity, and the Growth of the American West (New York, 1985); An Unsettled Country: Changing Landscapes of the American West (Albuquerque, 1994); The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination (New York, 1993); Richard Grove, Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); on global capitalism, "creative destruction," and notions of the survivability of capitalism, see Joseph A. Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy (New York, 1942); Eric Hobsbawm, The Age of Capital, 1848-1875 (New York, 1975); Neil Smith, The Endgame of Globalization (New York, 2005).

²⁶ I hope to add a world history for a global age, bringing back a large analysis with specific historical actors to explain what I think is the ultimate universality: a distinct humanity. For historians Charles Bright and Michael Geyer, in a widely read essay title "World History in a Global Age," universal modernity as an idea faded into "an integrated world of multiple and multiplying modernities." See Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, "World History in a Global Age," The American Historical Review 100, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 1034–1060.

the African family; a nurse lectures mothers on infant feeding in a clinic in Lagos, Nigeria, in 1959.”²⁷ To colonial officials – and many nationalists – women were the key to transforming African culture; if they could be taught lessons in child rearing and household management and were properly supervised, they would raise a new generation of Africans adapted to modern life.” Speaking to the neocolonial framework, Richard Sklar wrote that critics of pervasive postcolonial oppression “need to explain the persistence of exploitation despite the passing of colonialism and other overtly imperialistic forms of political control.”²⁸ He contributed to that explanation in his influential essay “Postimperialism: A Class Analysis of Corporate Expansion,” based on multinational mining companies in Zambia.²⁹ This dissertation moves beyond these studies and details one important aspect of the postimperialist, transcontinental ruling class. For historian Timothy Burke, these locally-trained and previously colonial bureaucrats and intermediaries evinced a "mission" that still lurked "at the heart of many similar contemporary neocolonial institutions, from the World Bank to the Peace Corps," and, I argue, NGO activists with visions of bodily health and improvement, and other Westerners concerned with infant morbidity and mortality.³⁰

²⁷ Fred Cooper, Africa Since 1940: The Past of the Present (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 123.

²⁸ Richard L. Sklar, African Politics in Postimperial Times: The Essays of Richard L. Sklar, Classic Authors and Texts on Africa (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2002).

²⁹ Richard Sklar advanced the scholarly formulation that multinational corporations were instruments of the transnational corporate bourgeoisie, and other state bureaucratic actors. The tone of Sklar's 1976 article expressed the under-examined nature of the multinational corporation and the surprise that political science and political theory had yet theorized or effectively analyzed the central importance of transnational business enterprise.

³⁰ Timothy Burke, Lifebuoy Men, Lux Women: Commodification, Consumption, and Cleanliness in Modern Zimbabwe, Body, Commodity, Text (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996).

This dissertation also wrestles with a number of seemingly self-evident keywords. “Development,” “growth,” and “hunger” were not objective descriptors of material conditions, but contested terrain for various historical actors to make claims. For example, nutrition expert Alan Berg understood that improved nutrition of babies and children also led to improved economic growth, and citizens’ contributions to the national economy, to GDP. Certainly that framing is how he pitched funding projects to the World Bank.³¹ Still, many people, on various sides of the political debates, viewed underdevelopment as pathology. Growth and health, then, seemed to exist as some sort of halcyon, with growth a unifying, universal language; many others saw growth as a disease, a sickness like cancer. And yet, poor people with poor diets fit into economists’ equations with the ultimate aim of improving growth and productivity, improving the integration of LDCs into the world economic community.³² Robert Constanza offered a Gross Progress Indicator (GPI) as an alternative to GDP as a measure of health. For him, “peak genuine progress” occurred in 1978, and since then the ecological and social costs of growth have “outweighed the benefits.”³³ The proliferation of quantitative metrics like

³¹ Alan Berg, The Nutrition Factor: Its Role in National Development (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1973); Malnourished People: A Policy View (Washington: World Bank, 1981); Berg and Nevin Scrimshaw, Nutrition, National Development, and Planning: Proceedings of an International Conference (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1973). See also Meredith Fort, Mary Anne Mercer and Oscar Gish, Sickness and Wealth: the Corporate Assault on Global Health (Cambridge: South End Press, 2004) and Jim Yong Kim, Dying for Growth: Global Inequality and the Health of the Poor (Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 2000).

³² Devi Sridhar, “Economic Ideology and Politics in the World Bank: Defining Hunger,” New Political Economy 12, no. 4 (2007): 499–516, 500.

³³ See in particular Jean-Paul Fitouss, Amartya Kumar Sen, and Joseph E. Stiglitz. Mismeasuring Our Lives: Why GDP Doesn't Add Up (ReadHowYouWant.com, 2011), cited in Ida Kubiszewski, Robert Costanza, Carol Franco, Philip Lawn, John Talberth, Tim Jackson, and Camille Aylmer, “Beyond GDP: Measuring and Achieving Global Genuine Progress,” Ecological Economics 93 (September 2013): 57–68.

GNP is something that we as historians must interrogate, recognizing the development and deployment of such metrics to be argumentative not objective.

The study is influenced by commodity histories such as Sidney Mintz's Sweetness and Power. Commodity histories are valuable for several reasons. For one, they can demonstrate the real world historical changes that have transformed eating food from a question of pure survival to one of both pleasure and commodification and placed much of the world's population at the mercy of corporate prerogatives. Processed foods, packaged in ever-diverse units for sale, became one of modernity's principal indicators.³⁴ For Mintz, food, diet and modernity converged with "the strangely imperceptible attrition of people's control over what they eat, with the eater becoming the consumer of mass-produced food rather than the controller and cook of it."³⁵ Secondly, commodities such as sugar, baby food or cotton reveal local and global connections. Sugar commodification was more than enormous – it changed the world, placed Africans in the West Indies, led to the rise of industrial capitalism, shook nations to their core, led to revolutions, and contributed to shifts in social relations and work disciplines in the Old World.³⁶ And third, for the period after World War II, commodity studies demonstrate that states and international organizations increasingly sought ways to regulate and monitor food. In this story of global infant formula, states struggled to ensure food and product safety, while large corporations often outpaced these efforts. International organizations focused on

³⁴ Sidney Mintz, Sweetness and Power: the Place of Sugar in Modern History (New York: Viking, 1985), 156.

³⁵ Mintz, 211.

³⁶ Mintz, 156.

corporations and the commodities they produced, especially when concerned about global health and underdeveloped areas of the world.

Milk is ideal for such a study, as nursing practices have been studied and politicized in many different registers. At the same time, as the basis of the mammalian classification, breastmilk is a human constant that lends itself to a global history.

Historian Deborah Valenze wrote, "Breast milk is a universal food because all infants possess the capability to digest it."³⁷ The question remains: What happens when you replace humanity's universal food with an industrially manufactured one? In Switzerland, testifying in the Nestlé libel trial about formula marketing, Dr. Derrick Jelliffe used the word "occidentogenic," or derived from Western cultural influences.³⁸ He also coined the term "commerciogenic malnutrition" to describe the juncture of illness and corporate food. Thus, for him the problem was cultural, western, part imperialist and commercial - in fact all these lumped into a form of occidental imperialism.³⁹ For Valenze, modern milk conquered territory, energy and ordinary people's eating habits. Milk and milk-derivatives became central to human survival. "The commodity of milk today has

³⁷ Valenze, 288-89.

³⁸ Jane Cottingham, Bottle Babies: A Guide to the Baby Foods Issue, (Rome: ISIS- Women's International Information and Communication Service, 1976), 15.

³⁹ See his many books and articles throughout this dissertation, as his involvement in the Nestle boycott and baby food story remained central, as was his participation in the collective management of bodies in the Third World. Both he and his wife imagined and acted out their perception of necessary world-saving and people-surveillance throughout the globe. See also: Derrick B. Jelliffe and E. F. Patrice Jelliffe, "Feeding Young Infants in Developing Countries: Comments on the Current Situation and Future Needs." Studies in Family Planning 9, no. 8 (August 1, 1978): 227-229; "Human Milk, Nutrition, and the World Resource Crisis," Science 188, no. 4188 (May 9, 1975): 557-561; "Mothers With HIV," BMJ: British Medical Journal 299, no. 6709 (November 11, 1989): 1219; Of course their seminal text on human milk should still be read today: Jelliffe, Human Milk in the Modern World: Psychosocial, Nutritional, and Economic Significance, Oxford Medical Publications, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

triumphed as a universal icon of modern nutrition, despite all attempts to deny it supremacy."⁴⁰ But even more important, recall that coming out of dairy-rich Switzerland, Nestlé SA became the largest food company on earth built on the productive capacity of cows.

Chapter One, “Capitalism Begins at the Mother’s Breast,” details the rise of scientific motherhood, maternalist ideology, and the politics of breastfeeding. Issues of the family existed alongside the rise of the infant formula industry coming out of the late nineteenth century. The chapter also highlights the beginning of Nestlé SA and the company’s “corporate soul” centered on baby feeding and nurturing. How the “little nest” (Nestlé) became the largest food company based on baby food forms part of my story. The activist line remained as follows throughout the controversy: doctors applied “Western solutions to Third World situations with often disastrous consequences.”⁴¹ And yet, this political situation would be contested from many different sides, and remained contingent no matter the local circumstances or the personal choices of ordinary women.

Chapter Two, “The White Man’s Milk Powder,” covers the central actors of the Nestlé boycott, and the broader anti-corporate, social justice and corporate democracy activists, most of whom queried the growth versus limits problem. These activists always brought together ecology, capitalism and overpopulation into the same conversations. Further, they worried about starving African babies and shocking infant mortality rates,

⁴⁰ Valenze, 3, and x; note the following, also vital for illuminating the history baby food, corporations and public health: “Even the science of nutrition, arguably the most powerful force in its history, needed help from other constituencies (such as insistent mothers and wartime governments) in order to define milk as universally necessary.” For wartime governments, motherhood, and saving babies for national health and power, see Anna Davin, “Imperialism and Motherhood,” *History Workshop* no. 5 (April 1, 1978): 9–65.

⁴¹ Mike Muller, *The Baby Killer*, (London: War on Want, 1974), 8.

while also possessing a conception of an entire planet that needed to be saved. This chapter follows specific activists and their rising political radicalism in the last 1960s and 1970s, shareholder democracy movements and the larger focus on corporate accountability.

Chapter Three, “The Business of Life Itself,” considers the corporate battles to contain these boycotts, international activism against their prerogatives, and institutional investigations into their activities.⁴² The corporations visualized a One World based on free markets and corporate sovereignty. They possessed visions of infant, family, economic and environmental health based on total growth as the solution to many of the problems facing societies in the 1970s. Food corporations, for one, imagined growth as the definitive answer to famine and scarcity. My dissertation places these political, social and cultural struggles within this tension between growth and scarcity. I argue that the companies at first tried to ignore the growing international boycott, and then implemented a strategy to counter, and defeat, the boycott at every conceivable turn. Sophisticated public relations campaigns began shifting the discourse of the boycott, swayed large institutional boycotters such as the United Method Church to abandon the cause, and agitated for an industry place within global public health policy and regulation

⁴² As discussed in Chapter Three, the phrase comes from an American infant formula executive. I hope this chapter contributes to understandings about imperial capital and an elite global capitalist class. Scholars have begun to reformulate their understanding of American empire, this time penetrating more deeply into political economy in addition to culture and disassembling beliefs about capitalism. This specific focus is the direction current scholarship must pursue, and my chapter on the capitalist vision should contribute to this conversation. See Ellen Meiksins Wood, *Empire of Capital* (London: New York: Verso, 2003); David Harvey, *Spaces of Global Capitalism: [towards a Theory of Uneven geographical Development]* (London: New York: Verso, 2006), *The Limits to Capital* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982); *The New Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). Neil Smith *The Endgame of Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

within the United Nations, World Health Organization and state level public health agencies.

Chapter Four, “Growing the Global Baby: Nations, International Organizations, and America's Multinational Moment,” details the institutional frameworks that endeavored to investigate and contain multinational corporations, marketing and distribution in the realm of food and infant feeding, environmental problems and an almost-universal anxiety about overpopulation. Thus, the "Multinational Moment" included state investigations into these corporations and their role in food and energy distribution and national security; additionally, the United Nations established an international body to study transnational corporations within the field of human rights; and the activist community, including church-led social gospel groups, increasingly targeted corporations to pressure the MNCs for social responsibility and for complicity in crimes, pollution, pesticides, infant mortality and other perceived social ills.⁴³ This chapter explores the multinational moment through U.S. Congress, federal Departments, and the UN. This narrative include postcolonial nations, the non-aligned movement and the New International Economic Order (NIEO), which appeared as the last institutional attempt to reign-in economic disparities and the corporate power of the Global North. My argument contributes to sociologist Nitsan Chorev’s analysis of the shift from the NIEO’s

⁴³ For reading on human rights genealogies and the United Nations, see Micheline R. Ishay, The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004); William Korey, NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (New York, 1998); Stanley Meisler, United Nations: The First Fifty Years (New York, 1995); and Werner J. Feld, Multinational Corporations and U.N. Politics: The Quest for Codes of Conduct (New York, 1980).

anticolonial impulse to a totalized neoliberal political economic, cultural and public health model.⁴⁴

Chapter 5, “What is World Health? The WHO International Code,” investigates the Code negotiations in Geneva and the lone “no” vote against it. Initially, the Code was supposed to be a regulation, a first step toward corralling global corporate capitalism. Instead, the Code became a recommendation, its language one of offering suggestions. The companies, allied with most developed nations, successfully limited its scope. The Code stipulated, among many other things, that company representatives could not meet directly with consumers, that public advertising should be prohibited, and that companies could not disseminate free samples. Article 4.1 of the Code, for example, specifies that informational materials should emphasize the superiority of breastfeeding over bottle-feeding and that “such materials should not use any pictures or text which may idealize the use of breastmilk substitutes.” Article 4.3 mandates that health care facilities could not be used to promote formula. It also states that national governments should be responsible for passing legislation which forces implementation; no corporate marketing in the health care system; no fake nurses or company workers in contact with mothers; removing the commission/incentives system from formula salespeople and marketers; warning labels on products, and labels without pictures of smiling, healthy babies.⁴⁵ As companies continued to violate this Code, and still do, pressure groups monitor industry activities around the world and compile reports within the auspices of WHO/UNICEF.

⁴⁴ Nitsan Chorev, The World Health Organization between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).

⁴⁵ World Health Organization, WHO International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes (Geneva: WHO, 1981).

Adherents of the Code hailed the negotiations as a momentous occasion. Even today the WHO Code is viewed as a model of civil action possibilities. Critics of the Code claimed that it was "consistently biased toward centralized government control and against the free market and civil liberties." Only one country in the world voted against implementation of the Code: Ronald Reagan's United States.⁴⁶

The boycott officially ended in 1984. However, because the international boycott coalition perceived that Nestlé continued to violate the WHO Code, the boycott resumed in 1988. It continues today, with a "Boycott Nestlé Week" held every year. INFACT worked under the International Baby Food Action Network (IBFAN), which now includes over 200 organizations in over 100 countries with regional offices on every continent save Antarctica. Still, the media storm over infant formula has largely died down.⁴⁷ More than that, Nestlé's profits have grown rapidly, as has the formula industry's as a whole. In the Epilogue, "The Liquids of Life," I draw some conclusions about this problem, assess the boycott's efficacy and limitations, and briefly talk about formula marketing today. Nestlé, too, aims to patent natural growing products and privatize water resources around the world. All formula companies market formula in ways that violate

⁴⁶ World Health Organization, International Code of Marketing of breastmilk Substitutes. The Code is also online at IBFAN's website, http://www.ibfan.org/site2005/Pages/article.php?art_id=52&iui=1 (Accessed March 28, 2012); and Miller, Out of the Mouths of Babes, 79.

⁴⁷ Miller, Out of the Mouths of Babes; S. Prakash Sethi, Multinational Corporations and the Impact of Public Advocacy on Corporate Strategy; Infant Formula Action Coalition, now Corporate Accountability International (CAI), <http://www.stopcorporateabuse.org/cms/page1128.cfm> (accessed June 10, 2013); House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade and on Human Rights and International Organizations, Implementation of the World Health Organization Code on Infant Formula Marketing Practices, 97th Cong., 1st Sess., June 16-17, 1981; WHO, International Code of Marketing of breastmilk Substitutes, Geneva, 1981.

the Code. Therefore, showing how reform activism in an incorporated age falls short is a necessary project.

The politics of baby food and breastmilk existed at all because corporations, states, international organizations and women themselves fought for the terrain of what George Gilder termed "the future of capitalism." And here, inexorably, capitalism entwined with feeding regimes, survival strategies and the convergence of history and biology. In the 1970s, women across the world felt the invisible hand all over their bodies, and they demanded more of a say about how they fed their babies, constructed their families, and managed their individual survival strategies. Corporations, through marketing and various distribution techniques, tried to influence their decisions. Market openness, whether continental or global, has been a central story in humanity's political and social organizations over the last five hundred years. But where has this expansion left us, as a body? I hope this dissertation contributes to an answer, showing that the domestication of humanity as an imagined global species has harnessed the imperial destructiveness of a rampant bio-organism on a specific, embodied biosphere. Capitalism or no, people in the late 1960s, the 1970s and the 1980s developed both radical and reformist answers to that destructiveness, and they began by saving babies and trying to regulate multinational corporations in an effort to save the world.

CHAPTER ONE

"Capitalism Begins at the Mother's Breast": Infant Formula, the Rise of Scientific Motherhood, and the Politics of Hunger

*"It is a curious commentary on our society that we tolerate all degrees of explicitness in our literature and mass media as regards sex and violence, but the normal act of breast-feeding is taboo."*¹

*"A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved."*²

Voices resonated in Krio, local broken English, across Sierra Leone in 1974, selling infant formula. "Bring up your baby with love and Lactogen. Dis now important news for dem . . . Now Lactogen better food cos it don get more protein and iron, all de important things that go make pikin strong and well. Lactogen Full Protein now get more cream taste and Nestlé den guarantee um. Lactogen and love."³ When activists in the 1970s collected instances of corporate advertising across the Third World, like this one from Sierra Leone, they saw a deleterious and racist imperialism at work. Consumer groups, anti-corporate activists, church organizations and health experts collected such

¹ "Breast-Feeding: Nutrition Committee of the Canadian Paediatric Society and the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics: A Commentary in Celebration of the International Year of the Child, 1979," *Pediatrics* 62 No. 4, (1978), 596.

² Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 136.

³ Jane Cottingham, *Bottle Babies: A Guide to the Baby Foods Issue* (Rome: ISIS- Women's International Information and Communication Service, 1976).

evidence of corporate marketing from around the world in the 1970s and 1980s. Church groups such as Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility (ICCR), consumer rights organizations such as the Infant Formula Action Coalition (INFACT), and nutrition experts claimed that local people in the developing world imagined bottles and formula cans as possessing special, magical powers. Corporate advertising only made matters worse. These groups believed that doctors and governments should counter the corporate baby formula propaganda onslaught with their own information to promote breastfeeding above all other feeding regimens.

By the time the Nestlé boycott was launched in the late 1970s, Nestlé and other baby formula producers had for more than a century endeavored to convince women to turn away from natural breastfeeding to the bottle. That history is the necessary context for my late-twentieth-century story, and it developed alongside, one might even say within, two critical decades-long processes. One was the professionalization of medicine and the emergence of the medical science experts after the end of the nineteenth century. The other, the advent of “scientific motherhood,” emerged from trends emphasizing the marriage of science and modernity. Birth and childrearing became medical problems to be decided in hospitals by health professionals rather than by ordinary women. The politics of breastfeeding thus took shape within the overlapping domains of medical professionalization, scientific management, and consumer capitalism. Intense personal, local and ultimately global struggles rested on the political site of a woman's body and that of her feeding child. Over time, corporations like Nestlé, in cooperation with medical experts and advocates of scientific motherhood, attempted to place between infants and their mothers commodities produced in a global marketplace.

The men and women who fashioned the Nestlé boycott in the 1970s would employ a different framework, however. Relying on their own medical experts, they looked ultimately to rights as much as to medicine as the proper domain for understanding maternal practices. World War II marked the first major rupture in the scientific motherhood and consumer capitalist vision of women's health that had developed in earlier decades. Human rights, based on the Universal Declaration of 1948, would ultimately come to stand at the center of the entire Nestlé boycott. Many of the 1970s activists claimed that access to food and health care, especially within a burgeoning privatized human world, ought to be a human right without qualification. Much of the activist push, whether through national bodies such as the United States Congress, or in international organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO), focused on codes, compacts, and declarations that aimed to improve the lives of the very poor and forestall the privatization of those resources central to life itself. Breast milk - a natural food produced by the human mammal - could provide the growth, healthy development and social productivity that improved individuals, but also nations and economies. This interpretation, performed and imagined by all the actors in this study, visualized the improvement and preservation of the species itself, alongside social justice for the poor.⁴

⁴ On the convergence of "species history" and the history of capitalism, especially considering the trend in humanist scholarship away from Western universal visions and world history, see my discussion of Dipesh Chakrabarty, "The Climate of History: Four Theses," *Critical Inquiry* 35, no. 2 (Winter 2009): 197–222, in the Introduction. Because of world historical realities of climate change, food integration, and global health issues, new historical analyses of these developments are vital. See also the influential article Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, "World History in a Global Age," *The American Historical Review* 100, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 1034–1060, in which the authors wrote about the problems of world history and globalization, especially the historiography that affirmed difference and identity, refused core and periphery, or the "West and the rest, rich and poor." This humanist tradition, however, now faces the interpretation that "the

Acting on these assumptions, consumer activists, church groups and medical experts collected evidence of corporate marketing in the Third World and pressured companies like Nestlé wherever the companies sold infant formula.⁵ For its part, the formula industry argued that its companies supplied necessary, safe products for people who chose not to, or could not, breastfeed. Furthermore, they argued, companies contributed to growth in developing countries, and provided free survival commodities during disasters, famines, and in refugee camps. By their very presence in these countries, companies argued that they improved economic health, decreased poverty, and grew better babies. It was not industry's job to clean water, improve literacy, or tell doctors and patients how to raise children. Companies supplied demand, that was all, and markets should be free.

This chapter presents a prehistory of the Nestlé boycott. It traces the rise of scientific motherhood and the infant formula industry, beginning in the late nineteenth century, and explores how the two came to overlap and interpenetrate over the course of the first two-thirds of the twentieth century. It then turns to the emergence, largely after World War II, of a set of critics of the formula industry and its practices in both the West and in the so-called Third World. By the launching of the boycott in 1977, I argue, both the formula industry and its critics had developed a storehouse of arguments on behalf of, and evidence for, their positions. Significantly, both sides imagined women's bodies as

world we live in has come into its own as an integrated globe, yet it lacks narration and has not history," 1037. In fact, historians need to appreciate that the globe is "a materially integrated totality," and "global integration is a fact, now part of the historical record." World events, especially in the twentieth century, had "little to do with the normative universalism of Enlightenment intellectuals or with the principled particularisms of *tier-mondists*." Thus, new histories must address the confusing "effects of globalization." "The world before us has a history to be explained."

⁵ Cottingham, *Bottle Babies*, book cover.

elemental to the health and longevity of nations and economies and, even, the entire human species. The range of historical actors within the long debate over breastfeeding and infant formula, across virtually the whole of the twentieth century, believed in such connections, mapped them out, and vigorously practiced them in policy and political engagement.

At its most concrete, this case study of the Nestlé boycott focuses on infant health and political struggles over the private choices and basic economic opportunity of ordinary people. At its most abstract, this case study helps to demystify the multinational corporation at a moment, the 1970s, when it entered American consciousness as a global source of social injustice. Corporations like Nestlé and others who manufactured infant formula and other instant food achieved their global position by infiltrating, and commodifying, one of the most intimate realms of human life: the feeding of an infant. Their power, then, was not simply economic. They had captured and rewritten the intimate logic of childrearing, giving their authority the air of “truth” and even “science.”

The Temple of Health

The formula companies began to employ new technologies and advertising methods in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite efforts by activists, nations, and international organizations to persuade the companies to address the potential danger of their products, these marketing techniques changed very little over more than a century. Industry texts such as Nestlé's Mother Book, explored below, exemplified the kind of advertising practices that influenced consumers. Consumer capitalism, based on the alluring concept of choice, and the intimate feeding decisions of individual mothers

collided in the rise of a new corporate feeding program that took root in the first decades of the twentieth century.⁶

The tale of industrial artificial baby food itself began in the late nineteenth century. A "virtuoso" chemist, Justus von Liebig, studied animal chemistry and his work "led to many breakthroughs in the study of food and nutrition."⁷ He moved from meat extracts and other experiments in prepared, proprietary foods to infant food. In 1864, according to accounts of his career, Liebig invented formula in order to feed his daughter who could not nurse. He published his discovery, called "Eine neue Suppe fur Kinder," (new soup for children). Other tinkerers and entrepreneurs followed, increasingly accompanied by new forms of marketing. One 1869 advertisement in the U.S. declared "No More Wet Nurses!"⁸ Liebig even advertised in The Lancet, the British medical journal that would decry the decline of breastfeeding and outline the problems of formula in the Third World.

Henri Nestlé followed the distinguished line that descended from Liebig. But Nestlé's intervention occurred on a distinct scale, because of his company's global reach. Nestlé noticed a demand for alternative feeding systems and developed a product and a marketing strategy. "A secret blend of powdered Swiss milk and roasted grain," employing the image of a bird bringing food to the nest - Nestlé means "little nest" - and

⁶ Nestlé's Mother Book: About the Care and Feeding of Babies (Nestlé Food Company, New York, 1890-1910?), photocopy in Action for Corporate Accountability Collection (ACA), Minnesota Historical Society (MHS), 144.B.16.2F, Box 25. See other booklets and pamphlets in collection, Nestlé Transforms Fresh, Perishable Raw Materials into Foods with Good Keeping Qualities, undated, ACA Collection, Box 25, and Those First Moments of Infancy: "Hints for Young Mothers," Nestlé Corporation, ed., 1974.

⁷ Deborah M. Valenze, Milk: A Local and Global History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 169.

⁸ Valenze, 173.

the milk of alpine cows from Vevey, Switzerland.⁹ According to Valenze, Nestlé was already engaged in global product shipments in 1873, "across two oceans to sixteen countries." The company never lost its global ambitions, or its self-image as nurturer and helpful servant to many in developing countries.¹⁰

Nestlé's approach to maternal health was encapsulated in the aptly titled Nestlé's Mother Book, published at the turn of the nineteenth century. The cover stated "Cupid's advice: Give the babies Nestlé's Food." On the inside front cover, the company claimed that health professionals and doctors possessed the first answer to any question about infant feeding and health. The book allowed that breastfeeding was the preferred feeding practice. However, the rest of the book offered professional-looking and -sounding advice about infant food and health, and the proper methods for preparing Nestlé baby foods. The company expressed an authoritative tone aimed directly at the new mom, but it frightened new mothers with juxtapositions of health and death. "You see some babies slipping away," Nestlé's voice claimed, "or growing up sickly, crying children, while others are rosy and plump and contented." The modern mother, concerned with feeding and survival strategies, should "know that the four pillars in the Temple of Health are Fresh Air, Food, Sleep and Happiness." But anxiety remained: "perhaps you do not know how to keep the baby in the fresh air without catching cold, what food to give it that will

⁹ This brief note on Henri Nestlé from Valenze, 190.

¹⁰ As Gabrielle Palmer noted, into this history of infant mortality and benevolent social justice movements stepped Henri Nestlé. He, "a dealer in mustard, grains and oil lamps," seemed to have saved a baby with his artificial food. The baby "allegedly rejected his mother's milk and all other food," but "accepted Nestlé's 'farina lace' (Nestlé's Milk Food)." By 1873, he sold 500,000 boxes of baby food around the world. On the social responsibility found in profit maximization and market expansion, Palmer sneered "delivering milk to babies began to be a large-scale task for these philanthropists and was seen as a noble, life-saving one." Industrialists were the ones to be trusted with delivering milk and feeding the world's children, not women. See Gabrielle Palmer, The Politics of Breastfeeding (London: Pandora, 1988), 165.

not upset its stomach, how to teach it to sleep at the right time, and how to make it happy without spoiling it."¹¹

The book doubled as expert presentation of advice and facts, and a marketing tool to place Nestlé's brand and products in front of mothers. It covered everything about nursing and feeding, bathing, clothing and caring for "her baby." Nestlé's Mother Book directed women away from breastfeeding in subtle ways. The text listed problems with cracked nipples, mingled nursing with formula, and emphasized the need for women to experience freedom from the responsibilities and travails of infant feeding. Cracked nipples were "excruciatingly painful," and this problem might not be resolved for weeks. The mother should visit the seaside, get plenty of rest, and find someone to help her with the baby.¹² "Careful physicians recommend all nursing mothers to give the baby one bottle of Nestlé's Food at a varying time each day from the time the baby is a month old, for several reasons." The company's reasons highlighted that bottle feeding allowed mothers to "leave it for a few hours," and "gives a mother an opportunity to go out, to rest, and to enjoy a little freedom, all of which is good for her health and prolongs the nursing period. It makes it possible to eke out a scanty nursing at bedtime." The modern middle class woman required freedom of movement, and sanity. Further, the company pointed out, not all women could breastfeed, and sometimes merely required help. The expert capitalist met the expert food technician who in turn met the health professionals around the world happy and willing to accept formula products and promotional materials.

¹¹ Nestlé Company, Nestlé's Mother Book, Preface page one.

¹² Nestlé Company, Nestlé's Mother Book, 9.

Nestlé's Mother Book illustrated product placement at its most intimate and vital. Menstruating mothers should use a little Nestlé's Food. If mothers were possessed by undue anxiety then their milk might diminish. In this case, "there is no need to worry about the quantity and quality as long as the temporary deficiency can be made up by Nestlé's Food, for it is so much like mother's milk and is so exact in the elements necessary for a baby's nourishment that babies brought up on the two together are frequently stronger than those that are nursed exclusively."¹³ A variety of maternal ailments could be easily addressed with a simple solution: a Nestlé product. Marketing techniques that played on women's own anxiety about their or their baby's health insinuated commodities into family life assumed health norms, while oozing with desire for market share and expanding profits. Nestlé warned mothers about using cow's milk or concoctions derived at home from cow's milk, detailing the difficulty of digesting cow's milk and clotting in infant stomachs. It required, of course, the expert to help mothers see their way through the intense - and intensifying - complications of infant feeding and raising children in the modern world.

Infant mortality concerned health professionals, mothers and private food companies. Nestlé learned early that mothers sought confidence in modern medicine and surveillance. "According to a prominent authority," Nestlé's Mother Book explained, "one-third of all children born die before reaching the age of three months, and three-quarters of all deaths in the first year occur during the first six months. Physicians agree that most of the infant mortality is due to stomach troubles from incorrect feeding."¹⁴

¹³ Ibid, 11.

¹⁴ Nestlé's Mother Book, 84.

Nestlé, and other infant formula companies, utilized expert evidence, and encouraged mothers to use their products.

During the late nineteenth century, artificial feeding converged with the science of pediatrics alongside high but falling infant mortality rates. New demand and expanding markets offered opportunities for food companies and pharmaceuticals to address these issues. "Scientific motherhood," in addition to relying on medical expertise and increases in technological births and feeding, was one product of the historical move away from midwives toward male physicians. Reasons for dramatic declines in breastfeeding included women's apprehension about their abilities, in their own productive capabilities - which impacted their let-down reflex - and especially the rise of male doctors.¹⁵ Male physicians, "perhaps afflicted by a prudishness that made it difficult to demonstrate nipple massaging and other techniques used to get mother's milk flowing," were culpable in a shift away from breastfeeding, as "they tended to shy away from urging breast feeding on mothers." Women were thus among the first to feel the effects of the modern

¹⁵ Dr. Jelliffe mentioned this consequence in multiple testimonies, and in his landmark Human Milk in the Modern World (1978). He conceived of the phrases "commerciogenic malnutrition," to describe corporate responsibility for sickness, and "occidentogenic malnutrition," a term that condemned western cultural influence for undue underdevelopment and infirmity. Derrick B. Jelliffe and E. F. Patrice Jelliffe, "Human Milk, Nutrition, and the World Resource Crisis," Science 188, no. 4188 (May 9, 1975): 557–561; Derrick B. Jelliffe and E. F. Patrice Jelliffe, "Refugee Health Programmes," The British Medical Journal 281, no. 6241 (September 6, 1980): 677; Jelliffe, Child Health in the Tropics; a Practical Handbook for Medical and Para-medical Personnel (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co, 1968); Jelliffe, Human Milk in the Modern World: Psychosocial, Nutritional, and Economic Significance, Oxford Medical Publications (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Derrick Brian Jelliffe, Growth Monitoring and Promotion in Young Children: Guidelines for the Selection of Methods and Training Techniques (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). The Jelliffes researched and published many articles and books within this field, and were major contributors to the baby food controversy for decades.

impulse away from "nature," toward professional medicine and its reliance on technology to produce healthy bodies.¹⁶

The legacy of the mother book was long and firmly in evidence in later decades. A Nestlé booklet from the 1970s showed photographs of complicated technologies, sophisticated laboratories, and claimed "permanent reliance on the most modern techniques has but one purpose: to manufacture the best products under the best conditions." Under a heading titled "Food Technology," readers learned about the sophisticated processes that brought healthy food to the world's populations, efficiently and rationally.¹⁷ Another polished public relations booklet from the company, replete with multiple colored photographs from around the Third World of mothers, farmers and their expert helpers harvesting food, preparing food and feeding babies, informed that "Nestlé Transforms Fresh Perishable Raw Materials into Foods with Good Keeping Qualities."¹⁸

A fundamental drive for profits ignored the realities of malnutrition, stagnation and even death.¹⁹ The formula companies claimed that they were in fact experts, based

¹⁶ Harvey Levenstein, "Best for Babies or 'Preventable Infanticide' The Controversy over Artificial Feeding of Infants in America, 1880-1920," Journal of American History 70, No. 1 (June 1, 1983), 88.

¹⁷ Nestlé Company (USA), Nestlé News, "Special Report on 1976," March-April 1977, ACA Records Collection, Company Records, Nestlé, Box 25, MHS.

¹⁸ Nestlé SA (Switzerland), Nestlé Transforms Fresh Perishable Raw Materials into Foods with Good Keeping Qualities, promotional brochure, ACA Collection, Company Records, Nestlé, Box 25 MHS.

¹⁹ Note: Activists and companies disputed actual profit figures, with activists claiming higher profits, and companies lower, especially for infant formula figures. Specific, contested numbers are discussed in the corporate analysis, Chapter Three.

upon years of experience.²⁰ But whether employing "Mothercraft nurses" - women dressed up as nurses and marketing formula to mothers in the Third World - or writing sophisticated-looking pamphlets and brochures, the companies effectively marketed themselves as medical experts, not institutions concerned with market share and profits. This had been part of the approach from the beginning, as evidence in Nestlé's cultivated image in Nestlé's Mother Book as the benevolent helper, and solver of the problems of motherhood and survival itself. "This little book will answer all your questions," Nestlé informed new and apparently apprehensive mothers. "It is the result of many years of experience on the part of doctors and mothers. If you cannot find the answer to fit your special need, write to us, and we will tell you what to do." The world for mothers contained dangers at every turn. And Nestlé, it seemed, was there to help.

The regime of scientific motherhood and artificial baby feeding was ascendant in the first decades of the twentieth century. When mixed with cultural receptivity to scientific motherhood and laboratory-clean food products, the shift from majority breastfeeding in the West to the dominance of bottle feeding at the advice of doctors by the mid-twentieth century foreshadowed later developments in the Third World and set the stage Nestlé's deep penetration of the global market after World War II. "The commercialization and medicalization of infant care established an environment that made bottle feeding not only less feared by many mothers, but indeed 'natural' and

²⁰ Note: The formula companies I identify in the Introduction. Throughout the dissertation, the phrase refers to the major companies who formed the International Council of Infant Food Industries (ICIFI), along with Abbott/Ross Laboratories, which worked with ICIFI, but refused to join it. Chapter Three analyzes the industry lobby group.

'necessary.'²¹ Following a deeper economic and cultural suffusion of private enterprise, huge profits ensued. At least for a while. In the second half of the twentieth century, lower birth rates in the West led companies on a quest for new markets around the globe. Dramatic population growth, concerns about world hunger, and high rates of infant mortality established the global terrain for a new era of baby food politics.

In the late nineteenth century, the marketing of medicine slowly achieved respectable status, distinguishing itself, if in style only, from the long American tradition of medical quackery. Companies selling prepared foods and proprietary medicines flourished. For example, Woolrich & Company manufactured Ridge's Food in the United States, and declared - as most companies and doctors did - that breast milk was best. Though most companies and doctors made sure to declare that breast milk was best, in 1882 scaring anxious mothers did not trouble the milk companies: in the art of breastfeeding confidence played a vital role. Women should seriously contemplate breastfeeding, but beware: "the mammary glands have suffered . . . outrages at the hands of the corset-maker, the dressmaker, and the manufacturer of bosom pads, so that what is left of our mothers is in the majority of cases, only an apology for the ideal which nature designed . . . In all classes and conditions of modern life, the mother's milk is most frequently neither in quantity nor quality adequate to the nourishment of the child . . . BUT THE BANE HAS AN ANTIDOTE."²² Do not worry fretful mothers. Companies selling artificial baby foods stepped into the void and supplied rampant demand.

²¹ Rima D. Apple, Mothers and Medicine: a Social History of Infant Feeding, 1890-1950, Wisconsin Publications in the History of Science and Medicine no. 7 (Madison, 1987) book jacket abstract.

²² Advertisement quoted in Levenstein, "Best for Babies or 'Preventable Infanticide,'" The Journal of American History 70, No. 1 (June 1983), 78.

The food and pharmaceutical companies that would become the focus of the Nestlé boycott and larger baby food controversy had been in the business for a long time. Companies like Nestlé, Wyeth, and Mead Johnson invented the business: they knew the science behind baby food, and they understood how to market their products. An absolutely integral part of this knowledge included building relationships with doctors and other health professionals. Early in the twentieth century in New York City, a city with high infant mortality rates and scrambling to address these deaths, a German chemist engaged in public health asked Mead Johnson to help creating the complicated formula.²³ In 1911, according to historian Rima Apple, this collaboration resulted in "the first infant-food product developed in the U.S. by a commercial manufacturer at the instigation of a pediatric researcher."²⁴ The company, Mead Johnson, only advertised the product to doctors and its "packaging contained no instruction for home use." This example reflected the general marketing trend of the conflict. The pharmaceuticals, such as Bristol-Myers, and the American companies, mostly marketed to health professionals and did not advertise on television or radio. Nor did they market directly to consumers. Nestlé and the food companies marketed everywhere they could.

Throughout this controversy a form of education through marketing in the realm of health, proper survival, and cultural values prevailed. Companies such as Nestlé, from the late nineteenth century through the growth of consumer society after World War II, taught mothers how to feed their babies, how to live a modern existence, and even

²³ Jerome S. Leopold worked at the Post-Graduate Hospital and Medical School of New York City. He labored on the complex problem of carbohydrates and sugars in infant foods. Milk stations began in urban areas of the U.S. at the turn of the century, where certified clean milk was distributed and where feeding advice offered. Leopold asked Mead Johnson to produce maltose-dextrin. The company agreed. Rima Apple, *Mothers and Medicine*, 33.

²⁴ Apple, 33.

instructed about nutrition, proteins and growth. Selling and consuming in the privatized age became "the whole impetus of society," as marketing and promotion became central to national life. Accessing markets meant accessing bodies. Advertising, for Raymond Williams, "in a society where selling by any effective means has become a primary ethic" existed as a structural, institutional force that pressed upon families, nations, and all people everywhere.²⁵ Advertising commodities fetishized existence and human relations, embedded in "the magic system" of false promises and imagined identity.

Advertising artificial baby foods in the developing countries began well before World War II. Marketing and promotion followed the British Empire and other market inroads. British nurses in Malaysia, as one scholar observed, "bossed" local women.²⁶ Managing from above demonstrated a steadfast belief in administered health and expert knowledge. Newspapers in the 1880s advertised Mellin's Infant Food - the 'perfect substitute for Mother's milk,' along with Nestlé's Milk Food around the First World War. Bottles and nipples, the paraphernalia exemplifying new technologies and disembodiment of women in the process, also made it into newspapers such as the Malaysian Straits Times.²⁷ In Nairobi and Lagos, radio and television spots sold infant formula in "modern" ways. But in villages and beyond, the companies employed other techniques to reach and heal underdeveloped bodies. Notoriously, vans and trucks drove around selling Nestlé products to poor people without clean water. Proprietary foods and market expansion

²⁵ Raymond Williams, "Advertising: The Magic System," in Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays (London: Verso), 334.

²⁶ Gabrielle Palmer, The Politics of Breastfeeding, 186.

²⁷ Lenore Manderson, "Bottle Feeding and Ideology in Colonial Malaya: the Production of Change," *International Journal of Health Services* 12, 4 (1982): 597-616, examples quoted in Palmer, 186.

marked rapid changes in rate and scale, eventually leading to buying, selling, and dumping of products around the world. When the health of infants grabbed activist attentions, when MNCs seemed to actually threaten global order, and when churches worried about their investments in mega-corporations doing business in South Africa under apartheid or in Asia selling milk products, then imagined and real corporate threats to health and survival brought together disparate groups concerned with the struggle to save the world. In precisely material, actual terms, imperialism segued into the presence of global corporations, along with western medical and health experts, universal norms of health at the WHO, and other western incursions into the attempted management, and disciplining, of the entire species.

What the Nestlé boycott ultimate showed was the growing consciousness in the United States of the extension of this system on a world scale. Critics transcended borders, too, from consumer groups, churches, health professionals and politicians. The marketing system existed for baby food and infant survival, and represented a kind of neoliberal conquest. This framing illuminated why privatized food distribution and replacing a woman's organic self with manufactured, technological implements existed as a life-or-death issue for many people. Like modern capitalism writ large, value, exploitation, and political struggle lay behind a commodity's appearance. Marketing systems proved "that the material object being sold is never enough."²⁸ Baby food helped to ground criticisms of fantasy with a near-universal human truth of infant feeding and growth. Formula marketing demonstrated pure materialism replaced by a dream existence. Objects turned into mythological existences, or fetishes, such as the bottle

²⁸ Raymond Williams, Problems in Materialism and Culture, 320, 335.

filled with Lactogen. Advertising seemed to "have been developed to sell persons," wrote Williams.²⁹ Rhetoric and practice often combined during the boycott to create babies as products, as objects.

Capitalism Begins with the Love of Families

Western industrial capitalism, it might be said, rested on the reproductive labor of women, on babies feeding inside a male-protected home, raised to compete, produce and consume in the marketplace. Capitalism expanded as families gained greater capacity to consume. Individual consumption was always central to capitalism's logic, to be sure. But consumption by and for families, whether those families were rural or urban, agricultural or industrial, had since the nineteenth century been the crux of consumer demand in the West. If capitalism depended on a population prepared and disciplined, and even coerced, to consume, one preeminent site of such consumption, and coercion, was the body itself.

This sort of logic was not an invention of late-twentieth-century academic cultural studies. Consider the conservative popular writer George Gilder, who in the early 1970s penned an elaborate defense of this prototypical male-breadwinner family, couched in an acerbic takedown of modern feminism.³⁰ Feminists' "greed," he wrote in *Sexual Suicide* ". . . leads therefore as by an invisible hand not to a soundly growing economy but to a rampantly growing welfare state. It leads to socialism, not capitalism." In their desire for personal autonomy, women in the feminist movement manifested pure greed and threatened to destroy America, and civilization itself. Infants must enjoy health in order

²⁹ Ibid, 333.

³⁰ George Gilder, Men and Marriage, (Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing), 194-97.

to eventually contribute to "The Economy," and growth. "Capitalism begins with the love of families for their children," Gilder went on, "and the belief that any child may grow up and make huge contributions to his society." The power of this system resided within the nuclear family, properly administered as an orderly and moral domain. And the sanctified center, the very core of the system, contained the mother and her infant. Consequently, Gilder wrote, without a trace of irony, "capitalism begins at the mother's breast, with the feminine belief in the sanctity of every life, enshrined in the family and equal before God."³¹ The system's impulse, its core imperatives - like the mother's baby growing and developing, and her instincts for feeding and survival within patriarchy's protective umbrella - remained growth and development. People, like the company and the economy, were duty-bound to expand.

Gilder's perfect world envisioned expansion and economic health, which depended on sound female bodies and healthy families making a prosperous nation. He presented this vision from the perspective of growth and productivity. Women nurtured their children, and they breastfed. The entire system rested on the women's body and her reproductive and caring capacities. In the 1970s, however, women's liberation and sexual freedom were leading to social decay. Socialism, according to Gilder, was a selfish political and economic organization that retarded growth, led to broken families, and ruined social cohesion.

Feminist and liberal responses to Gilder embodied the tensions that ran through the entire baby food/marketing debates as they began to take shape in the 1970s. Judith Hennessee, a journalist and member of the National Organization for Women (NOW),

³¹ Gilder, Men and Marriage, 194-97.

wrote in the New York Times when Sexual Suicide appeared that, "one reads this elaborate, Freud-haunted apology for patriarchy with a depressing sense of déjà vu."³² "Whether men invent a mythology that makes women superior or inferior," Hennessee continued, "the end result is likely to be the same - women belong in the home."³³ Women in the home defined the system, according to postwar ideologies, and even national survival depended on women remaining in this domestic sphere, caring for children and nurturing breadwinning husbands. Subscribe to this ideology, Gilder and others seemed to say, and everything would be okay.³⁴

While feminists derided Gilder, Sexual Suicide became a popular anti-feminist manifesto. Feminists and those allied with the women's movement hated the book, yet women were divided about the role of breastfeeding versus bottle-feeding. Feminist critiques of WHO and the Academy of American Pediatrics perhaps surprised some, because these institutions advocated healthy, breastfed babies. As Linda Blum and anthropologist Dana Raphael noted, the WHO Code paid little attention to actual women and their needs, and imagined a universal health standard imposed from on high.³⁵ For

³² Judith Adler Hennessee, Review of Sexual Suicide, "What We Don't Know About Sex Will Fill an Encyclopedia," New York Times, December 9, 1973.

³³ Hennessee, "What We Don't Know About Sex Will Fill an Encyclopedia," New York Times, December 9, 1973.

³⁴ See Margot Canaday, The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009) and Mae Ngai, Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004) for methodological framing of the state of humanity and the norms of health, and how health perspectives reflected and performed upon capitalism and global administration/governance.

³⁵ We will see later that activists and boycotters derided Dana Raphael and her Human Lactation Center because the formula companies appropriated her findings, and funded her research. INFACT chairman Doug Johnson criticized her position with special force. But her interpretation reflected many feminists, and thus united feminism and industry on this issue.

some women, this pro-breastfeeding perspective forced women back into the homes, under the patriarchal and capitalist palms of power. If Gilder and his anti-feminist comrades advocated women breastfeeding their capitalist babies and nurturing their out-in-the-world capitalist hunter-husbands, for many feminists a top-down WHO mandate was not necessarily much better.³⁶

The critical feminist intervention in the kind of patriarchal politics represented by Gilder was the women's health movement. Though movements around women's health and rights can be traced, like many elements of this story, to the nineteenth century, most scholars agree that the modern women's health movement began in the late 1960 and early 1970s.³⁷ Nationally, grassroots activism and structural changes began nurturing social justice movements within the field of women's health. For example, in the 1970s more women began attending medical school. Title IX and the Public Health Service Act of 1975 both contributed to more women engaged in medical education, and in conversations about health issues. Women attempted to take control over both the

³⁶ One sociologist noted that for men like Gilder, women's liberation threatened masculinity and American civilization: Gilder, 133, quoted in Barry M. Dank, "Sexual Suicide," *Review, Contemporary Sociology* 3, no. 5 (September 1, 1974): 418–419. Dank wrote that American males such as Gilder also fought gun control since the American-male "hunters", providing for women and children in nuclear households filled with American-produced commodities, supporting the entirety of post-war capitalist growth and development, protected the home. In protecting the home, they asserted their manhood and found fulfillment.

³⁷ Important work on the women's health movement includes Wendy Kline, Bodies of Knowledge: Sexuality, Reproduction and Women's Health in the Second Wave (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010); Sheryl Burt Ruzek, The Women's Health Movement: Feminist Alternatives to Medical Control (New York: Praeger, 1978); Sandra Morgen, Into Our Own Hands: The Women's Health Movement in the United States, 1969-1990 (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2002); Francine H. Nichols, "History of the Women's Health Movement in the 20th Century," Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing 29, no. 1 (January 1, 2000): 56–64; Boston Women's Health Book Collective, and History of Science Collection (Brown University), Our Bodies, Ourselves: A Book by and for Women (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976); Kathy Davis, The Making of Our Bodies, Ourselves: How Feminism Travels across Borders (Next Wave. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).

discourse surrounding their health and lives, but also their material bodies, their actual selves.

The women's health movement followed a similar pattern in the 1960s and 1970s of questioning the inherited structures and beliefs. With the rise of medicalized childbirth and health care, women's groups increasingly sought self-empowerment in many ways. They organized groups who shared health information with each other, they wrote pamphlets and gave talks; women founded clinics and took female health matters into their own hands and, most important, away from male doctors. The thousands of letters and testimonies within the Boston Women's Health Book Collective (BWHBC) archives demonstrates just how frustrated women were when dealing with the patriarchal medical establishment. But also their sense of unity and liberation when finding one another, realizing their common cause, and acting to serve their own interests and push back against subjugation and humiliation.

In 1969, the first group of women who would found the Boston Women's Health Book Collective met at a workshop called "Women and Their Bodies," and began compiling knowledge about their experiences in a nation of patriarchal health. In 1970, they published almost two hundred pages called "Women and Their Bodies." And in 1971, the BWHBC published Our Bodies, Ourselves. In 1973, Barbara Ehrenreich and Deidre English published an essay "Witches, Midwives, and Nurses: A History of Female Healers," which they later expanded into For Her Own Good, an excellent study on more than a century of male "expert" advice to women. Women fought back against the male-dominant, capitalist-dominant primitive accumulation – the primary theft – of their

bodies.³⁸ This convergence of bodies, privatization and theft was central to understanding critical perspectives on the rise of transnational experts and multinational corporations.

Following these particular supra-national trends, the women's health movement exploded internationally, with groups forming networks, organizing conferences and publishing their materials. The infant feeding controversy and the Nestlé boycott united many women across the globe, first across the Atlantic, and then to Malaysia and the Philippines. The BWHBC corresponded with Jane Cottingham, who in Geneva ran the Women's International Information and Communication Service (WICCE). Letters between the two organizations revealed their attempts to establish international networks, hold conferences and add to their long list of women's rights issues.³⁹ Associates from around the world, including the founding members of BWHBC, Judy Norsigian, Pamela Morgan, and Norma Swenson, joined women from the United Methodist Church, World Council of Churches, World YWCA, Asian region Freedom from Hunger campaign of FAO, the Women's Liberation Movement, the International Documentation & Communication Center in Rome; the Swedish International Development Agency, and groups in Egypt, Colombia, Chile, Senegal, and the Netherlands.⁴⁰ Women showed an

³⁸ On "primitive accumulation," see Karl Marx, Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production (London: S. Sonnenchein, Lowrey, 1887); Silvia Federici, Caliban and the Witch (New York: Autonomedia, 2005), and Stephen Hymer, "Robins Crusoe and the Secrets of Primitive Accumulation," Monthly Review 63 No. 4, (January 2001 [Reprint]). Many critics of the dominant system saw the motives behind imperialism and capitalism, as control over foreign land bodies and extraction of resources, as the same as thieving the bodies of women and children, especially within the control of the modes of reproduction. For Federici, and for scholars like Sandra Morgen, coercion, control, and consumerism had been thrust upon women.

³⁹ See BWHBC Collection, "Collaborations, Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies," and ISIS Project, MC 503, Cartons 47 and 48, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies.

⁴⁰ See ISIS-WICCE materials, Carton 48, Folder #5, MC503 BWHBC, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies.

awareness of the problems of development in developing countries, and on developing children and their mothers. ISIS wrote a guide entitled Women & Development that they sent to women in Boston and around the world.

The women's health movement also nurtured breastfeeding activists and anticapitalist agitators around the world. One of the boycott activists, Leah Margulies, noted that her involvement in progressive grassroots politics and concerns about multinational corporations and health came out of her involvement in the women's health movement in Boston. She attended many living room consciousness-raising talks, and played in the Women's Liberation Rock Band in Boston.⁴¹ Jane Cottingham, a women's health activists who in 1976 disseminated a booklet called Bottle Babies on the global infant formula controversy, corresponded with the BWHBC, consolidating international networks between the Global North and South. Cottingham wrote to the group in Boston, "as you probably know, Isis is an international women's information and communication service based in Geneva, Switzerland and Rome, Italy." Founded in 1974, the organization "built up a network of 10,000 contacts in about 100 countries of the world, and a data base of more than 80,000 items of documentation and information by and about women and women's movements worldwide." In the late 1970s and early 1980s, women formed networks to combat not just patriarchy, but also capitalist imperialism and the commercialization of women's bodies and minds; women around the world helped each other "develop their own positive alternatives"⁴²

⁴¹ Leah Margulies, Interview with the author, February 2007.

⁴² Jane Cottingham to BWHBC, "ISIS letter and the Women's International Cross-Cultural Exchange," (Geneva, November 25, 1983). ISIS Project, MC 503, Carton 48, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies.

The BWHBC work on breast-feeding and contraceptives demonstrated the importance of the group's national and international labors within the age of capital. The collective provided detailed information about contraceptives, when many women in the US hoped for safe contraceptives for women, to be used by women. Women's self-help clinics and their production of knowledge, covering everything from breast feeding, cervical caps, college age contraceptive use, contraceptive effectiveness, contraceptive funding, "costs of birth control methods," Essentials of Contraceptive Technology, and information on the Dalkon Shield, are all in keeping with the BWHBC's method of operation, its drive toward self-education for women, and the sharing and international dissemination of this learning. Their work also provided evidence on the amount of effort that went in to educating women, and claiming their own bodies, that was necessary in a patriarchal, conservative country.⁴³

Bearing in mind that abortion was illegal in the United States in the 1960s, the fight for reproductive rights emerged as a core issue in the women's health movement. Moreover, no matter one's personal orientation, it is easy to see why the cultural medical practice that created the clinical space of a supine naked woman examined by a clothed male expert could start a social movement.⁴⁴ The political culture in the United States also influenced the movement, including civil rights, "antiwar, student, and welfare rights" that contributed to activist mobilizations. Progressive critics singled out "racism,

⁴³ BWHBC, MC 667, Carton 27, Folder #1, Schlesinger Library Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies.

⁴⁴ See Ellen Frankfort, Vaginal Politics (New York: Vintage, 1970).

sexism, capitalism and imperialism” as the structural forces that impinged women’s rights.⁴⁵

Nutrition and National Development: Experts Design the World

As much as some activists, UNICEF/WHO, and mothers looked to doctors for support during the infant formula controversy, it is inescapable that pediatrics contributed to the rise of formula and artificial infant feeding in the first place. Emerging professions struggled for respect and access to their own control of specialist knowledge. In the late nineteenth-century, when companies utilized the allure of science and technology to produce artificial foods, so too pediatrics labored vigorously to find artificial baby food that actually worked, that mimicked breast milk, and that did not kill babies. Over time, doctors created fractions and percentage breakdowns for specific foods and child ages, thus leading to the word "formula."⁴⁶

Industry poised itself to supply demand, and to create need wherever it could. The formula companies began addressing demand on an international scale. In this way, infant feeding and the baby food controversy illuminated the rise of global capitalism. As Rima Apple, an activist scholar of baby food politics influenced by the women’s health movement, and food historian Harvey Levenstein, who wrote an influential formula controversy article at the end of the boycott, showed in their studies, the companies

⁴⁵ Morgen, 3; See also Francine H. Nichols, “History of the Women’s Health Movement in the 20th Century,” *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing* 29, no. 1 (January 1, 2000): 56–64.

⁴⁶ See Levenstein, "'Best for Babies' or 'Preventable Infanticide'?", 75–94, especially 80–83 on the rise of professional pediatrics in America. Additionally, Levenstein's article shed light on the entire baby food controversy, showing that the social, political, economic and cultural struggles of the 1970s and 1980s existed in a much longer history than any of the participants - save perhaps the Nestlé S.A. - realized.

quickly learned that they needed the doctors and other health experts on their side. Levenstein demonstrated that "after 1912 most infant-food companies began turning out products requiring detailed instructions from physicians regarding their preparation." Therefore, as INFACT activists later emphasized, "promotional campaigns became directed primarily at the medical profession." The consequences of this expert linkage were that "with proprietary infant foods now reinforcing rather than undermining physicians' status and income, medical opposition to them practical vanished." During the 1970s and 1980s, the AMA and national pediatric associations all underlined the importance of breastmilk. But the AMA also qualified this emphasis in ways that industry had as well - namely that some conditions called for proprietary foods, the situation was too complex to blame one actor, and the ultimate cause of infant mortality was poverty not formula.⁴⁷

Nutrition and infant feeding existed within ideas and practices governing national development. Some observers saw breastfeeding as an answer to international scarcity and economic stagnation. Utilizing more human milk would beneficially affect food insufficiency, but also the entire "world resource crisis."⁴⁸ Derrick Jelliffe's work on infant feeding in the Third World influenced east and west, north and south, and "developed" and "undeveloped" regions within the cumulative realms of human ecology. His deep concerns for babies and the conditions of bodily sickness and ecological unhealth, his medical practicing for thirty years in impoverished regions and his published science, impacted every participant and nearly every specific moment in the broad history

⁴⁷ Levenstein, 92.

⁴⁸ See Derrick Jelliffe and Eleanore Jelliffe, "Human milk, nutrition, and the world resource crisis," Science, (May 9, 1975), 556-561.

of the Nestlé boycott. Jelliffe and nutrition expert Alan Berg, especially in his seminal The Nutrition Factor, argued that diminished breastfeeding equated to a loss in national resources in the tens of millions of dollars.⁴⁹ Within the World Bank, Berg lobbied bank president Robert McNamara, no stranger to statistics, for greater allocation of financial resources to studying nutrition and national development.

Healthy babies positively impacted GDP, and thus economic development and the creation of new consumers. Nutrition scholar Michael Latham wrote about nutrition and infection related to national development, as well.⁵⁰ He led a research team assembled by USAID in 1978 to study infant feeding in the Third World. Many hundreds of academic and scientific journals published studies on infant feeding in the 1970s and 1980s, when worries about breastfeeding declines and multinational formula companies raised new questions about baby feeding and global politics. The Canadian Paediatric Society and the American Academy of Pediatrics held talks and published summaries on breastfeeding during the Year of the Child, in 1978-9. The nutrition committees for both academies and the report's co-authors were all men. At the United Nations, reports on

⁴⁹ I take up this argument further in Chapter Four.

⁵⁰ Michael Latham, "Nutrition and infection in national development," Science (May, 9 1975), 561-565. Latham was Professor of International Nutrition at Cornell University, he organized USAID's study in four different locations (Kenya Colombia, Thailand, and Indonesia) in the Third World. The group included a team from Cornell, Columbia University, and the Population Council of New York. Additionally, Penny Van Esterik joined as anthropological expert in 1980. The study united expert statistics with real people - mothers and infants - within the global politics of human breasts and development. The USAID report was collected as Beverly Winikoff, Mary Castle, and V. Laukaran, Feeding Infants in four Societies: Causes and Consequences of Mothers' Choices (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988). See also B. Winikoff, M. Latham, and G. Solimano, The Infant Feeding Study: Semarang, Nairobi, Bogotá, and Bangkok Site Reports, (New York, Population Council), 1983; also Barbara Winikoff, "Nutrition, Population and Health: Some Implications for Policy," Science 200, (1978): 895-902.

infant nutrition and breastfeeding also contributed to the social and political noise about the issue.⁵¹

The Canadian and American professional pediatrics organizations addressed the issue of breastfeeding and including many of the themes noted elsewhere. The group understandably emphasized breastfeeding for infants when possible. Education for proper feeding should cross many segments and boundaries, including "provided in schools for all children" and added to the "curriculum of physicians and nurses." Television and radio should educate the masses, and women undergo prenatal education about breastfeeding. Health professionals in clinics and hospitals should be supportive and knowledgeable. These usual recommendations from health professionals came with a unique economic justice angle, though. "Studies should be conducted on the feasibility of breast-feeding infants at day nurseries adjacent to places of work subsequent to an appropriate leave of absences following the birth of an infant." For some, maternity leave and workplace breastfeeding stations amounted to socialism. And yet women's health experts and the groups concerned about infant health in developing countries placed these items at the forefront of their social struggles.⁵²

The world food crisis in the 1970s led to research, congressional investigations and a world food summit at the UN in 1974. Billions of people and their food consumption affected the human environment with newly understood global implications. Holism became a way for theoretically understanding the world, and implementing

⁵¹ "Breast-Feeding: Nutrition Committee of the Canadian Paediatric Society and the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics: A Commentary in Celebration of the International Year of the Child, 1979," Pediatrics 62 No. 4, (1978).

⁵² Canadian and American Nutrition Committee, 598.

practice within it.⁵³ Science covered the food crisis in 1975, and in it Dr. Jelliffe and Alan Berg profoundly influenced discussions and the politics of infant malnutrition in the emergent struggles over development.⁵⁴ Jelliffe argued that solutions to "these complex world problems" lay in greater compromise and mutual understanding. Never in the entire controversy did Jelliffe imagine breastmilk as a total solution or formula as a total evil, contrary to the corporations or conservatives' interpretations.⁵⁵ An individual mother's breast provided proper nutrition, economic power for people and nations, and "simultaneous biological contraception and free oral immunization." Further, pragmatic approaches between all political and economic actors, and the women themselves, would help the global "search for compromises between technological and biotraditional methods."⁵⁶ Some feminists, of course, feared such "biotraditional" methods. In Chapter

⁵³ Nutrition image, Science (May 9, 1975), 556. See Linda Sargent Wood, A More Perfect Union: Holistic Worldviews and the Transformation of American Culture after World War II, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

⁵⁴ I think, conceptually, linguistically and practically, we should pay special note to the fact that both Jelliffes worked at UCLA's Division of Population Family, and International Health. I hope to always foreground the question, what is global health, world health, international health? What did people mean when they thought and lived within that rubric, and how did it impact society and politics.

⁵⁵ See business ethics scholar Lisa Newton and her skeptical idea of "The Jelliffe Scenario," which she claimed misled generations of activists, medical professionals and business executives. See Lisa Newton, "A New Power Agenda: Tracking the Emergence of a New Global Polity in the Infant Formula Controversy," Business & Professional Ethics Journal 19, no. 2 (July 1, 2000): 5–39, and "A Question of Power: Science-Based Enterprise and the Non-Governmental Organization." Business & Professional Ethics Journal 20, no. 3/4 (October 1, 2001): 49–78.

⁵⁶ For example, Jelliffe noted that "human milk should be recognized as a national resource in economic, agronomic, and nutritional planning" for nations and international organizations concerned with total concepts; contemporaneous models included, breastfeeding declines impacting national economies in Singapore after the war meant "family or agencies" spent \$1.8 million on artificial foods; in 1968, the Philippines "about \$33 million"; in Kenya, about \$11.5 million lost that "was equivalent to two-thirds of the health budget or one-fifth of the average economic aid." The World Bank explored similar numbers, USAID, and UN agencies; scientists,

Four I will explore the economic, nutritional and development issues deriving from Jelliffe's understanding. For now, it is helpful to unravel their emphasis on nutrition, on breastfeeding as a viable contraceptive, and as human milk as a national, and species-wide, natural resource.⁵⁷

The projections involved in breastmilk politics from Jelliffe's perspective included the administration of mass society within and across national boundaries. Expert oversight, education and implementation were seen as key. Family planning should be extended to all nations and transnational migrant or refugee populations. The health of infants and children, as noted, possessed a promise for national improvement and growth, and these connected seamlessly to "increased agricultural production of nutritionally relevant foods, family economic betterment," and health services for children. Within the concept of total population management, professionals concerned about Third World infant programs believed that these "should encompass simple surveillance by serial body measurements." Increasingly, experts measured GDP, populations, and human bodies.⁵⁸ Companies monitored infant bodies and breastfeeding habits, as well. Ross Laboratories, makers of infant formula, produced a marketing survey that noted breastfeeding numbers for 1973, finding that 35% of women breastfeed infants during the first week, but "by 3 and 6 months, only 17% and 6%" of women used their own milk. Consumer Reports and

economists and politicians also attempted such quantifications. We know, too, that MNCs expanding into new markets possessed their own set of numbers. See Jelliffe, Science, 557-560.

⁵⁷ See Jelliffe Human Milk in the Modern World, testimony in Kennedy Hearings, in Nestlé libel case, Berne Switzerland, and in *Science*, 55. For full citation of Kennedy Hearings, please see 79n on page 35.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 558.

Mead Johnson monitored breastfeeding habits, too, within the politics of consumption.⁵⁹

In the industrialized world, the epidemiology of infant feeding provided companies with incentives to supply demand for artificial foods.

Berg and Jelliffe studied the economic benefits of breastmilk and its importance for nutritional and national development. Berg wrote that it was, “possible to estimate the economic contribution of the nursing mother to her child's nourishment.”⁶⁰ Here, the mother became a manufacturer, a factory producing a product, a domesticated object that possessed economic value. The multinational food companies competed directly with human mothers in the production of food for infants, of milk for babies; and dairy farmers contended with human bodies in the domestic production of foodstuffs for growing humans on individual and mass scales. Berg, along with other nutrition experts, quantified human milk value and its relationship to individual, family and national budgets. One example existed in data collected for mother's milk, cow's milk, and "whole powdered milk formula," for human milk production versus the costs of milk substitutes. Berg also included a section on the global infant feeding crisis, and hoped to address the impression of high infant mortality rates in developing countries.⁶¹ Furthermore, his concerns detailed, for the World Bank as well as the Brookings Institute that, "experts

⁵⁹ "Breast-Feeding: Nutrition Committee of the Canadian Paediatric Society and the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics," *Pediatrics*, 596.

⁶⁰ Alan Berg, *The Nutrition Factor: Its Role in National Development* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1973), 229-230; see also Derrick Jelliffe, *Human Milk in the Modern World*, in which he and his wife Eleanore supplied such data, and the "world consequences of early weaning," 128-132, and 241-245. This type of thinking also existed within ideas of family planning, whereupon lactation was known to interrupt fertility and act as a form of birth control. "In terms of national development, lactation has another major economic asset – its link to family planning."

⁶¹ Berg, *The Nutrition Factor*, 103.

and policy makers . . . have been changing their view of the malnutrition problem" because this former "welfare problem" began to be viewed as a major obstacle to development." National health remained constructed upon healthy, growing bodies; developing bodies for developing countries. Here was the central issue, the vital common denominator in a materialist conception of historical change during an extremely turbulent time.

In Berg's conceptual framework, women existed for creating infant bodies that would grow into productive adults capable of labor, consumption, and national development. Berg's facts aimed to show that children who breastfed for two years received "an average of 396 quarts of breast milk. That is nutritionally equal to 461 quarts of cow's milk, which could cost about \$65, a not insubstantial portion of most family incomes in developing countries. For packaged dried milk formulas, which increasingly are finding their way into food stalls of local bazaars, the cost would be close to \$140."⁶² Women fought against expert advice directed at their bodies, and especially the idea of women as machines or milk-producing animals - the disembodied mother transformed into a domesticated animal capable of producing milk for reproduction.

In 1973, people worried about world hunger, national development, and food security. To grow people, healthy nations, and to save humanity itself, many thought, babies must feed at their mother's breasts.⁶³ World health depended on it; and world

⁶² Alan Berg, "Mother's Milk: A Wasted Food," The Washington Post, Times Herald (1959-1973). April 29, 1973, sec. OUTLOOK Editorials Columnists, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁶³ Furthermore, Berg once mentioned that "the most important subject in slave management was sufficiency of food," quoting a pre-Civil War Virginia planter. Chattel management historians have studied at length, especially studies of the relationships between slavery and capitalism.

health necessarily mirrored the health of humanity.⁶⁴ Protein and health drove the body, the LDCs, and the species forward in some vision of progressive movement - the developed and the undeveloped - a vision of mobility inherent in the verb "developing." World health held forth a universal vision, a wellness norm, a growing person in a growing human universe. The entire baby food controversy, within an emerging context where concerns about MNCs held center stage evinced the social struggles over healthy and sick babies, about growth and power in a dangerous, imperiled world.

Berg worked for MIT, and for the World Bank by the time of his famous publication. Economist Alok Bhargava's exploration of food, economics and health noted Berg's understanding of the links between underdevelopment and under-nutrition in an "economic view of the nutritional sciences"⁶⁵ This perspective, according to one reviewer, "still forms the core of the World Bank's approach to nutrition today."⁶⁶ The World Bank, the World Health Organization, and the MNCs themselves, possessed

Chattel and bookkeeping, chattel and clothing, chattel and domestic animals: but few have really noted the management and domestication, of the entire species, in thought and in attempted practice. Pundits like Gilder believed, not only empire and slavery rested on the foundation of the mother and baby feeding, but so did capitalism itself. Berg quoted in Devi Sridhar, "Economic Ideology and Politics in the World Bank: Defining Hunger," New Political Economy 12, no. 4 (2007): 499–516.

⁶⁴Anna Davin. "Imperialism and Motherhood." History Workshop no. 5 (April 1, 1978): 9–65.

⁶⁵ Alok Bhargava, Food, Economics, and Health (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Bhargava and Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy (World Health Organization), Modeling the Effects of Health on Economic Growth (World Health Organization, 2000); see A. K. McLennan, "Food, Economics and Health. By Alok Bhargava," Journal of Biosocial Science 41, no. 02 (2009): 287–288.

⁶⁶ Please see A. K. McLennan, "Review of Food, Economics and Health. By Alok Bhargava," Journal of Biosocial Science 41, no. 02 (2009): 287–88, and Devi Sridhar, "Economic Ideology and Politics in the World Bank: Defining Hunger," New Political Economy 12, no. 4 (2007): 499–516, for an exceptional discussion of the World Bank, of "global governance," world hunger, order and regulation, and ideas of hegemony viz. IOs and assumptions of health, norms of economic activity, and food.

images of management and market access that amounted to a total vision of knowing and of prescriptions for health and profit. Of course, social history has taught us to note the "practical limitations of studies and their subsequent analyses or models."⁶⁷ These combined ideas of statistical dominance, of cataloging and seeing, were never able to manage all people everywhere. Expert studies, corporate market research, and the UN's vast databanks focused on humanity; the World Health Organization's impulse on universal norms of health; and yet billions of people remained without proper health care, clean water, or economic opportunity.

In a time of the disastrous Sahel famine between 1968 and 1975, the World Food Conference in Rome (1974) and the increasing notice of MNCs and food distribution, popular and scholarly attention focused on core survival issues. One writer, a director of social development at the Ford Foundation, discussed "nourishing the nation," where nutrition and food led directly to national health and growth.⁶⁸ Scarcity and want seemed to pervade; but so did popular criticisms of "abundance." Discursively, assumptions posed by some illustrated ideas about improvement, nutrition and productivity, that capitalism's entire edifice rested upon. For example, a 1975 article in the Washington Post outlined the role of nutrition "for people who must assume responsibility for

⁶⁷ McLennan, "Review of Food, Economics and Health," 287-88. James Scott noted this perspective for his "high modernism" interpretation in Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

⁶⁸ Food and famine focused many popular thinkers, politicians and activists during the era. We have already looked at Ehrlich's The Population Bomb. Other texts of the era included Anthony Burgess, The Wanting Seed (London: Heinemann, 1962), which declared this novel could be described as a Malthusian strip cartoon, for its underlying theme is the problem the whole world may soon have to face - over-population." Other popular books in this series, which reflected the deep penetration of this new global thinking coupled with anxieties about survival, were William Paddock, Famine, 1975! America's Decision: Who Will Survive? (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967); Time of Famines: America and the World Food Crises (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976).

performance." The author outlined three categories where food demanded a planner's full focus: the "manager of a major construction project in a poor country" whose "fee is dependent" on worker productivity; a "commander of troops" and his supply line; and a prison warden, because "adequate meals for his prisoners" related to their behavior. The management of populations increased from multiple angles, public and private, mixed and hybrid, local and global.⁶⁹

William McPherson of the Post introduced the above material in a Book World section on hunger and famine, and while doing so evinced a global, united vision of solutions to these problems. One explanation lay in reading books like Alan Berg's text. McPherson quoted a contemporaneous Harpers piece that asked, "Why are most people in the world hungry?" The affluent society, the "land of plenty" yielded the "paradox of plenty," in Harvey Levenstein's phrase.⁷⁰ The abundantly producing U.S. existed as a land "where the livestock consume as much grain each year as all the people of China and India, where the pets of the affluent eat beef while the poor eat dog food, where the children eat Froot Loops."⁷¹ In this landscape of poverty and hunger, of famine in Africa

⁶⁹ Sol Chafkin, "Nourishing the Nations," The Washington Post, April 13, 1975, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁷⁰ Harvey Levenstein, Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

⁷¹ Note especially the excellent research career of Marion Nestlé, who wrote many books on the politics of food, including pet food. Marion Nestlé, Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health, California Studies in Food and Culture 3 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Pet Food Politics: The Chihuahua in the Coal Mine (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008); Safe Food: Bacteria, Biotechnology, and Bioterrorism, California Studies in Food and Culture 5 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2003); Why Calories Count: From Science to Politics, California Studies in Food and Culture 33, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012).

and Asia, of malnutrition and breastfeeding, people sought big answers to global questions.⁷²

Levenstein, who early in the baby food controversy demonstrated the longer history of artificial infant feeding and its unique concerns and social struggles, also researched food production and America in Paradox of Plenty. In a broad study of the social history of eating in America, he covered nutrition concerns for the national defense. Nutrition as a science expanded, as did the role of the expert; new technologies for understanding vitamins and nutrition contributed to a belief that the United States, within its affluent abundance, was in fact greatly malnourished. Thus, Susan George, in an Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) project titled Feeding the Few, slammed capitalist economic injustice and the inequitable distribution of food.⁷³

⁷² William McPherson, "Looking into the Lean Years," Washington Post, April 3, 1975, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. The "editors of Book World have pre-empted our regular features and assembled this special section on the food crisis." Starvation, the technologies of species-awareness, and capitalism converged within a vast political arena. See the way people imagine global warming today.

⁷³ See Susan George, Feeding the Few: Corporate Control of Food (Washington, D.C., Institute for Policy Studies, 1979). She was a fellow at the Transnational Institute (TNI) and she wrote the book for TNI's International Economic Order Project. She covered what she called the "new imperialist economic order." George was an "active militant in the anti-Vietnam-war struggle." She and TNI also created a "counter-report" for the 1974 World Food Conference, titled World Hunger: Causes and Remedies. In 1976 she published her full views on the above in How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger, (Montclair, N.J.: Allanheld, Osmun, 1977). This work also influenced her investigations of the Nestlé, in "Nestlé Alimentana SA: The Limits to Public Relations," Economic and Political Weekly 13, No. 37 (Sept. 16, 1978), which explored its FDI impacts in the Third World. The company did not come off well in her analysis. Susan George, Food for Beginners (New York: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative Society, Ltd. ; Distributed in the USA by W.W. Norton 1982); Ill Fares the Land: Essays on Food, Hunger, and Power (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Policy Studies, 1984). As we will see in Chapter Four, Richard Barnet's IPS work led to the bestselling book Global Reach, on MNC rampant power, an important contribution to the broader story. Richard Barnet, Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974). I cover Frank Church's subcommittee investigations into MNCs in this chapter, and how Leah Margulies, Stephen Hymer, and Richard Barnet were connected. Barnet said that George's analysis helped

According to Levenstein, the postwar era produced "Recommended Daily Allowances" that a National Nutrition Conference concocted in 1941. Wartime desires for a healthy fighting force *and* a healthy population drove these concerns. The conference "turned out to be just what a host of public and private agencies were looking for: an official-looking yardstick for judging how well everyone from factory workers in Chicago to GIs in New Guinea were being fed. The subtle term 'allowance' was usually ignored, and individuals whose diets did not come up to its high standards were then deemed undernourished." President Roosevelt had called the "three-day conference" in order to "suggest a program to improve the nation's nutrition."⁷⁴ National nutrition existed for bodily health, the health of a population, for wartime defense, for national wellbeing, and for capitalist expansion. Soldiers needed food, as did workers, as did future consumers: America's children.

The Refrigerator, The Bottle and Modernity

Much of the debate among First World experts about Third World non-experts, such as mothers with their own methods for childrearing, centered on the role of clean water, proper sanitation, and storage technologies such as the refrigerator. Postwar American capitalism and its "consumer republic" were grounded in the suburban nuclear family.⁷⁵ The implements of the modern home, and especially of the modern kitchen, underlay the

explain "what is happening to the world food system, and why people in the Third World are hungry."

⁷⁴ Levenstein, 66.

⁷⁵ See Kenneth Jackson, Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), and Thomas Sugrue, Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996).

growth of consumer culture and a political economy based upon consumption. Over-consumption, in fact, as demonstrated by the total growth principal, became the essential element of economic health.⁷⁶ Thus, in the conversations about infant health - and attempts at practicing these values in the real world - the refrigerator became a device, much like the bottle, that symbolized modernity, development and often unspoken assumptions about economic vitality. Infant health and economic health became linked by such technologies.

The refrigerator and the bottle also demonstrated the American Way of Life, and the political economy of postwar United States and Europe. The refrigerator, as kitchen device, functioned as a wedge between East and West, as a symbol of class, as a machine for proper survival in the modern era, as a product for consumers. The refrigerator and baby bottle represented the North. And non-refrigeration, in the tropical, disease-ridden climates, signified the unhealthy South. Refrigeration and air-conditioning reflected healthy growth into unsavory climes. One legal scholar querying MNCs and health in the Third World asserted that, "human milk does not require refrigeration until expressed, and some experts maintain it can be safely stored at room temperature for at least eight hours."⁷⁷ And, perhaps to be expected, other experts argued that breast milk developed bacteria if left at room temperature in as little as two hours.

During the 1978 Edward Kennedy hearings on the boycott and the broader formula controversy, detailed in later chapters, industry provided UN data that detailed

⁷⁶ Lizabeth Cohen, A Consumer's Republic: the Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America (New York: Knopf, 2003); Meg Jacobs, Pocketbook Politics: Economic Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005).

⁷⁷ Nancy Zelman, "The Nestlé Infant Formula Controversy: Restricting the Marketing Practice of Multinational Corporations in the Third World," Transnational Lawyer, 3 (1990), 703.

infant mortality rates around the world. These data showed a near-universal decline in infant mortality from 1920 to 1976, and formula companies used this evidence in defense of artificial feeding and its contribution to wealth creation. During the height of the baby food controversy, corporations, politicians and public health officials all quoted and argued about mortality rates and national numbers for states around the world.⁷⁸ They gathered demographic data for meetings with the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR), for February 1976.⁷⁹ In 1920, for example, the U.S. national rate was 75.7 for 1000 live births; in 1950, it declined to 29.2; in 1970 to 20.1 (By comparison, according to the U.S. Census for 1900, infant mortality statistics showed the death rate at almost 190 out of 1,000 live births in New York City).⁸⁰ Switzerland in 1975, home of Nestlé SA, possessed one of the world's lowest infant mortality rates. Chile during this period had appalling rates of infant death over much of the twentieth century. Sweden, one of the centers of the international boycott against Nestlé, sustained the lowest infant mortality rates in the world, according to UN vital statistics. In many countries and regions across the globe, these morbid rates dropped radically between 1954 and 1964, when breastfeeding showed marked decline. It is important to register throughout this baby food discussion that the richest countries in the world with the

⁷⁸ Levenstein, 84.

⁷⁹ Infant mortality rates from 1920 to 1973, from United Nations Demographic Yearbooks, 1954, 1968 and 1973; additional data from UN Population and Vital Statistics Reports and the 1975 UN Demographic Yearbook, collected in Senate Committee on Human Resources, Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations, 95th Cong., 2nd Sess., (hereafter Kennedy Hearings), May 23, 1978, 1488-1498. The records, testimonies and submissions make up around 1600 pages, including vital corporate material, such as internal memoranda between executives.

⁸⁰ United Nations Demographic data, collected for Kennedy Hearings, 1497.

lowest death rates were the ones that spirited a consumer boycott against the planet's largest food company.

Economic health actually contributed to bodily health and declining mortality rates. Improving the land, the body and the economy were related. Levenstein, after examining the assembled evidence, concluded that "rising standards of living, and especially of nutrition played a major role" in improving bodily health.⁸¹ Poverty as an overall understanding, an interpretive rubric, explained much of the health problems of the world over the last several hundred years. Critics of the current capitalist consensus, discussed later, have pointed their censorious fingers and political actions against the wealth and growth paradigm.⁸²

Business ethics and bioethics converged during the world hunger and infant formula conflicts. The Hastings Center, an institution that has focused on bioethics and public interest since 1969, turned its attention to the turmoil surrounding the boycott and produced a 1980 report. The report drew heavily from the Jelliffes' Human Milk in the Modern World, an instrumental text in an era of humanity-centered, millennial studies. The Jelliffes spoke the expert language of world human health, focused on biological survival, and concerned about the intersection of health, state regulation, and profit

⁸¹ Levenstein, 93; Additionally, he cited contemporaneous medical and scientific evidence that linked "low birth weight, low economic status, and high rates of infant mortality." Many studies during the "world food crisis" existed for the developed and underdeveloped worlds.

⁸² See Paul Farmer's work, Partners In Health (PIH), and studies such as Dying for Growth and Sickness and Wealth. These books, when paired against Milton Friedman or Hayek's The Road to Serfdom, demonstrated the fundamental ideological dichotomy that has existed since socialism and capitalism arose as political economic systems. The extreme ideological differences, through real world compromise and actual, contingent circumstances, have yielded a patchwork, as this dissertation explores during the creation of the WHO code of conduct. Nonetheless, blame, especially when babies died around the world, was easy to toss about, especially if one read the proper books.

within emerging markets. "The ill-consequences of bottle-feeding rather than breast-feeding are widespread, and very large dimensions, and can involve millions of infants throughout the world . . . In practical terms, breast-feeding is a key prophylactic against both marasmus *and* infantile obesity, against infective diarrhea *and* acute necrotizing enterocolitis, as well as the perfect promoter of physical growth and emotional development."⁸³

The expert class refused to relinquish knowledge about infant feeding and survival, within institutional sovereignties of states, international organizations, and corporations. The voice of the global expert rose to declare a unified vision of human health and planetary survival. Once again, women and their bodies required representation, as they demanded inclusion in these conversations from the margins. Whether it was capitalism, neoliberalism, patriarchy or other forms of totalized incursions, women represented the central core of family, national, and humanity health. This particular brand of politics became an issue of species survival that resided at women's bodies.

In a document titled "Facts for Life," UNICEF, WHO and UNESCO advised, "mothers with AIDS to continue breastfeeding their babies."⁸⁴ The life and death science was very serious, as health professionals, the World Health Organization, and state ministries detailed everything from vitamin deficiencies, diarrhea, blood clots and the HIV virus. Nutrition; vitamins D, K, and B1; rickets; bone development; hemorrhagic

⁸³ Hastings Center, "No Milk Like Mom's Milk: Nestlé, WHO, and the American Academy of Pediatrics Agree," The Hastings Center Report 10, No. 1, (Feb., 1980): 2.

⁸⁴ UNICEF, Facts for Life (New York: United Nations Children's Fund, 1989). UNICEF Publications can be accessed on the web. For example, see http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_53254.html (accessed March 11, 2014). Facts for Life is translated into over 200 languages.

disease caused from Vitamin K deficiency; bacteria; immune system defense - this and more became data for arguments among experts in various arena.⁸⁵ Integrated food systems and resource distribution informed central elements in the conversation about formula, babies and life. Infant mortality numbers as objective and quantifiable, met the subjectivities within notions of quality of life. Birth and death rates, growth and development patterns for bodies retained prominent places in all administrations concerned with health in the world.

What, then, was the relationship between world hunger movements and the infant formula controversy? In the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, modern nongovernmental organizations focused increasingly on the Third World, on world hunger and issues of exploitation. The group War on Want in England wrote its pamphlet The Baby Killer, and Third World Action Group in Switzerland translated it into German. The German rendition "Nestlé Kills Babies" incensed Nestlé, and led to the suit for libel and defamation. War on Want's work, though, requires a closer look, in order to trace assumptions and norms, along with ideals and practical action. Andy Chetley, for example, dedicated much of his entire professional life on this particular cause, and was responsible for consequential literature published on the issue. Until his death in December 2012, he helped create and maintain the global networks constructed through the 1970s and 1980s.⁸⁶ Chetley influenced activists in Europe concentrating on the

⁸⁵ Ibid, http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_53254.html (accessed March 11, 2014).

⁸⁶ Chetley's career followed the contours of this broader history. As noted elsewhere, he wrote The Baby Killer Scandal (1979), which updated Mike Muller's War on Want publication The Baby Killer: A War on Want Investigation into the Promotion and Sale of Powdered Baby Milks in the Third World (London: War on Want, 1974), ACA Records Collection, 144.B.16.138, Box 36, MHS; he dedicated his life to "the millions of children born into poverty," and worked in global health his entire career. He influenced the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk

problems of multinational corporations, accountability, and the issues of actual health and survival. War on Want engaged the struggle to save the world.

In the early 1970s, because of intensifying criticisms against the company, Nestlé invited activists from War on Want - and anyone else for that matter - to come to Vevey, Switzerland and hear the company's take on the formula issue, to visit its labs, and to see its survival versus mortality numbers. And so Mike Muller of War on Want visited Nestlé headquarters and toured their formula operations. He wrote the pamphlet that led to the Arbeitsgruppe Dritte Welt (or Third World Action Group – TWAG) pamphlet Nestlé Tötet Babies, which led to the infamous libel suit in Bern that, for the first of many times doomed Nestlé in the public relations realm. From Derrick Jelliffe's "Commerciogenic Malnutrition" article in 1972, a 1973 article titled "The Baby Food Tragedy" in The New Internationalist, which interviewed nutrition experts on the issue, to Muller's 1974 The Baby Killer, the story moved through the politics of dying babies and breastfeeding to a ready condemnation of industry.

After Muller's text came the translation by TWAG, and a total anti-capitalist, anti-industry, anti-free market condemnation of Nestlé and the formula industry. For many on the left - explicitly not the churches - this critique attacked big business. At the time TWAG was a "tiny left-wing student organization" which published "an altered" version of Muller's text, "leaving out *all* the qualifications." For Nestlé, "that was going too far,"

Substitutes (1981), or the WHO Code; he joined War on Want in 1972, mentored the influential NGO Baby Milk Action group in the UK, and was a founding member of the International Baby Food and Action Network (IBFAN). The food companies and pharmaceutical industries and their negative influence on world health drove his activities. In Bangladesh he worked against pharmaceutical MNCs. He published on this subject in A Healthy Business? World Health and the Pharmaceutical Industry (1990) and Problem Drugs (1995). He embodied global health activism and its criticism of corporate control of health, and the problems of growth, wealth and sickness. Growth and health, or growth and sickness, discursively and materially, propelled this era's politics.

wrote philosopher and business ethics scholar Lisa Newton, "especially after they had been so nice to Mike Muller."⁸⁷ Not only did the controversy catch Nestlé by surprise, activist charges wounded Nestlé's pride and self image, and the company did its best to offer not only its version of the story, but the general Third World "facts" about the issue.

There were multiple accounts of the trial and its effect on Nestlé's public relations. But Newton wrote one of the more concise versions: "Nestlé sued the ADW for libel on several counts, eventually narrowing them down to the title alone. The trial . . . was a mismatch: the ADW turned out to consist of 17 unknown activists who thoroughly enjoyed skewering the giant Nestlé in public for the two years' run of the trial. In July 1976 Nestlé won its case - but at a terrible cost in public relations. The trial positioned Dr. Jelliffe, who testified for the ADW, as the world's best known authority on infant nutrition, it gave worldwide currency to his scenario of poor third World mothers duped (by Nestlé, for its own profit) into using formula rather than breast-feeding, and it made The Baby Killer, in which that scenario played a central role, known in the United States."⁸⁸ Newton coined the phrase the "Jelliffe Scenario" to describe the unified

⁸⁷ Lisa Newton, "New Power," p. 9; and copyright page of Muller, The Baby Killer.

⁸⁸ Newton, 9. Newton's take was a welcome contribution to the controversy because it rested somewhere between the anti-capitalist activists and the corporate position. But she dismissed the Jelliffe's, who actually published important articles, engaged excellent work in saving lives in the Third World, and wrote a famous and important book, Human Milk in the Modern World. For Newton's general political and philosophical position, see a New York Times interview in 1988 discussion the environment, climate change and the role of market incentives in the issue. She is highly critical of ignoring the science and of pollution and waste in general; and she advocates a probably sane market answer to the problem, evidence of reform within rising neoliberalism. She discussed this political and survival issue in 1988. Some might argue that nothing much has changed since then, one of the core concerns about corporate boycotts over the long term more generally, especially that of the Nestlé boycott. "Connecticut Q & A, Lisa Newton, "We've Got To Stop Pollution Now," New York Times, (Accessed June 20, 2013): <http://www.nytimes.com/1988/12/11/nyregion/connecticut-q-a-lisa-newton-we-ve-got-to-stop-pollution->

criticism versus industry. The film Bottle Babies also contributed to the Jelliffe Scenario and the arsenal that activists used throughout the boycott. While Ralph Nader sat on the board, the Consumer's Union critiqued the formula companies, and in 1975 activist Leah Margulies and the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR) began work on the issue within their shareholder activism approach. Bill Moyers added to this politicized issue with the documentary "Into the Mouths of Babes" in 1978.

The politics of dead babies in the Third World took place during an era when infant mortality rates declined across the world, a confounding element of this story. These quantified accountings of the human population existed within states, health organizations, companies and the United Nations. Newton's skeptical account included criticism of the "Jelliffe Scenario,"⁸⁹ the baby food story as it has been told for the last forty years: uneducated Third World mothers; contaminated water and bottles; sneaky corporate "Mothercraft" nurses in maternity wards handing out canisters to unsuspecting

[now.html?n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/Organizations/F/Fairfield%20University&pagewanted=2.](#)

⁸⁹ Lisa H. Newton, "A New Power Agenda: Tracking the Emergence of a New Global Polity in the Infant Formula Controversy." Business & Professional Ethics Journal 19, no. 2 (July 1, 2000): 5–39. She scoffed at the "facts" of the formula controversy from the Jelliffe, INFANT, IBFAN, activist side of the story. But she was not a knee-jerk apologists for capitalism, though she ultimately supported conservative positions on political economy. Her pragmatic approach to business ethics allowed her to criticize the IMF, the WTO, irresponsible corporations, and the lack of economic justice. She also desired that babies live healthy lives. Newton simply believed that the companies in this particular case were not killing babies, and that some of the activist positions threatened babies, too, especially in the HIV expert battles over breastfeeding mothers with HIV. The WHO supports infected mothers breastfeeding babies during the first few months, as it might be better than bottle feeding, given the "facts" of the Jelliffe Scenario. Ultimately, however, her total dismissal of the activist side does not work either. See also her similar and informative articles, Lisa H. Newton, "A Question of Power: Science-Based Enterprise and the Non-Governmental Organization." Business & Professional Ethics Journal 20, no. 3/4 (October 1, 2001): 49–78; "Abortion in the Law: An Essay on Absurdity." Ethics 87, no. 3 (April 1, 1977): 244–250; "Ethical Imperialism and Informed Consent." IRB: Ethics and Human Research 12, no. 3 (May 1, 1990): 10–11; "The Internal Morality of the Corporation." Journal of Business Ethics 5, no. 3 (June 1, 1986): 249–258.

mothers; company posters in village shops; advertisements on radio, TV, and billboards in places like the Philippines or Kenya; and then diarrhea, malnutrition, and "millions" of babies dying. Newton thought the companies could have done a better job maintaining the "myth" of the formula problem, a "good story" that has been told only because it possessed 'good guys' and 'bad guys' from either side of the debate. Nestlé's method throughout, with variations as outlined in Chapter Three, aimed at presenting the actual facts of the matter, the "actual" mortality and survival numbers, and the steady continuance of breastfeeding in contested regions of the globe. Despite its efforts to argue scientifically (or perhaps because of this), Nestlé lost the moral center of the story. The "left wing" activists and church groups won; according to the public, the corporations were bad and big business caused more harm than good. The formula industry was at least partly responsible for malnourished, unhealthy, and dying babies.

Muller's pamphlet may have been incendiary, but he acknowledged the debt to the companies, especially his group's very method of working in the Third World. Additionally, in the context of refugees and disaster zones – and during the 1980s, HIV – formula use was not a straightforward issue. Muller wrote in The Baby Killer that his group was "one of many Third World charities indebted to certain of the milk companies for donations of infant foods and other products for relief programs. In disasters and other *abnormal* situations, these products can be extremely useful. We may be accused of 'biting the hand that feeds' with this report, but our responsibility lies with the communities in which we work." Notice the assumptions of total breastfeeding outside of

"abnormal" conditions, ignoring women's actual choices, the political economics of motherhood, and the arguments about "breast is best" within feminism.⁹⁰

Muller included on the inside cover of The Baby Killer an advertisement for Dumex formula. If a mother purchased two tins of Dumex Baby Food, the company would send her a Free Dumex Feeding Bottle. "Join the Babies Union now by feeding your baby with Dumex Baby Food so baby will grow fat and strong." A healthy baby, presumably Nigerian from Lagos, drinks from a bottle and wears a cloth diaper. To begin the summary for the book, Muller wrote "Third World babies are dying because their mothers bottle feed them with western style infant milk. Many that do not die are drawn into a vicious cycle of malnutrition and disease that will leave them physically and intellectually stunted for life." He began his famous pamphlet with "the object of this report is not to prove that baby milks kill babies. In optimum conditions, with proper preparation and hygienic, they can be a perfectly adequate infant food." But, from sometimes real and sometimes imagined perspectives, "the conditions in much of the Third World are . . . far from optimum." An element of benevolent paternalism, and the orientalist gaze perhaps influenced activist perceptions: "And in communities where the standard of living is low, housing is poor and mothers do not have access to the basic facilities that most English housewives would take for granted, baby milks can be killers." Of course, the principal consumer was a woman, a mother; and the principal producer of babies and milk also happened to be women.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Muller, The Baby Killer; including: The Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN), and their work with infant feeding in emergencies within the IFE Core Group, <http://www.ennonline.net/ife/>, (accessed May 2013).

⁹¹ Mike Muller, The Baby Killers, 1.

Mother's milk never escaped economic analysis. When included with nutritional needs for a nation, the millions of dollars lost in mother's milk significantly contributed to a given nation's health costs. Economists and health experts considered the interconnection between human survival, breast milk and cow's milk. Cows on farms provided the milk necessary for infant formula manufacturing. In this way, human babies and dairy cows linked across farms and cities, beyond nations, and across markets.⁹² Human female production and cow's milk formed a basic framework for understanding formula, corporate profits and national development. Muller, quoting scientific sources, merged mass numbers of babies with mass numbers of liters of milk a year with mass numbers of cows. A "herd of 114 million cows," for example, would be required to feed "60 million infants under one year in Asia." This kind of statistical battling exhibited the big thinking that existed at the heart of these social, economic and political struggles. For Muller, subsequent activists and some policy experts, national declines in breastfeeding occurred "at great economic cost to countries least able to waste resources. Valuable foreign exchange or internal productive resources are being diverted for the purchase or production of breast milk replacements."⁹³ The mixtures of company, state, and private

⁹² See Alan Berg, The Nutrition Factor. Additionally, for the multiple connections and vectors existing within the baby food story and how that narrative fits into national, regional and global human "development" and growth, it is instructive to note some of the journals that covered Berg's influential book that came out during the height of the west's fascination with famine and hunger, MNCs and survival, states and international regulation: A few of the journals illustrated the place of people, animals and resources within bodies, nutrition and total survival. The French journal on the Third World Tiers Monde (1975); The American Political Science Review (1975); Population and Development (1976); Journal of Economic Issues (1974); American Journal of Agricultural Economics (1974); The Journal of Developing Areas (1974); Journal of Development Studies and more. Newspapers published articles on the book, as well, covering nutrition and hunger.

⁹³ Eating, proper nutrition and bodily health met national health in these studies of the 1970s. Additionally, healthy bodies explicitly meant healthy workers. See for example a recent book by

choices related to feeding and survival, growth and development reflected the rising intricacies that faced those concerned about the end of days, about profit or regulation, safety and health.

Westerners worried about poverty and hunger in the Third World, organized themselves to help, and created propaganda and plans of action that they hoped would save the world. Peter Krieg's documentary film Bottle Babies (1978) helped ignite the infant formula controversy, while he summarized many of the issues that concerned activists. The film opened with dramatic Third World baby politics. Shots of Dr. Nimrod Bwibo of Kenyatta National Hospital in Nairobi started with malnourished babies, dehydrated from one of the world's leading child killers: diarrhea.⁹⁴ From pediatric hospitals in big cities and from rural villages in the Third World, "desperate mothers" believed that giving children "the best there is . . . powdered milk from the bottle" led to the problems of malnutrition. The documentary presented the standard narrative of the baby food controversy from the activist perspective, and hit most of the main points of the issue up to 1978. These details included interviews with TWAG. Krieg showed advertising posters, product vans, canisters in small shops, milk nurses visiting homes

economist and public health scholar Alok Bhargava, who used econometrics and "longitudinal econometric methods" to study the role of nutrition, health and economic growth. The book's blurb on Google stated, for example, "thoughtful econometric and statistical analysis can improve our understanding of the relationships between a number of socioeconomic, nutritional, and behavioral variables on a number of issues like cognitive development in children and labour productivity in the developing world." Ultimately, when contemplating cumulative impacts of human bodies in the world, the kind of thinking about nutrition and baby development supporting the labor force growth crossed many minds during the baby food conundrum and the world hunger issues that arose during the Earthrise era. See Alok Bhargava, Food, Economics, and Health (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

⁹⁴ Peter Krieg, Bottle Babies, viewed at Northeastern University; Information on Bwibo and exchanges with activists and corporations, along with Dr. Elizabeth Hillman, Peter Krieg, and INFAC's Doug Clement and Doug Johnson, in Action for Corporate Accountability Records Collection (ACA), Administration Files, Box 3, 144.B.14.12F, MHS.

and clinics; and he followed a woman, her new baby, and her family within her community. The mother prepared formula incorrectly, using dirty utensils, a re-used bottle, visited watering holes, and pulled up water from a muddy pool. The rampant marketing malfeasance purveyed by corporations met the ills of bottle-feeding in the Third World, and reflected for audiences in the West the consumer group positions and perspectives about the developing world.

ICCR and INFACT, when organizing boycott movements within the United States, often showed the film at events from living rooms to meeting halls.⁹⁵ One edition of the film contained an ICCR addendum exhorting people to get involved in a variety of ways, including letter-writing, boycotting products, and disseminating the film. ICCR spoke of the American companies who must have been equally culpable, utilizing "questionable advertising and promotion," and noted that some developing countries rightly tried to regulate formula and bottles. But multinationals used their influence to resist such measures. To combat this global problem, "here's what you can do to help," ICCR exhorted: One should bring the baby bottle scandal to the attention of your local citizen action groups, your local world hunger organizations . . . and your church." Corporate accountability organizer Leah Margulies detailed these living room consciousness-raising experiments.⁹⁶ People could "arrange for showings of the film in your community, write protest letters to the US corporations," and to members of Congress and various UN agencies. Reflecting shareholder democracy, divestment attempts, and the entire moment of corporate democracy and accountability, interested

⁹⁵ Peter Krieg, Bottle Babies, ICCR Addendum, Northeastern University, viewed March 8, 2013; Leah Margulies, Interview with the Author, February 2012.

⁹⁶ Leah Margulies, Interview with the Author, March 2013.

consumers could "question investments by your church, pension funds, and unions," exacerbate shareholder resolutions and "shareholder initiated lawsuits." These attempts, too, illuminated angling for some kind of access point against the power of MNCs.

The slums in Kenya resembled slums around the world, and pediatric feeding needs in Africa, Asia and Latin America, where "few people have regular work" and very little hope.⁹⁷ The need for rising living standards and healthy food remained paramount. And these impoverished people, living in squalor in a system predicated on mass economic inequality and social injustice, reached "for small symbols of prosperity and modern living." Grasping for the image of modern living, for bettering one's condition, for an approximation of that modern consumer dream in America, existed for many people on the planet. Yet, individuals with low monthly wages could not afford the dream though they strove to attain it. Most people encouraged to bottle feed by companies or pediatricians could not afford processed infant foods marketed by the multinationals in their midst. Formula and food companies sought markets and bodies in the unhealthy world, convincing poor people to buy, consume, and join productive Western countries. The symbols for modernity, for prosperity, health and growth, remained the formula canister and the bottle; these particular modern tools led to healthy, developing cherubic babies, the white skin, and the happy smile.

As if inside a scientific laboratory, subjective actors in the world had to follow these instructions with exacting precision, lest their babies become malnourished and add to the world statistics of infant morality. Instructions included, with proper visual demonstrations for the western audience: washing hands, boiling water, ensuring the

⁹⁷ Slavoj Zizek, *In Defense of Lost Causes*: (London: Verso, 2008), 426-430.

exact amount, "very strict hygiene is necessary," and the science involved stressed by Krieg so as to show that any deviation presented trouble. In the slums demonstration vans offered their globally connected wares, people used "water from the communal tap." But boiling water remained problematic developing countries, because the Third World Mother, "can only boil it if she has enough fuel." Sometimes mothers, observed by the concerned western gaze, used dirty dishwasher for cooking and for mixing with formula. And formula mixed with such water entered infants' fragile stomachs, their delicate digestive systems. Both the water and bottle were contaminated; paraphernalia "becomes a breeding ground for bacteria," with "little resistance in the small body." As Jelliffe pointed out early in the controversy, improper usage led to diarrhea, vomiting, morbidity and sometimes mortality. According to this view, unhealthy conditions, with unhealthy education and decisions made by unhealthy people in unhealthy markets contributed to mortality rates that frightened many doctors and scientists.

So-called nutrition courses proliferated, as did sales personnel dressed as nurses. Women earned more money in the private sector selling baby formula than they did in the public-sector hospitals, those spaces that truly needed such expert personnel. Huckstering professional women in professional-looking uniforms, pushed a commodity sold at market for feeding babies, keeping them alive, and contributing to growth and development. And "behind them stands only the sales strategy of a corporation." More than five billion dollars US in sales, a voice-over narration contended while the jingle for Nescafe rang in women's ears in Minneapolis, in Cleveland, in Boston, in London: "More, more more! More Happiness." Krieg organized a shot of possibly every Nestlé product, in a vast array of containers and colors, hopes and dreams, and even addictions

and needs - the company offered "anybody who [could] pay for it a food paradise." A paradise of foodstuffs, presented from the world's largest food corporation, and the paradox of plenty.⁹⁸

The individual subjectivities of death persisted, and there were billions of dollars made over living and dead bodies. The corporations perpetually argued the personal responsibility angle. Real people diluted the formula on their own volition, knowing the potential consequences, like riding a motorcycle without a helmet. Real people mixed formula with dirty water. And real national governments failed to improve their literacy rates, ensuring that their citizens could not read the directions on the labels. The companies argued that their responsibility never detailed educating national or international masses. Bill Moyers investigated the entire controversy for CBS and showed malnourished and dying babies for American television audiences.

Moyers covered the food problem from Santo Domingo, and included mothers themselves, corporate executives, the Minneapolis organizers of the boycott, and the Kennedy hearings. Jack Stafford, senior vice president of American Home Products at the time, and Robin Chandler Duke, a member of the board of directors, outlined the company's position, its contribution to health and growth, and its safety. One element of the piece explored how the Dominican Republic, as a developing nation concerned with health and growth, addressed the issue through educational efforts, especially of its health care professionals. Moyers ended the piece with a call for corporate, national and international responsibility for the lives of millions of children. "There are answers,"

⁹⁸ Harvey Levenstein, The Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Moyers said, "if someone will act for the children who cannot act for themselves."⁹⁹ This call for action gathered tremendous momentum in the late 1970s, actually frightened MNCs, and led to the first code of conduct regulating corporate conduct on a global level.

Some observers agreed with Krieg and claimed that the corporations contributed to "social murder." This perspective followed a Marxist critique of bourgeois society straight from Friedrich Engels and his observations of England's poor. He wrote about urban slums, malnutrition, and mortality in the nineteenth century, presaging benevolent observations of developing nations after World War II.¹⁰⁰ For many reformers, economic health and accumulation included sickness and starvation. For Krieg and the Arbeitsgruppe, the controllers of the means of production equaled those masters over the means of reproduction - for creation, there was destruction, for development, there was underdevelopment, for health, there existed pathology, whether for land, cities, or individual bodies.¹⁰¹ Starvation, malnutrition and the negligence of the capitalist class

⁹⁹ Chetley, 160.

¹⁰⁰ Friedrich Engels, The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844 (New York: Cosimo, 2009), 25. Engels wrote about social murder with stark, harsh, stridently moral terms. He blamed the bourgeois for working class conditions, starvation, and especially death. "When one individual inflicts bodily injury upon another" and leads to death" and "when the assailant knew in advance that the injury would be fatal, we call this deed murder," 95. And so Nestlé killed babies, according to some views, the formula industry remained responsible for infant mortality, and capitalism as a whole culpable for not only economic injustice and inequality, but environment sickness and bodily morbidity, leading to multiple examples of social murder. Here, sickness, commerciogenic malnutrition, and death reflected the opposites of the health many capitalists and national policymakers sought.

¹⁰¹ Recall Schumpeter's use of creative destruction to define and illustrate the workings of capitalism, and authors such as Neil Smith, Uneven Development: Nature Capital and the Production of Space (New York: Blackwell, 1984) for development and underdevelopment, ideas of nature and land; David Harvey on cities, especially Consciousness and the Urban Experience: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), and Thomas Sugrue's The Origins of the Urban Crisis for an analysis of the material conditions behind urban riots, and the rise and decline of American cities after World War II.

displayed concerns about "third worlders" living in industrial slums. African babies died due to famine and starvation; additionally, they made the news and evoked empathy from Western middle class philanthropists. The Carter administration and other policy bodies studied world hunger, along with UN conferences, academics and the popular press.¹⁰² Church groups fretted starvation and infant mortality, in addition to their corporate investments. The Nestlé boycott activists at INFAC and the global network IBFAN focused their energies on the cause of infant morbidity and mortality and corporate marketing practices.

Activists used Peter Krieg's film as a recruiting tool, an empathy generator, and a piece of the anger puzzle that incited many to join the cause.¹⁰³ Demonstrated in Krieg's work was a sense of First World helping the Third, of the educated and wealthy Global North improving the illiterate and unhealthy Global South – the developed hoping to constitute development, all the while saving the world. Engels blamed the capitalist class, as a unified body. Many of the boycotters blamed MNCs and their impulses toward control and access, their drive toward profits, and the ingrained inequalities in the capitalist system itself. Nestlé became the universal corporate monster.

¹⁰² See the World Hunger presidential commission report, United States, Overcoming World Hunger: the Challenge Ahead: Report of the Presidential Commission on World Hunger (Washington, DC: U.S. Govt. Print. Off, 1980), with Bob Dole and John Denver, et al.

¹⁰³ On empathy and human rights, on the technologies of human rights and global understanding, see Lynn Hunt, The Invention of Human Rights: A History (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007). Within this type of thinking, of epistemic communities and empathetic communities, of shifting networks for causes, and for units of analysis of national and transnational rubrics, also place Hobsbawm and Ranger, The Invention of Tradition and Benedict Andersen's Imagined Communities. Here, these imaginaries joined the shift in the humanities brought about by Edward Said's Orientalism. Because this imagined global community and the dangers to it, and to the planet, encouraged the type of activism, politics, and even market presence of MNCs, uniting the various peoples, nations and systems in an inextricable survival political economy that brought together the species.

Underdevelopment and social murder drove the emotional heart of Krieg's work for Western audiences. The film depicted "the killing and maiming of African children in the name of profit."¹⁰⁴ Fancy corporate headquarters and laboratories diverged from squalid conditions on the ground in underdeveloped, unhealthy lands: unimproved lands and unimproved bodies unfit and improperly disciplined for the tasks of contributing to The Economy, and to survival at all within such a system. The film, a tense survival drama, impelled many people to join direct action, give money to INFACT and other organizations, and refuse Nestlé's products. No more Nestlé's Quick for the family pantry in the West. The responsibility for social murder, which activists lay at Nestlé's corporate feet from the beginning, met an "infant necropolis." Dead babies and their graves, canisters and bottles, juxtaposed with Nestlé's headquarters in the hyper-West of Switzerland. Rising living standards and improved bodies - groomed, educated, constructed, disciplined - in the process of global growth and wealth creation existed as the answers to world problems.

Contemporaneous thinkers explored Marxist explanations of the global relations of production in the baby food controversy, which stood for many critiques of the era. "The commodity - here the bottle - and its exchange both in purchase and nursing become a representation of human relations, even a focus of veneration. Thus the term commodity fetishism well applies, since the bottle attains magico-religious significance." According to Krieg and most of the activists - no matter their underlying politics - the bottle and the canister represented a kind of magical power, and social power. Using

¹⁰⁴ Howard Z. Lorber and Margo Cornelius, "Bottle Babies: Grave Markers," Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media No. 27, (July 1982): 33-34. <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC27folder/BottleBabies.html>. (Viewed multiple times from 2007 to 2013).

formula created perfect babies, and provided their infants with energy, health and spirit; bottle-feeding made the baby modern, and constituted communal status. "In 'reaching for the small symbols of progress,' claimed the narrator, "poor Africans play out a kind of 'religious drama.' They venerate the object which mediates relations between themselves, between their poverty and their well being, between reproduction of social life and living itself." The political struggles over the means of production, class and regional struggles between rich and poor nations, national elite managers and their poor, converged with the politics of reproduction, where commodity fetishism squarely met the realities of feeding, of growth and development, of survival itself.

The baby food controversy, with its political struggles between international organizations, NGOs, churches, and companies demonstrated the relationship between survival and capitalist expansion. In short, the integration of feeding, clothing and energy requirements with capitalist markets helped propel the system. Companies integrated as many bodies into this system as possible. "Promoting a reliance on bottle feeding and other 'symbols of progress' builds the changes necessary to modern capitalist expansion: a consumer society inserts objects between humans, mediating their relations - in this case the relation of nurturance." Bottle Babies showed how in some cases this type of alienation removed the infant from her mother, separated them, and began the process of creating a new, viable, healthy consumer.

Baby life and baby death cycled far too rapidly, and people invested everything in the health of their children, in their survival and their development. Thus, when an advertisement promoted images of healthy babies and a nearly magical food, the commodity-survival dynamic increased in tension. "By focusing on children's health and

well-being, the Nestlé promotional campaigns directly links bottle use to fears about childhood death. These campaigns continually insisted that the bottle is the best method of feeding if mothers want healthy children." Promoting healthy children, marketing images of western success and cherubic white babies, became integral to the neocolonial mission, to the expansion of markets and to the growth of capitalist profits. Life and death integrated with profit and growth, development and underdevelopment.

Modernity and development formed the explanatory focus of many arguments within the baby food controversy. Imperialism and capitalist growth remained similar in their combined, shifting, and even challenged imperatives. "In the colonial world, the indigenous people heard time and again that they were inferior to the colonizers - morally, religiously, socially, technically, physically. They heard that to improve their lot they must adopt Western ways, and in many instances the colonized people were forced to adopt them." Capitalists, many health professionals, national elites, and Western governments viewed the matter in less stark, and even in opposing terms. The Western superior vision of free markets and economic growth solved the world's problems, not socialist intervention in free lives or free markets, and not regulation that would inhibit investment and growth. For Nestlé and the other formula companies such "modern" formula feeding actually enhanced health, for individual bodies, for economic health, and for national health via the GDP. Krieg and the British group War on Want critiqued the global bourgeoisie for creating conditions of illness, morbidity and death as capitalists sought health, expansion and growth.

Conclusion

Infant formula politics represented not only the medicalization of motherhood, but also the creation of the ideal mother and an institutional surveillance of women for their health-and-productivity capacity. Creating healthy bodies for the national body also involved nations interlinking with other nations in an integrated world. Motherhood as systematized and made perfect, "man-made" for national utility, reflected scientific motherhood and rationalized childrearing for national development. Capitalism rested at the mother's body, supported by the perfect mother raising perfect healthy babies according to prescribed norms that professional experts handed down from on high. These modernist planners were doctors, scientists, politicians and corporate producers. However, the activist and church communities joined this list. And the "consciousness-raising" element of the Nestlé boycott ignited far more than a change in thinking. Activists, consumers, mothers, and policymakers forced corporations to stop for a brief moment, focus their attention on the little people, and spend multiple millions to contain the activists and maintain their image, burnish their brand. In other words, feminist concerns about equality-difference, the difficulties of actually raising children in late capitalism, of objectified bodies in the scientific imagination, of women's health in an androcentric world, of changing attitudes about breasts and bottles, also existed within the structural realities of international governance. Global thinking reflected a greater emphasis on universal planning, potential regulation of survival products, and international oversight of corporate movements in the world. Shifts in thinking, struggles within feminism, processes of medicalization and pathologization, economic transformations, and global governance all converged at the political and cultural and

economic site of the infant feeding at the mother's breast. And that confluence existed within ideas and material realities about global survival of the species.

State-focused political action demonstrated size and scale in the early twentieth century management of mass societies. The Nestlé boycott shed light on how these concerns spread across the planet, encompassing a universal humanity, concerned about the healthy state of humankind. The core issue that drove the thinkers and actors during the 1960s, 70s and 80s was a concern for administering mass societies in aggregate - the "us" that encompassed notions of humankind. The UN's FAO, UNICEF, WHO and other sub-sectors of its "system" underscored much of this impulse. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, its Food and Drug Administration, Department of Agriculture, and other similar agencies in almost every other nation on earth, demonstrated citizens' belief that "the government ensures a safe food supply for large modern populations," and focused on individual and collective nutrient intake, vitamins, Recommended Daily Allowances and the sites where practice met ideas of total systemic health.¹⁰⁵

Consumer groups exerted much of the new liberal politics after the demise of the New Left. Activism in particular became increasingly focused on corporations, corporate sovereignty, and marketing issues. Consumer groups, media attention, and boycotts reflected the politics of reform in the late twentieth century. During the infant formula

¹⁰⁵ Valenze, 287. Imagine the politics surrounding agribusiness, corporate dairy farms, Monsanto Corporation, and critics of recombinant bovine somatotrophin (rBST) or bovine growth hormone (rBGH) used on industrial dairy cows. These types of genetic manipulation end up in the food system, in the environment, and in human bodies. The boundaries between individual bodies and the land, and in ideas of health, productivity and improvement of them, united the global politics of baby foods, as this dissertation aims to show. See Valenze, 283 for the nasty consequences of rBGH. But in very real ways, companies tried to supply the demands of growing populations through the market, just as Adam Smith imagined for his illustration of famines.

controversy, Nestlé agreed to abide by some of the voluntary aspects of the code of conduct, including restrictions on promotional advertising "to the public." But INFANT and other groups continued pressure on the company because, they determined, "promotion and advertising to health personnel is still permitted." This particular type of promotion existed in mailings to pregnant mothers, free samples to new mothers in private and public hospitals throughout the world, and educational materials that detailed the benefits of infant formula for women who chose to use this specific kinds of survival commodity. The "expert" educational information, whether from companies, activists, organizations such as La Leche League, the American Academy of Pediatrics, Congress and the World Health Organization, often employed the growth and development language of neoclassical economics. And it is here, at the mother's breast and politics of hunger, that the rhetoric of survival and growth for bodies united with nations, global economies, and the species as a whole.

In order to more precisely explore these connections, I now turn to a close study of the Nestlé boycott and the rise of corporate accountability from the activist perspective.

CHAPTER TWO

“The White Man’s Milk Powder”: The Nestlé Boycott, Corporate Accountability, and Saving Underdeveloped Infants

Amid the sprawl and congestion of Bogota, Colombia in the late 1970s, Rosa Suarez, a young single mother, lived with her five-year-old and twin babies in a shack of "two tiny rooms." Rosa was one of eight children, and her life’s journey reflected a prominent pattern in expanding urbanization: she had moved to the city from the countryside seeking economic opportunity. Rosa had never attended school, and she worked as a domestic in Bogota. When her life intersected with researchers from USAID in the early 1980s, her twins were seven months old, and her partner had just left.¹

Rosa's living conditions were representative of many of the "poverty environments" found throughout the developing world in these years. She and her children had one bed, no running water, and only a hotplate for cooking. Rosa lived in "critical" economic peril: she "worked sporadically, washing clothes for neighbors . . . paid in food or money," while struggling to find care for her children so that she could

¹ The ethnography of Rosa Suarez and the infant feeding study of Bogota came from Penny Van Esterik, Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 31-63, and the USAID Bogota Site Report, Beverly Winikoff, Michael Latham, et al., The Infant Feeding Study: Bogota Site Report (USAID, 1983). Latham, a professor of international nutrition at Cornell and one of the directors of the study, noted that Esterik worked in all four of the study sites - Bogota, Nairobi, Bangkok, and Semarang, with sensitivity to both anthropology and pro-breastfeeding activist politics. She selected Rosa Suarez, and three others from 5,000 others in the study, and helped analyze the "complex issues related to the most important questions of development and sustainability." Esterik desired to connect individual women and children, from specific families in particular locations, to broader communication, health and economic networks. Women in developing countries, from "very different urban communities" were "connected to processes and institutions that crosscut national boundaries," which she, following other thinkers of the era, called "the broader world system." Esterik, 31.

work.² Weaning foods included "sugar cane juice, corn cakes, yucca, plantains, meat, calabash, oranges, and blackberries." With her twins, while scraping together a living, she "felt as though she were feeding one or the other all day long." Rosa supplemented the twins' diet with S-26, an infant formula manufactured by Wyeth-American Home Products (AHP), an American pharmaceutical giant.³ According to the USAID ethnographic study, corporate marketing hardly reached Rosa; she did not own a television, listen to the radio, or read newspapers. She received breastfeeding support and education at the hospital where her twins were born, and believed that "breastmilk is best." Because of several illnesses, and her need to find work, however, she supplemented her own milk production.

The USAID researchers chose Rosa's community because of its "social risk indicators," which included low-income laborers active in informal or day labor, and high infant mortality rates.⁴ Like so many cities in the global South, Bogota grew rapidly in the twentieth century, from a tiny nineteenth-century village of 21,000 to over four million in the 1970s – 60 percent of Colombia's population. Rosa lived in a neighborhood of over a hundred thousand people, in a squatter settlement that officials considered illegal, with "high unemployment and irregular work" for the "informal work force."⁵ The

2. Esterik, 33-5.

3 Ibid, 35. See also IBFAN's report on Wyeth and S-26 infant formula, a product line begun in 1961, in Breaking the Rules, Stretching the Rules (2004) its regular report on monitoring the infant formula industry and of industry's abuses, a key element in baby food politics globally, especially within the WHO.

4 Beverly Winikoff, Michael C. Latham, and Giorgio Solimano, et al., The Infant Feeding Study: Bogota Site Report, United States Aid for International Development (USAID), 1983, 2, and 5 for population data.

5 Esterik, 46.

scale of urbanization in Colombia, combined with new types of economic colonialism, placed powerful pressures on Rosa and her family. According to anthropologist Penny Van Esterik, "industrialization, trade, capitalization of agriculture" were not structural abstractions but affected real people in particular locations. Those process had created unfamiliar human migration patterns in the postwar era, forged by refugees, migratory workers, and tourists, which had dramatically reshaped the world into which Rosa was born and undertook her own migration.⁶

Global food and pharmaceutical companies, such as Wyeth, Bristol-Myers, and Nestlé, saw such developing, highly populated urban areas as potential markets. Activists viewed them as places to save and empower the exploited poor. Poor people spent over half of their patchwork income on sustenance and other survival activities.⁷ Most children after three months of age did not receive milk of any kind, and after four months milk was nonexistent.⁸ From the perspective of western-centric "world health," most of these babies were prematurely weaned. Ninety percent of women in the USAID study gave birth in hospitals, and many claimed that they received formula such as Dextrose or Nan right after birth. These free samples depended on socio-economic status, with wealthier women receiving formula more often than not.⁹ Male-dominated decisions about

6. Ibid., 55.

7 At the time of the research, the median household income was under \$190 a month. USAID Bogota Site Report, 11.

8 USAID, Bogota Site Report, 40. Additionally, before three months, breastmilk substitutes such as formula were extremely rare, with almost 90% of women breastfeeding their infants up to three months. After that, however, women began weaning their babies, returning to work, and struggling for the basic necessities of life.

9 USAID, Bogota Site Report, 51. On premature weaning, which often led to malnutrition cited by activists and consumer groups, the ethnographers noted the existence of a "self-fulfilling

breastfeeding also influenced or coerced women to shift to alternate feedings, with male doctors, fathers, husbands and partners encouraging early weaning.

Most ordinary people, though, possessed some options within this context. They negotiated space for themselves, appropriating knowledge and products according to their own design. In a shifting global environment, a too deterministic portrait of western or capitalist hegemony can obscure choices made by poor women struggling to survive. A too optimistic view of individual autonomy, however, can be just as analytically limited. As Van Esterik phrased it, "living environments bombarded by western products, institutions, and messages" did not erase local culture, but women did not have the ultimate power to "choose not to participate in it."¹⁰ Through it all, mothers and babies, within their households and communities, made the personal choices around which this shifting, contested "world system" revolved.¹¹

cycle," one in which mothers perceived that they had insufficient milk, and then "the introduction of bottle formula; followed by decreased interest in breastfeeding by the infant and a diminution of mothers' milk," and which led to vulnerable babies and children, p. 59. Nestlé was "the largest producer of infant formula in Colombia," and sold six brands in Bogota, found in almost 70% of retail outlets; Wyeth Laboratories sold two types of formula through the city. Additionally, the government sold baby foods as well: its Plan for Applied Nutrition (PAN) manufactured products for infants and distributed them widely for the poorer segments of the population, 133-36.

10 Penny Van Esterik, *Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy*, (New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press, 1989), 62.

11 Researchers hoped to provide a reasonable portrait of actual women and children at the center of this global feeding controversy. The Population Council submitted the study to USAID. See Beverly Winikoff, Michael C. Latham, and Giorgio Solimano, et al., *The Infant Feeding Study: Bogota Site Report*, United States Aid for International Development (USAID), Contract No. AID/DSAN-C-0211, Project Number 9311010, 1983. All site reports may be found at USAID's website, Development Experience Clearing House (DEC), at <https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/search/SearchResults.aspx?q=IIRoZSBJbmZhbnQgRmVIZGluZyBTdHVkeSI%3d> (accessed April 4, 2014). See also, Population Council, *Feeding Infants in Four Societies: Causes and Consequences of Mothers' Choices*. Edited by Beverly Winikoff, Mary Ann Castle, and V. H. Laukaran, Contributions in Family Studies no. 14. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988; and Penny Van Esterik, *Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy* (1989), especially 15-63.

This chapter explores the various linkages that connected Rosa Suarez and her family to the Nestlé boycott. At the chapter's center are activists, about whom I ask several questions: how did they view women such as Rosa in the developing world? Why did they choose the baby food issue and a corporate boycott? And how did they go about implementing this particular form of activism? The activists themselves came from a variety of walks of life in the United States. Some were physicians with a conscience. Others were activists radicalized by 1960s causes such as civil rights and the antiwar movement. Still others were ordinary women, in American churches who took special interest in this as a *mother's* issue. Many of them, as we'll see, came from Minneapolis, Minnesota, a center of Nestlé boycott organizing. Their stories, their successes and failures, and the challenges they faced, form the core of this chapter.

Women like Rosa in her undeveloped, pathological setting resided at the center of perceptions about food distribution, nutrition and proper growth. Activists feared malnutrition and the horrors of infant mortality. But because of prominent perceptions about the spread of global corporations unanswerable to democracy or legal codes, they also feared for the global baby, the symbolic infant who represented every child. This chapter explores the way the activists used the technologies, images and rhetoric at their disposal to create international networks that aimed to combat the rising power of MNCs and what they saw as global injustice. Rosa Suarez represented the prototypical Third World Mother who needed to be taught how to feed properly amid external modern pressures. But she was also the symbolic global mother, someone to study, protect and save. The activists in this chapter visualized her as they hoped to save her children from corporate enterprises within a global imagined community.

Milk, Murder and Multinationals

"But what happens to the coolie baby in the slums of Singapore?" In 1939, a tall, thin doctor named Cicely Williams posed this question to the Singapore Rotary Club as she summarized her thoughts in a speech called "Milk and Murder." She answered her own question by outlining the baby's unfortunate fate, including malnutrition, blindness, diarrhea and often death. Williams, a pediatrician in Britain's Colonial Medical Service, castigated formula companies for marketing sweetened condensed milk to babies in Malaya.¹² "Misguided propaganda on infant feeding," she declared, "should be punished as the most criminal form of sedition, and that those deaths should be regarded as murder."¹³ The chairman of the Rotary Club happened also to be a Nestlé executive.

Williams based her professional expertise on a social analysis of patient illnesses, in which she uncovered unhealthy eating habits among women and young children. The

¹² Cicely Williams (1893-1992), a maternal and child health pioneer who practiced and taught in many countries, became an advisor at WHO, and a professor at various universities. Born in Jamaica, ninth-generation colonial daughter to a landholder and Director of Education, she attended Oxford and was admitted to medical school during World War I when male applicants were scarce. She was widely credited with discovering the cause of kwashiorkor, a lack of sufficient protein. Kwashiorkor, in Gold Coast local language Ga "by which the Accra people," according to Williams, meant "the sickness the older child gets when the next baby is born," or as pediatrician and colleague at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, David Morley, defined it, "the disease of the child displaced from the mother's back." Vitally, she employed a social diagnosis for diseases, interviewing families about their culture, feeding practices, and living conditions. She called this approach "Social Pediatrics - that it should take full account of all the circumstances in which the children live," as distinct from clinical pediatrics. Quoted in "Cicelyisms," in Naomi Baumslag, Primary Health Care Pioneer: The Selected Works of Dr. Cicely D. Williams, Geneva: World Federation of Public Health Associations and UNICEF, 1986), p. 158. See Dr. Rebecca Tortello, "A Pioneer, A Survivor," *Jamaica Gleaner*, <http://jamaica-gleaner.com/pages/history/story0037.htm>, posted November 26, 2002, (accessed December 15, 2011); See also David Morley, "C. D. Williams CMG, DM, FRCP, DTM&H." BMJ: British Medical Journal 305, no. 6848 (August 1, 1992): 307.

¹³ Quote cited in multiple sources, especially among the activist groups. See Baby Milk Action, "Briefing Paper: History of the Campaign," <http://www.babymilkaction.org/pages/history.html> (accessed April 16, 2010).

problem, she contended, was not inept local government, as westerners would have it, but lack of attention to local needs. "The patient is not the embarrassing by-product of some pathological state," she wrote. Unfortunately, western experts perpetually seemed "to tackle human welfare from the wrong end," that "we set up medical schools and train doctors long before we have studied local conditions and local needs."¹⁴ In 1945, three years before heading the first WHO Maternal and Child Health Section, she defended welfare work as a branch of medicine, and took on a well-established male expert, who criticized such medical practices in the field.¹⁵ In many correspondences to medical journals she defended the local people and their medical traditions.¹⁶

Breastfeeding advocates and boycott organizers in the 1970s and 1980s reached back to Williams as the starting point for their narratives of the boycott's historical arc. English pediatrician David Morley noted in the British Medical Journal in 1992 that she

14 Cicely D. Williams, "Whither Welfare?" The British Medical Journal 1, no. 4192 (May 10, 1941): 719–721. She noted that medical welfare workers in "developing countries, often felt a need to apologize for their endeavors, p. 720. Further, she never referred to the common dichotomy "developed" - as in already arrived - and "developing." She used the terms "more" developed and "less," and prayed that health existed as the most important element of this spectrum. Note some of her collected works in Naomi Baumslag, Primary Health Care Pioneer: The Selected Works of Cicely D. Williams, (Geneva: World Federation of Public Health Associations and UNICEF, 1986).

15 Cicely D. Williams, "Welfare Work A Branch Of Medicine." The British Medical Journal 2, no. 4430 (December 1, 1945): 786. She wrote that "As Lord Horder, paid me the compliment of referring to me as 'a distinguished pediatrician' I feel it is most ungrateful to cavil at his article. But as he quotes me only to disagree I feel bound to defend my credo," p. 786.

16 Cicely D. Williams, "Protein Deficiency In Negro Infants." The British Medical Journal 2, no. 4798 (December 20, 1952): 1360. According to the Wellcome Library, Williams "was equally important as a pioneer of maternal and child care in developing countries with a system based on local traditions and resources rather than on the use of expensive drugs and western systems of child care," Historical Background, Personal Papers, Cicely Delphine Williams, Wellcome Library, at <http://archives.wellcomelibrary.org/DServe/>, (accessed January 25, 2014).

"fired the first salvo" in the baby food controversy.¹⁷ Williams, the professional woman ignored by male colleagues, and activist pediatrician concerned for child health around the world, was a vociferous critic of the milk and food companies that sought markets and mouths. Her lecture at the Singapore Rotary Club concluded with a declaration that activists quoted forty years later. In 1979, the International Organization of Consumers Unions (IOCU, now Consumers International) in Malaysia disseminated a postcard, citing Williams in declaring "one million deaths" as a result of industrial baby food marketing, along with dramatic images of African women with canisters for breasts holding up dead infants.¹⁸

At the same time, Williams's position within the British Empire complicated a simple reading of her contributions to maternal and child health. Without a doubt, her strict adherence to framing health in terms of the patient's local social and cultural circumstances made her a pioneer. But she carried with her imperial assumptions about hygiene and citizenship that created conflict when dealing with local customs and cultural values. She demanded of the colonial and local elite that they teach their servants how to feed babies and maintain proper cleanliness, for proper "citizenship must be learned as a

17 David Morley, "C. D. Williams," *BMJ*, 1992, 307. He wrote that Williams "recognized the danger of allowing sales representatives dressed in white to go around tenements suggesting to mothers that they should bottle feed their babies," a sales technique that led to "tragic" results. Williams and Jelliffe co-authored a medical textbook together in 1972 in which they wrote "Universal solutions are an illusion. Child Health Services have to be tailored to local circumstances," and complained that in a world confounded by infant mortality and malnutrition, it seemed a problem that experts sought solutions for protein deficiencies in "such exotic sources as algae and leaves," while "breast-feeding should be disappearing and constantly ignored by nutritionists," in Cicely D. Williams and Derrick B. Jelliffe, *Mother and Child Health: Delivering the Services* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 15.

18 Cicely Williams, Speech, "Milk and Murder," Singapore Rotary Club, collected in Baumslag, *Primary Health Care Pioneer*, (1986), 66-70. IOCU image.

life to be lived."¹⁹ The healthy baby contributed to thriving and stable homes, and such homes made a great nation. Furthermore, there was "a war on," so Britain and its colonies needed to grow healthy children for the war effort. The patriarchal, technological and modern explosion that was World War II provided Williams with a chance to express her views, and implement them.

Williams dedicated herself to a lifelong "crusade" against improper feeding practices and the hubris of western medical practitioners.²⁰ In the late 1950s, she joined La Leche League's Medical Advisory Board early in the group's existence, and inspired "several generations of nutritionists," Derrick Jelliffe the most famous among them. Jelliffe became a global defender of breastfeeding, and both Williams and Jelliffe dedicated their lives to the fight against western exploitation in developing countries.²¹ They bitterly opposed the Nestlé "milk nurses" or Mothercraft nurses in the health care industry. Williams noted in 1978 that, "I went to Singapore and found Nestlé nurses, these girls dressed as nurses, dragging a good lactating breast out of the baby's mouth and pouring in baby milks."²² Jelliffe explicitly saved the lives of many children, living and working around the world, and published widely. He began a career testifying against the

19. Cicely Williams, "Milk and Murder," in Baumslag, Primary Health Care Pioneer, 69-70.

20 Herbert Ratner, Editorial introducing "Milk and Murder," Child and Family 16, No. 1, (1977), 50. See also Baumslag, Primary Health Care Pioneer, 66. Williams, according to Ratner, "was the spearhead of a movement that brought lifesaving nutritional practices to colonies whose natives were being seduced from natural practices by the importation of unsanitary technologic food products."

21 See Ratner, Editorial, 50, and Baumslag, Pioneer, 66.

22 Cicely Williams, Interview in the Lansing Star, October 18, 1978, quoted in Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods, 40.

formula industry, and his expertise and official status became an important tool for the boycotters and consumer groups.

The Commercial Empire of Health

If Williams was one key early progenitor of the Nestlé Boycott, Jelliffe was the other. In 1968, when Jelliffe was Director of the Caribbean Food and Nutrition Institute in Jamaica, studying malnutrition, he coined the term “commerciogenic malnutrition.” He explained what he meant in a subsequent speech in 1971, published in Food Technology, when he pointed the finger directly at multinational formula companies, stating: "It is harsh, but correct, to consider some of these children as suffering from . . . the thoughtless promotion of these milks and infant foods."²³ He never claimed that baby foods led to infant death, only that formula was one factor in a complex web of nutrition and health. Additionally, he suggested that health professionals and industry representatives work together to solve infant malnutrition in the developing world.

Health professionals like Jelliffe, who worked at the height of the development era in the 1950s and 1960s, negotiated the junctures of foreign policy, economic development and national sovereignty during the Cold War. In raising central issues concerning infant feeding and multinational food and pharmaceutical companies, many health experts focused on advertising and private nutritional development in the Global South. For instance, in 1969, a journal devoted to health in the Global South covered the

23 Derrick B. Jelliffe, "Commerciogenic malnutrition?," Food Technology 25, (1971), 55. Jelliffe also used the term "occidentogenic malnutrition," equating corporate responsibility with Occidentalism and imperialism. For many critics of big business in the 1970s, this view remained a vital way of interpreting infant feeding.

problems of bottle-feeding in Nigeria.²⁴ One author pointed to a radio advertisement for Lactogen in Nigeria, which she found particularly loathsome. "Mother, believe in Lactogen . . . All things in mother's milk are also present in Lactogen. Mother, watch the health of your baby, and give him the best, give Lactogen," the ad intoned.²⁵ Western NGO's, increasingly on the lookout for nefarious actions in the developing world, documented corporate abuses in formula, food, and pharmaceuticals. After exposing the problems of corporate baby feeding in multiple journals and books, Jelliffe called for more concerted efforts from the global community of experts.

Jelliffe, having both advised and pressured national governments, decided in 1970 that an international forum should explore the baby feeding controversy. That year he asked colleagues at the UN Protein-Calorie Advisory Group (PAG) to organize a gathering of experts from all sides of the debate. This meeting became one the earliest efforts to address the issue with industry, but ultimately reaffirmed and legitimized corporate presence in global infant feeding. The convention's aim was to publish proposed regulations and investigate "scientifically" the causes of breastfeeding declines and infant mortality. Held in Bogota, under the sponsorship of the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), WHO and UNICEF, the PAG meeting became a model for later

24 Dr. Catherine Wennen, "The decline in breast feeding in Nigeria," Tropical and Geographical Medicine 21, (1969), 93-6. Wennen expressed her dismay with Nestlé's promotion of Lactogen in Africa, and challenged a Nestlé executive about company practices. "He ignored our criticisms and arguments," she wrote, even though he understood the complex issues of corporate marketing, poverty and health. For family, national and humanity's health, experts needed to study infant feeding and ponder declines in breastfeeding. Capitalism began at the mother's breast, but so did national development, no matter the political economic ideology and hybrid practices on the ground. Survival was tied to growth and development, to infants and whole economies.

25 Swiss Information Groups for Development Policy (SAFE), Does Nestlé Kill Babies?, 1975, 8-10, quoted in Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods: Successful Challenges to an International Marketing Strategy, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 40.

gatherings (especially the Joint Meeting held in 1979, and the WHO Code process at the World Health Assembly (WHA) in 1981, discussed below).

The Bogota meeting also marked the industry's awareness that it needed to proactively engage the issue, contain its critics, and always attend such meetings in order to influence the proceedings in their favor. Formula companies attended the PAG gathering, and there began to learn how to deflect criticisms. David Cox, President of the Ross Division of Abbott Laboratories, claimed that the 1970 meeting was the first moment he became aware of the growing critics of his industry.²⁶ He also emphasized that no expert studies anywhere in the world had proven a direct correlation between formula marketing and global declines in breastfeeding. This point grew to become a central argument against critics through the years, in addition to agreement that "breast is best" and that free choice should prevail.

Ultimately, the crucial development at the PAG meeting was the attendees' focus on two issues: the dominance of corporate-produced infant formula in the developing world and the lack of a critical stance in the public health field toward the impact of that dominance. The conference met privately, with no published report, in order to "ensure full industry participation."²⁷ Eventually, PAG Statement 23, "The Promotion of Special Foods" issued in 1972, reflected the amount of work activists needed to do in order to

26 David O. Cox, "Summary Statement of Abbott Laboratories," Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in Developing Nations: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, 95th Congress, (May, 23, 1978), 248-254. (Kennedy Hearings). According to the company, Abbott, a "worldwide health-care company, had sales in 1977 of \$1.245 billion," \$222 million of which came from infant formula. The company, a manufacturer of "pharmaceuticals, hospital supplies and medical equipment, in addition to infant formula SIMILAC and ISOMIL, claimed to have only 10% of its sales in the Third World. Pharmaceutical companies provided a contrast to the major food companies such as Nestlé.

27. Chetley, 41.

overcome entrenched private interests.²⁸ For British activist Andy Chetley and other critics, the statement "read like a catalog on how to improve infant formula sales." Despite the presence of public health activists from around the world, industry representatives used the conference to advance their own agenda.

The PAG stated that infant malnutrition in developing countries could be overcome by public support of private enterprise. Countries without proper breast milk substitutes should subsidize the production of scientifically balanced and nutritious infant formula; nations should provide "incentives that will encourage industrial investment"; countries should implement free programs to distribute baby foods "to the vulnerable groups in the lowest income families"; provide proper training of infant formula use "to all mothers"; "stimulate use of mass media channels for both educational and ethical product promotion communication," and should recognize that promotion and marketing are both "essential" components of any effort to "establish widespread consumer use of nutritious foods for children." For the companies, such promotion was essential from a "public health standpoint."²⁹ The formula industry's involvement in international public health and policy initiatives angered many critics and health professionals.

At the same time, the 1972 PAG established guidelines that inspired later restrictions against the industry. In recommendations to companies, the UN gathering stated that business leaders should help solve "special nutritional problems of vulnerable groups," and "industry should recognize" that "the immediate postpartum period" and the

28. Protein Advisory Group of the United Nations System, "Promotion of Special Foods (Infant Formula and Processed Protein Foods) for Vulnerable Groups," PAG Statement No. 23, (July 18, 1972), in Kennedy Hearings, U.S. Senate, 1978, 1460-1467.

29 Protein-Calorie Advisory Group of the United Nations, 'Promotion of special foods (infant formula and processed protein foods) for vulnerable groups,' PAG Statement No. 23 (July, 18 1972), quoted in Chetley, 41.

"hospital nursery" are inappropriate locations for promotions or advertising.³⁰ The International Pediatrics Association also met and proffered feeding guidelines, involving notions of global consumerism, and the "purchasing power of African and Asian consumers in relation to meeting the nutritional needs of the child through commercial channels." These international experts covered marketing and advertising to Third World citizens in terms of nutrition, which directly equated to growth and development. Marketing nutritious foods to children constituted serious business. Should governments work toward "stimulating the supply of nutritious foods and supplements for infants and young children," or leave these feeding relationships to industry? Pediatricians and industry experts should meet, teach, and care for the world's nutrition needs, for bodies and for nations, for refugees and for workers.

The Three Stone Kitchen

In 1973 the bottle-breast controversy moved out of academic journals and public health gatherings, and into the popular press. Andy Chetley, a central figure in the baby food controversy, wrote that the problem shifted "over from quiet, secluded discussion at UN meetings and exploded on the pages of the world's press."³¹ The New Internationalist, a British magazine formed in 1973 with the financial support of Oxfam and Christian Aid, to "encourage more people to understand the processes of 'development,'" wrote a cover piece titled "The Baby Food Tragedy."³² The magazine interviewed two child health

30 PAG Statement No. 23, in Kennedy Hearings, 1466.

31 Chetley, 43.

32 Hugh Geach, "The Baby Food Tragedy," New Internationalist (August, 1973). The magazine, called Internationalist at first, began as a member publication for the "student development

experts who, like Cicely Williams and Derrick Jelliffe, had worked for years in the developing world. They linked bottle-feeding with infant health problems and worldwide declines in breastfeeding. More importantly, the magazine called for an action campaign to tackle the issue. In addition to declaring "we must not accept the creation of more malnutrition for the sake of commercial gain," the magazine sought NGO help with the campaign.³³

The editors contacted another group, called War on Want, concerned with North-South inequality and social injustice. The London-based development group, already occupied with health care problems in the Third World, agreed to work with the magazine, but desired "a stronger case" for the link between infant formula and poor infant nutrition. War on Want commissioned Mike Muller, a freelance journalist, to draft a full report. Muller eventually published his findings as The Baby Killer in 1974, which led to investigations by the British parliament and shown additional light on the role of corporate interests in infant feeding in the developing world..

War on Want detailed for the public the complicated relationship between corporate profit and public health. English formula companies remained at the center of the investigation, mostly for their product marketing in Africa. Twenty thousand copies

organization Third World First (now People and Planet), in the United Kingdom. The group approached UK aid agencies Oxfam and Christian Aid and pitched them for money. The magazine hoped to cover "the people, the ideas and the action in the fight for world development,' and it offered . . . a radical analysis of rich-poor world relationships," or the complicated history of the Global North-South divide. See "Our History: How Did It Begin?" New Internationalist, <http://newint.org/about/history-of-new-internationalist/> (accessed May 20, 2014).

33 New Internationalist, August 1973, quoted in Chetley, 43. See also S. Prakash Sethi, "A Conceptual Framework for Environmental Analysis of Social Issues and Evaluation of Business Response Patterns," The Academy of Management Review 4, No. 1 (Jan., 1978), 70. Sethi studied baby food politics and corporate social responses for twenty years; Judith Richter, International Regulation of Transnational Corporations: The Infant Food Debate, unpublished dissertation, University of Amsterdam (2001), 48.

of the English-language edition were "sold or distributed world-wide," and NGOs translated it into many, mostly European, languages.³⁴ One of those translations sparked the initial uproar against Nestlé. It came in May 1974 from Swiss left-leaning Swiss development NGO, Arbeitsgruppe Dritte Welt (hereafter and throughout I use the English translation, Third World Action Group, or TWAG), which notoriously titled its translation Nestlé Tötet Babies (Nestlé Kills Babies).³⁵ In addition to outlining the bottles-to-malnutrition narrative -- including illiteracy, contaminated water, and declines in breastfeeding due to aggressive marketing - War on Want's The Baby Killer offered prescriptions to the problem based on initial investigations by WHO, pediatricians, and other experts.

Public pressure began to mount on Nestlé with publication of The Baby Killer. TWAG railed against economic imperialism, and believed that Nestlé Alimentana AG led the list of culprits in neocolonial activities in the developing world. In addition to attacking Nestlé in the book, the group printed a condemnatory poster, and members published an open letter to the company. Student newspapers also disseminated versions of the book throughout Switzerland.³⁶ The Swiss media reviewed the book, and in July

34 Chetley, 43.

35 TWAG focused on Swiss companies and government agencies working in the developing world and brought a critical perspective that reflected the West's multinational moment. In 1968, TWAG began a holiday season campaign called "Denken statt Schenken," or "think rather than buy presents." In 1970 they focused on political and economic problems in Angola, especially the construction of the Cabora Bassa dam, a project that involved Brown-Boveri, a Swiss company. The group focused on arms dealing in the Third World, as well, and studied multinational corporations leading into their treatment of home-country corporation, Nestlé S.A. See Jane Cottingham, Bottle Babies, 28.

36 Jane Cottingham, Bottle Babies, 29.

1974, Nestlé sued TWAG on four counts of libel. The company pressured newspapers to publish its own rebuttals, threatening legal action.

The Third World Action Group's singling out of Nestlé drew on Muller's data, as well as his personal experience at Nestlé headquarters in Vevey during his research. While there, he debated nutrition, protein and weaning foods with Nestlé executives. According to Muller, Nestlé claimed that corporate critics "are the sort of people who are putting forward these arguments . . . and these people are idealists. It's very nice to say that these countries should be self-sufficient and should produce their own weaning foods and so on but it is not a fact of life at the moment."³⁷ Yet to industry critics like TWAG, those "facts of life" were themselves products of the detrimental influence of corporations and western power generally. Furthermore, food and pharmaceutical companies impinged on Less Developed Countries (LDC) growth and development, rather than helping poor countries, creating what Muller called a "World Protein Gap." Muller wrote that "a minority of mankind, in the affluent countries, enjoy more than their daily protein needs; many of the world's people receive less than they need to sustain growth and health. Any trend away from breast feeding must aggravate" this worldwide nutrition gap. Mother's milk supported national growth and infant growth, but also the health of all humanity, in this view.³⁸ Muller emphasized the infant-to-global understanding, quoting Jelliffe, who noted "on a community, national or global scale the economics of human milk production is, strangely, seldom considered in a world understandably striving for increased traditional and unconventional forms of protein."

37 Mike Muller, The Baby Killer, War On Want, 14.

38 Ibid, 14.

Protein for bodies, and for economies, focused political energy on women and their feeding choices.

War on Want underscored the disconnect between corporate images of the health and safety of western food products in Africa and the realities of life choices in the Third World. In addition to quoting from Dr. David Morley of the Tropical Child Health Unit at London University's Institute on Child Health, who researched in rural Nigeria, the pamphlet quoted Nestlé's Mother Book and British company Cow and Gate's Babycare Booklet to show their label instructions. "Wash your hands thoroughly with soap each time you have to prepare a meal for baby," read Nestlé's instructions, and "place bottle and lid in a saucepan of water with sufficient water to cover them. Bring to the boil and allow to boil for 10 minutes," read Cow and Gate's.³⁹ The labels showed an image of a modern electric stove and "gleaming saucepan," depictions of the modernizing African family.⁴⁰ These representations of modern health, however, stood in stunning contrast to the local facts of living: "Sixty-six per cent of households in Malawi's capital have no washing facilities at all. Sixty percent have no indoor kitchen," and as for electric stoves, most West African mothers used a "three-stone kitchen, that is, three stones to support a pot above a wood fire." Third World mothers rarely had modern kitchens for cooking the family meal.

More than any of the potential dangers of bottle-feeding, however, the cost of artificial food remained notoriously prohibitive for poor families in developing countries. Most impoverished people simply could not afford infant formula, or processed food

³⁹ Muller, 7.

⁴⁰ This phrase came from Fred Cooper, Africa Since 1940, (see Introduction), an overview with an excellent context of post-colonial African history and ideas of the modern, of developing, of the local versus the global.

more generally. Some local doctors claimed that the controversy did not apply to women in the slums or in rural areas because most could not buy the products, and so they did not. According to the USAID site reports for Bogota, Semarang, Nairobi and Bangkok, many poor women weaned their children employing traditional local foods and based their decisions on cultural norms, not on corporate marketing.⁴¹ Muller cited the British Medical Journal, among many reports, to show that in Nigeria "the cost of feeding a 3 month old infant is approximately 30% of the minimum urban wage. By the time that infant is 6 months, the cost will have risen to a crippling 47%."⁴²

Measuring national per capita income, however, has been notoriously problematic in development studies. The USAID site report for Nairobi noted "the problems with modeling . . . income as a socioeconomic status proxy." Income for households often depended on "household composition and the intra-family distribution of resources" which went unaccounted for, especially considering "non-cash incomes, irregular income, and illegal or otherwise unreported income."⁴³ Often, too, urban dwellers

41 Winikoff, USAID Bogota Site Report. See also USAID Bangkok Site Report and others (see below 43n).

42 Muller, 7.

43 Beverly Winikoff, Michael Latham, et al, The Infant Feeding Study: Nairobi Site Report (USAID, (1981), 41. Attempting to find the exact "science" of breast-feeding declines, especially when trying to sort out the principle dichotomy between corporate-food and mother's milk, remained notoriously difficult. For example, the Kenya Central Bureau of Statistics Surveys defined "household," the definition used by USAID for Nairobi, as "a person or group of person generally bound by ties of kinship, who normally reside together under a single roof or several roofs within a single compound and who share a community of life in that they are answerable to the same kind and have a common source of food or income." USAID noted that households as such ranged "from 2 to 13 members with a mean household size of 5.5." Add education levels, age by member, marital status (which also differed between reality and legal status, and shifted over time), sex of every member, extended kinship networks beyond the "household," community influence, such as midwives and in-laws, who contributed to a mother's feeding choices, sleeping and cooking arrangements, water sources, and access to electricity and the problem is acute. See Nairobi Site Report, 44-50.

maintained family and economic ties in rural areas. Morten Jerven, an expert on income accounting in global connections and debates about “African economic performance,” noted that such national income estimates “have a historical and geographical specificity” that made such data “unsuitable and misleading.” Searching for non-Eurocentric metrics led Jerven to question income estimates “in pre-and post-industrial societies, in decentralized societies, and in polities outside the temperate zone.”⁴⁴ In any case, doctors from developing countries still reacted strongly to the problem of formula costs and poverty.⁴⁵ And no matter extralegal income from sources such as prostitution, resale of vegetables in slum neighborhoods, or brewing alcoholic beverages on the side, the lack of refrigeration exacerbated ordinary women's ability to buy and use formula properly over time. These divergences between North and South drove TWAG's involvement in Third World social justice.

Amid the uproar that followed publication of Muller's book and the launching of TWAG's campaign, Nestlé unsurprisingly took issue with the title, Nestlé Kills Babies, and its direct accusation of baby deaths. The company fought the book's charge that its actions “were unethical and immoral.”⁴⁶ In a libel suit filed in Switzerland Nestlé challenged TWAG's assertion that the company was “responsible for the death or the permanent physical and mental damage of thousands of babies by its sales promotion policy,” and that the company hired fake nurses to promote its products. The company planned to settle out of court, and demanded that the group pay court fees and destroy all

44 Morten Jerven, “An Uneven Playing Field: National Income Estimates and Reciprocal Comparison in Global Economic History,” Journal of Global History 7, no. 01 (2012): 107–28.

45 Interview Milton Ocheang, Kenyan physician, April 2014.

46 Chetley, 44.

copies of its book. But TWAG pressed the issue and went to trial, claiming that the public needed to hear its criticisms of the company for the good of infants in the Third World.

During the trial, which lasted from the end of 1975 into the middle of 1976, TWAG compiled evidence from of company practices in developing countries that compelled Nestlé to drop all of its charges except one against the damning title. Jelliffe supplied evidence for the trial. "High pressure promotion, advertising and distribution" contributed in "changing the pattern of infant feeding" and led to diseases that yielded "mortality and morbidity in the early months and first year of life."⁴⁷ The judge found the title libelous, and fined each member of the group 300 Swiss francs, claiming that a causal link between company products and infant death was impossible to prove.

Two significant unintended consequences resulted from the trial. First, Nestlé imagined that it had won a victory against "leftist revolutionaries."⁴⁸ In reality, publicity from the trial spread beyond Switzerland, and the judge possessed enough cause to chastise the company for its marketing practices. He affirmed that the company's products could be dangerous in certain situations, and that its marketing material was "in no way appropriate for mothers in developing countries." The judge claimed that the company had to change its marketing practices if it wanted to appear ethical and avoid criticism in the future. He also emphasized that the available evidence, despite what the company claimed, supported Nestlé's use of misleading "health nurses" to sell its

47 Derrick Jelliffe, "Summary of a Statement to the Bern Court," November 1974, quoted in Jane Cottingham, *Bottle Babies: A Guide to the Baby Foods Issue* (Rome: ISIS- Women's International Information and Communication Service, 1976), 5. Jelliffe appeared as a witness on February 26, 1976. Also, according to Cottingham, in Swiss law "the defendant may prove that his statements correspond to the truth or that they were made in good faith," 30.

48 Chetley, 46.

products.⁴⁹ Second, the trial created a foundation of critical activism against the company, the formula industry and multinational corporations. By expanding media coverage of baby food politics between North and South, the trial ended the formula industry's ability to work in developing countries without notice, unmolested by social justice and world health monitors. Further, as the company continued to insist that its behavior remained ethical despite revelations otherwise, activists focused on Nestlé as the company to single out among potentially many others.

Because of TWAG's experience with the libel suit, consumer groups realized they needed to organize international networks, maintain a united front against attacks, and continue pressure on what they saw as culpable multinationals. As Chetley noted, the Bern trial "provided the first clear organizing focus for the entire campaign," one that would grow beyond Switzerland, beyond continental Europe, and eventually lead to an international boycott started in the United States.⁵⁰ Because the lawsuit forced TWAG to assemble evidence from around the world, it created lasting networks that other groups later used for data collection. Furthermore, the concept of monitoring the formula companies in the Third World solidified, and would be used even within the UN system

49 The Swiss Information (Action) Groups for Development Policy (SAFEP) recorded much of the trial, including the judge's comments, translated into English by TWAG and widely disseminated in the international press. TWAG became a member of SAFEP in 1973, formed with other Swiss groups. The judge said: "It is considered proved by the evidence that the Nestlé company uses health nurses who have an advertising task and who, by their activity, have an advertising effect . . . hence, the need ensues for the Nestlé company fundamentally to rethink its advertising practices in developing countries concerning bottle feeding, for its advertising practice up to now can transform a life-saving product into one that is dangerous and life-destroying. If the complainant in future wants to be spared the accusation of immoral and unethical conduct, he will have to change advertising practices." Quoted in Chetley, 45.

50 Chetley, 45.

into the 2000s. Activists gathered together and figured out what strategies to employ against unethical business practices around the world.⁵¹

Additionally, because groups such as War on Want, TWAG, and INFACT originated in western urban centers, the groups realized the necessity of establishing local contacts on the ground in developing countries. These relationships included individuals, often within existing consumer groups, mothers, and health professionals sympathetic to the cause. For example, TWAG's evidence included a letter from the Food and Agriculture Adviser, Ministry of National Education, in Tanzania, who noted the expense of manufactured food versus local mixtures.⁵² These networks were essential for activist groups compiling evidence against the companies. Had Nestlé ignored TWAG's pamphlet, it is not certain that industry critics would have coalesced and established such information networks, or gained experience defending their position, gathering expert science on nutrition, and locating examples of questionable promotion campaigns. The trial provided focus for pressure groups, and ignited the organizational spark that sustained the eventual boycott and WHO Code process. Nestlé began to learn vital lessons for its marketing strategies. But so did industry critics, church groups, and consumer organizations convinced that their efforts helped corral the unhealthy results of rampant multinational capitalism.

51 The various groups formed Baby Foods Action Group (BFAG), based in the UK, to "encourage restrictions on the inappropriate commercial promotion and distribution of artificial baby milks in the Third World and the West," and to "show how the harmful trend away from breast feeding to bottle feeding is an example of what happens when societies are based on production for profit rather than for use." Quoted in Cottingham, Bottle Babies, 31.

52 G. A. Semiti, Letter to Arbeitsgruppe der Dritte Welt, Bern, 1975, quoted in Cottingham, Bottle Babies, 1975, 12. The doctor explained the family cost differences between artificial food, around 25% of income, and "a traditional baby food."

One of the most effective rejoinders to corporate self-defense came out of the Bern trial, as well. Companies staunchly defended their right to meet consumer demand wherever it existed. Where women could not, or chose not to, breastfeed, companies prepared themselves, with stiff competition for market share, to supply feeding and nutrition products that contributed to both infant growth and development. Jelliffe, in his statement for the defense, noted that in point of fact most women could breastfeed, and the number who did not, especially in poor areas, was extremely small. There was a need for artificial food, Jelliffe argued, but that demand did not support multiple products, with different names and colorful labels, radio spots and TV advertisements, multi-page promotional newsletters, and free canisters. For activists like Jelliffe, people did not require the mass of processed, differentiated artificial food products being dumped on the market in developing nations. The need, Jelliffe said, "under these circumstances would be for a low-cost, minimally advertised form of breast milk surrogate" that could be supplied by a doctor, "and not for the extremely costly and highly advertised formulas promoted by infant food companies."⁵³ Unable to put much of a dent in corporate marketing strategies with rhetoric alone, however, activists increasingly sought concrete points of leverage. In short order, they would surprise the industry. Consumer groups, churches, and left-wing activists began attacking companies at their core: within the boardrooms themselves.

Radicals Inside the Global Firm: Corporate Accountability and Shareholder

Resolutions

53 Derrick Jelliffe, "Summary of Statement for the Defense," Nestlé Libel Trial, heard February 26, 1976, in Cottingham, 17.

Shareholder democracy within the politics of breastfeeding emerged out of the National Council of Churches' (NCC) heritage of civil rights activism. The NCC had investigated the investment portfolios of domestic corporations engaged in racism as early as 1963, chiefly firms in which member churches had investments. The NCC board initiated the first public suggestions "that equity relationship to corporations might be used to influence their social conduct." The first line of attack consisted of encouraging corporations to "cease and desist" engaging in racial discrimination, and then to remove any company from its portfolio that did not comply. Church investments in multinational corporations ran in the billions of dollars – large endowments managed by the Catholic Church and United Methodist Church included petroleum, pharmaceutical, chemical, food, automobile and infant formula companies.⁵⁴ The movement from civil rights and anti-war movements toward agitating against multinational corporations appeared to reflect the new postwar paradigm.⁵⁵

Because racial discrimination occupied the top of the NCC's divestment list in the 1960s, by the early 1970s the organization began to focus on South Africa.⁵⁶ The church

54 National Council of Churches, Corporate Information Center, Agenda Item no. 13 for Presentation to General Board, February 11-15, 1972, 1.

55 William F. Buckley at the National Review published an article titled "What in the Name of God is Going on in the Catholic Church" in a 1965 cover story that attempted to locate the impulse for the change toward social activism within the Church. This transition provided fertile cultural ground in the NCC from which the ICCR grew. See Findlay, Church People in the Struggle, 5-6, 37; Isserman and Kazin, 256; G. Wills, "What in the Name of God is Going On in the Catholic Church," National Review, 1965; http://www.nccusa.org/about/about_ncc.htm (accessed January 4, 2010).

56 Historian Ken Cmiel chronicled the emergence of this new politics in his work on the rise of human rights activism in the 1970s, especially his focus on Amnesty International. He wrote, "just as much as the transnational flow of capital, the new human rights politics are a part of what has come to be called 'globalization.' And like transnational capital, human rights politics emerged during the 1970s." This echoed the methodology of the church groups, as we will see, and later the Nestlé activists. See Kenneth Cmiel, "The Emergence of Human Rights Politics in

groups expanded this type of activity through the 1960s, and in 1968 they issued the pamphlet "The Church as Purchaser of Goods and Services." This statement declared that "the nature of the Church requires that as an economic institution it also consider the social impact of its . . . decisions in terms of justice and equity." A desire to manage its own investments, to remain an influence on social causes, and the work of global missionaries led to the decision to apply pressure on corporations throughout the world.⁵⁷ Sociologist Clarence Tygart discussed what he called the "attitudinal predisposition" of clergy toward social movement activism, and this perspective echoed what we know of moral reform in the nineteenth century as well. For moral suasion and social responsibility to be effective, there must be a "belief that human conditions can be improved," which individuals themselves can affect. Individual perfectibility, as evinced by the rhetoric and actions of abolitionists in the antebellum decades, was the operating principle, often theologically driven. Liberal and "neo-orthodox" clergy differed from their conservative counterparts, in that they saw "societal involvement as an integral part of the clergy's role." But as evangelicals challenged the liberal domestic order, liberals

the United States," The Journal of American History 86, No.3, The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on United States History: A Special Issue (Dec., 1999), 1232.

57 David Vogel, Lobbying the Corporation: Citizen Challenges to Business Authority (New York: Basic Books, 1978), 161-170. For many years, Vogel has been one of the foremost historians on this subject. See also Vogel, National Styles of Regulation: Environmental Policy in Great Britain and the United States (Cornell Studies in Political Economy. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1986); The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility (Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2005), and Trading up: Consumer and Environmental Regulation in a Global Economy, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995); also, Corporate Information Center, Agenda Item no. 13 for Presentation to General Board, February 11-15, 1972, 1; another chapter on the subject is Horace E. Gale, "Why Are the Churches Getting Involved in Investments?" Corporate Responsibility and Religious Institutions, 34.

transitioned into a global network that transcended preceding international approaches by its sheer volume and intensity.⁵⁸

The Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR) emerged from the NCC during this intense contraction. The corporate accountability organization arose from the combined efforts of two groups within the NCC in 1974 – the Corporate Information Center (CIC) and the Interfaith Committee for Social Responsibility in Investments (ICSRI).⁵⁹ The resulting ICSRI "was an action organization that grew from an ad hoc coalition of seven major Protestant denominations." Its members engaged in intense agitation "against the plans of Kennecott Copper and American Metal Climax for open pit mining in Puerto Rico" and succeeding in "delaying and scaling down the mining venture." ICCR's criticism levied against wealthy religious groups was that they did not use "their extensive corporate stockholdings for ethical purposes." But 1971 was also the year that "the Episcopal Church became the first clerical investor to file a shareholder resolution." This resolution related to GM's involvement in South Africa.⁶⁰ Timothy Smith, director of ICCR, led efforts against American companies doing business with

58 Clarence E. Tygart, "Social Movement Participation: Clergy and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement." *Sociological Analysis*, 34, No. 3, (Autumn, 1973), 204. See also Charles Findlay, *Church People in the Struggle*, 222; David M. Ermann and William H. Clements II, "The Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility and Its Campaign against Marketing Infant Formula in the Third World." *Social Problems* 32, No. 2 (Dec., 1984): 185-196

59 The Vietnam War played heavily in ICCR's formation and early activism. As mentioned with the NCC, it was progressive clergy who "questioned whether churches were profiting off the war." In its own words, ICCR began to "challenge military contractors on their production of nuclear weapons (a top priority of ICCR members during the 1980s), foreign military sales and development of space weapons. Similarly, ICCR member opposition to apartheid in South Africa was an extension of the longstanding opposition of U.S. faith communities to slavery, discrimination and segregation." ICCR information on website, <http://iccr.org/about/faq.php>, (accessed May 20, 2014).

60 Vogel, 165-177; M. David Ermann and William H. Clements II, "The Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility and Its Campaign against marketing Infant Formula in the third World," *Social Problems* 32, No. 2 (Dec., 1984): 185-196.

apartheid South Africa.⁶¹ The NCC created its corporate responsibility arm with member denominations supplying staff and funds. Smith and ICCR urged "full withdrawal" of all U.S. companies, unless "the government takes steps to give full political, economic and social rights to the black majority."

The pressure point for this "corporate guerrilla" movement was something called a "proxy resolution," a device nominally designed to protect stockholders. According to attorney Donald Schwartz, an expert in shareholder democracy and an active participant in Campaign GM - a much-publicized effort to improve the company's corporate responsibility, and include African Americans on its board - proxy resolutions originally existed as a structural method of challenging for control of a company. These "rules governing . . . corporate combat" existed to give stockholders "adequate information about the rival forces . . . so that they can intelligently choose between them."⁶² Proxy reports for stockholders, annual reports and annual meetings focused on the ordinary running of business. However, social justice movements that attacked corporations increasingly decided "to use the corporation as a vehicle for reform." These movements

61 Timothy Smith spent 29 years at ICCR, engaged in "environmental, social and governance issues (ESG)" for many church groups. He advocated within the corporate responsibility rubric "some 275 Protestant denominations, Jewish agencies, Roman Catholic orders, healthcare agencies, dioceses, and other concerned religious investors" which cumulatively possessed "assets under management of over \$100 billion." See Institutional Investor Information Exchange (3iX), Timothy Smith, Director of ESG Shareowner Engagement, Walden Asset Management, a division of Boston Trust and Investment Management Company, at <http://www.3-i-x.com/2011-Speaker-Bios/timothy-smith.html>, (accessed January 4, 2012) He received a Masters of Divinity at Union Theological Seminary in New York. Eventually, Smith left ICCR and entered the private corporate social responsibility (CSR) sphere, working for asset management companies. Walden Asset's webpage on Smith failed to mention the Nestlé Boycott specifically, save to say that he "was active in bringing social concerns to corporate attention through dialogue with management, open letters, public hearings, legal actions, stockholders resolutions, divestment, etc."

62 Donald E. Schwartz, "The Public-Interest Proxy Contest: Reflections on Campaign GM," Michigan Law Review 69, no. 3 (January 1, 1971), 421.

reflected quintessential reformist activism, and were deeply embedded within the dominant power structures of the age. Management decisions ultimately favored those who sat on boards and ruled the companies. Additionally, industry advocates claimed that church groups could always invoke the "Wall Street Rule": if you don't like management, sell your shares. Effecting change from the boardroom seemed promising at the time, but also demonstrated the severe limitations of acting from within.

However, ICCR pressed hard against those limitations and managed to change the political, economic and social landscape of corporate responsibility. Proxies and social justice movements started with Saul Alinsky's early 1960s agitation against Eastman Kodak. The company's response surprised him, and revealed that he had touched a corporate nerve: executives' anxiety "convinced me that we had the razor to cut through the golden curtain that protected the so-called private sector from facing its public responsibilities."⁶³ Alinsky added that "in all my wars with the establishment I had never seen it so uptight." Following the lead of activists like Alinsky, in 1971 the Episcopal Church pressured General Motors with a proxy resolution to end its operations in South Africa (lack of success in that campaign inspired the formation of ICCR). According to David Vogel, a historian of business and public policy who wrote prolifically on MNCs, their managerial prerogatives, and "citizen challenges," proxy resolutions achieved their influence because of "the drive for increased public controls over the corporation that dominated the political agenda during much of the seventies." The use of proxy

63 Saul Alinsky, Rules for Radicals, (New York: Vintage, 1972), 175. See historian of consumer boycotts, Monroe Friedman, Consumer Boycotts: Effecting Change Through the Marketplace and the Media (New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 171-79. Additionally, for an excellent history on Alinsky, see Mark Santow, Saul Alinsky and the Dilemmas of Race in the Post-War City (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2000).

resolutions was part of a larger downward trend in public support for big business in the 1970s.⁶⁴

ICCR's focus on proxy issues and pressuring corporations from the inside informed its institutional support of the Nestlé boycott. These activities illustrated for the churches a growing emphasis on corporations and investments around the world, especially within the framework of corporate social responsibility. Mostly, though, such activism reflected the power of corporations and their influence on the world. The Chicago Tribune noticed this trend. "Today's religious activist no longer is cast from the antiwar protester's mold of radicalism," Christine Winter wrote.⁶⁵ The NCC's role in antiwar protests had become culturally commonplace. Civil rights and the Vietnam War defined an era, certainly, and had radicalized ordinary people and professional activists, and honed their critique of the establishment. The dominant structures, especially the growing vitality and influence of global capitalism, determined reactions against it.

Even with these entrenched political and economic difficulties, ICCR continued to push against dominant global corporations. Leah Margulies, ICCR's Program Director, evolved into one of the most influential members of the infant formula

64 David Vogel, "Trends in Shareholder Activism: 1970-1982," in Mark Green, Michael Waldman, Robert K. Massie, Jr., eds, The Big Business Reader: On Corporate America (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1982), 403-04. This collection of essays from the anti-business, Corporate Democracy, environmental and other movements converged the rising critical energies of the activist community and the "leftist" work of the Institute of Policy Studies (IPS). The Reader came out of Big Business Day, a day of consciousness-raising across the United States meant to mimic Earth Day. Compared to Earth Day, Big Business Day achieved little success. Leah Margulies contributed to the collection, as well: Leah Margulies, "Babies, Bottles and Breast Milk: The Nestlé Syndrome," 353-361.

65 Christine Winter, "Tempo: Nuns Storming the Boardroom to Save Babies' Lives Tempo Nuns Tackle Profit Motive to Promote Social Justice in Third World Nations," Chicago Tribune (1963-Current File). April 8, 1978. "Nuns Claim Victory on Breastfeeding Issue," Boston Globe (1960-1982), February 12, 1978, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

movement, and a founder of the Nestlé boycott. According to historian S. Prakash Sethi, Margulies was "the single most effective force behind the issue" with the religious groups. Sethi noted that for some, Margulies was "dedicated and committed." But to conservatives and corporate executives, she presented a "dogmatic, ideologically anti-business, ruthless" activist who threatened the American Way. Her methods were "those of a street fighter." Margulies referred to a Fortune article from 1980 called "The Corporation Haters: Marxists Marching Under the Banner of Christ." As Margulies phrased it, "I'm described essentially as a Jewish interloper at the National Council of Churches."⁶⁶ She also intruded into the corporate status quo.

Margulies's anti-corporate work started in 1969 with the women's movement.⁶⁷

"Women, motivated by philosophies from left to right, organized boycott activities, wrote letters, and signed petitions about the controversy." One scholar noted that western, middle-class women could "identify with women in the third world who were being victimized by the high-pressured promotional efforts of the multinationals. When a

66 Sethi, Marketing, 159-61; and author interview, September 2013; Herman Nickel, "The Corporation Haters: Marxists Marching Under the Banner of Christ," Fortune, 1980. The Heritage Foundation persistently attacked IPS, and noted that Nickel's article covered the "anti-corporate movement," that came out of the churches, and Clergy and Laity Concerned (CALC) and NCC "progressed from active participation in the major Communist-dominated 'peace' coalitions of the 1960s and early 1970s to worrying with 'those who are angry and hate the corporate power which the U.S. presently represents.'" See William Poole, "The Attack on the Corporation," The Heritage Foundation, September 19, 1981, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/1981/09/the-attack-on-the-corporation> (accessed May, 22, 2013). Nestlé, as it happened, paid for the research that went into Nickel's article. More on this article in Chapter Three.

67 Margulies had always been politically active. In high school she spent two years early in the movement doing civil rights work in the South, in 1959 and 1960. This activist momentum continued at Boston University, which, according to her had "copied the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley." Margulies worked with two activists who started the Liberation News Service out of Boston. "I was also heavily involved in the women's liberation movement," Margulies affirmed, and the American Indian Movement (AIM).

specific opportunity arose to take action, they were prepared to move."⁶⁸ Political economist Stephen Hymer hired Margulies at the Yale Economic Growth Center in 1969, where he pioneered studies of MNCs and investments in developing countries in the 1960s. This group began thinking of corporations as the "new economic, social and political structure" of the world.⁶⁹

Many in the women's health movement, including Margulies, attacked patriarchal society and its assumptions about women. In Women in Sexist Society (1971), a collection of critical writings by women, Lucy Komisar condemned advertising and corporate marketing. "Advertising is an insidious propaganda machine for a male supremacist society. It spews out images of women as sex-mates, housekeepers, mothers and menial workers . . . but which also make it increasingly difficult for women to break out of the sexist stereotypes that imprison them."⁷⁰ The 1970s produced many such books, finding their collective voice against the male expert, the capitalist marketplace, and oppression. In For Her Own Good (1978), Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English studied over a century of "the expert's advice to women," in which readers learned about "motherhood as pathology," the privatization of female bodies, and the commodification of their children. "Women began to question their doctor's opinion on their cervix, not to mention his ideas about sexuality, marriage, or femininity."

The women's health movement also shined a light on men's control over women's bodies. Ehrenreich wrote that "the great romance between women and the experts was

68 Hallman, 61, see this, Esterik, 77.

69 Leah Margulies, Interview with the Author, September 12, 2013.

70 Lucy Komisar, "The Image of Woman in Advertising," in Vivian Gornick and Barbara Moran, eds., Women in Sexist Society: Studies in Power and Powerlessness (New York: Basic Books, 1971).

over . . . because the experts had betrayed the trust that women had put in them. Claiming the purity of science," male experts "had persisted in the commercialism inherent in a commoditized system of healing. Claiming the objectivity of science, they had advanced the doctrines" of patriarchal relationships and social order.⁷¹ The male experts and their structures of power and knowledge, especially their control of reproduction and health, "turned out not be scientists - for all their talk of data, laboratory findings, clinical trials - but apologists for the status quo." Confronted with feminist power and counter-knowledge - "the critical and rationalist spirit of the new feminism" - these experts "could only bluster . . . and mumble in embarrassment." Unfortunately, patriarchs could also fight these new movements and strengthen their hold on discursive and material power.⁷² But women like Margulies dedicated their lives to combating this system, and improving the lives of women and children. In the 1970s, there were many reasons to believe that radical change was possible.

Individuals involved in social movements coming out of civil rights and antiwar campaigns often aimed to professionalize their critical propensities. This was the moment when various threads came together: the civil rights/social justice thread, the public health movement, the anti-corporate impulses, and the feminist thread. In 1974 Margulies

71 Ehrenreich and English, 285.

72 A list of "exposes of medical practice" included: Ellen Frankfort's Vaginal Politics (New York: Quandrangle Press, 1972); the Boston Women's Health Collective's Our Bodies, Ourselves (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976), Barbara Seaman, Free and Female (Greenwich, Fawcett Crest, 1972), Adrienne Rich, Of Woman Born (New York, W. W. Norton and Col, 1976), Doris Hair, The Cultural Warping of Childbirth (Seattle: International Childbirth Education Association), Naomi Weisstein's essay "Psychology Constructs the Female," in Gornick and Moran, eds., Women in Sexist Society (New York, Basic Books, 1971; also Claudia Dreifus, Seizing Our Bodies: The Politics of Women's Health Care (New York: Vintage, 1978), John Ehrenreich, The Cultural Crisis of Modern Medicine (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978). That women still struggle for these positions today is instructive of hegemonic power, and the entrenched hegemony of patriarchal capitalist enterprise.

worked on Hungry for Profit, an IOCU publication, for which she fact-checked a chapter on infant formula abuses by huge multinationals. She helped organize ICCR's shareholder resolutions, started the Eco-Justice Task Force, and worked against world hunger and "exporting white bread to other countries." World hunger proved to be "hard stuff" on which to file shareholder resolutions, so she continued her search for the right cause. Margulies contemplated the Coca-Cola Company as the alkaloid version of a multinational, but could not find the necessary support within ICCR. But dead babies tied to corporate greed? Within ICCR infant formula became an issue that easily converted and convinced⁷³.

Meanwhile, Margulies built international contacts at the 1975 United Nations Conference on Women. Shortly thereafter a group called the International Coalition on Development Action (ICDA) held a meeting in Palacios, Texas, where she met fellow activists Mark Ritchie and Doug Johnson.⁷⁴ In addition to becoming an expert on multinational corporations, Margulies continued raising the infant formula-Third World paradox. In June 1975, at the International Women's Year Tribute held in Mexico, she encouraged women from around the world to explore the issue. And in October of that year, she sent more than a thousand questionnaires to church groups around the world, asking them to document infant formula use, abuse and marketing techniques wherever

73 Two contemporaneous sociologists, David Ermann and William Clements, noted that "ICCR participants found the infant formula issue attractive because it resonated with their changing breast-feeding preferences and growing concerns about world hunger, and because it was documentable, emotional, tied to visible physical harms, and causally explained by the marketing practices of intransigent corporations. Organizationally, ICCR found that the infant formula issue generated funding and bolstered commitment from groups with limited commitment to ICCR." See David M. Ermann and William H. Clements II. "The Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility and Its Campaign against Marketing Infant Formula in the Third World," Social Problems 32, No. 2 (Dec., 1984): 185-196.

74 Margulies, Interview with Author, 2007.

possible. These efforts taught ICCR about building international networks and monitors that could pressure companies whose activities had gone unnoticed. She collected information, as she had on company activities when working for Stephen Hymer, on companies, health centers and hospitals, doctors and government policies.⁷⁵ Her critique of big business and corporate ethics violations, her search for a cause, and her labors of self-education led Margulies to shareholder action that triggered the eventual boycott in the United States.

"Nuns Storming the Boardroom"

ICCR initiated shareholder action with American companies Abbott Industries, Bristol-Myers, and American Home Products (AHP). The Abbott and AHP actions produced some minimal compliance with activists' demands, but Bristol-Myers remained intransigent, and eventually faced a lawsuit. In August 1975, the company disseminated a report titled "The Infant Formula Marketing Practices of the Bristol-Myers Company in countries outside the United States." Critics claimed the report contained inaccuracies and outright falsehoods, and in 1976, ICCR helped organize a shareholder suit against Bristol-Myers on behalf of the Sisters of the Precious Blood (SPB), a Roman Catholic order in Dayton, Ohio.⁷⁶ The SPB owned 1,000 shares of stock, which allowed them to file a stockholder resolution, a move that companies usually defeated handily by the

⁷⁵ See Jane Cottingham, 34.

⁷⁶ Author interview with Leah Margulies, January 6, 2013. See "Nuns give guidelines in sale of infant food," New York Amsterdam News, March 4, 1978, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, C2.

majority.⁷⁷ According to court documents, the nun's resolution received less than 3.5% of the vote at the 1976 annual meeting.⁷⁸ The religious order then filed suit in U.S. District Court in New York, the home state of Bristol-Myers, and charged the company with "false and misleading statements" about promotional campaigns in developing countries. The company sent these materials to stockholders before the vote.⁷⁹ Leah Margulies wrote the brief and most of the other material for the nuns.

The suit was settled in January 1978, and settlement terms required Bristol-Myers to send a revised report to its shareholders that included the company position, its own internal guidelines for promotion overseas, and the church organization's scathing critique of the company's marketing practices. Bristol-Myers argued that it did not allow direct marketing of formula to mothers and patients, and only supplied it to doctors. The report "detailing the ill effects resulting from misuse of the company's infant formulas in developing countries," corrected original shareholder documents that misrepresented its role in the Third World. Bristol-Myers paid for the new 11-page mailing.⁸⁰

77 For an excellent discussion of proxy contests and the rise of the new "corporate guerilla fighters" in the early 1970s, see Donald E. Schwartz, "The Public-Interest Proxy Contest: Reflections on Campaign GM," Michigan Law Review 69, no. 3 (January 1, 1971): 419–538.

78 Sisters of the Precious Blood, Inc. v. Bristol-Myers Company, No. 76, CIV. 173 (MP) and 431 F. Supp. 385 (1977), May 11, 1977.

79 See Sisters of the Precious Blood "Bottle Baby Lawsuit," 1976-1978, in Company Files, Bristol-Myers (Mead Johnson), 1975-1989, Box 23, ACA Collection, MHS, and Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR) materials, Bristol-Myers Folder, Box 28, ACA Collection, MHS.

80 Sisters of the Precious Blood, Inc. v. Bristol-Myers Company, No. 76, CIV. 173 (MP) and 431 F. Supp. 385 (1977), a follow-up statement by the district judge on May 11, 1977, when Bristol-Myers moved for a summary judgment dismissing the plaintiff's complaint. See also Marjorie Hyer, "Firm Making Infant Formula Settles Court Suit Filed by Catholic Sisters," The Washington Post, March 10, 1978, A28, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Nuns entering corporate boardrooms for annual meetings made an impression on executives and galvanized the public. The Chicago Tribune observed that 1970s social critique "has boiled down to a push for corporate responsibility," and "today's nuns have learned that money is power." Sister Florence Seiffert of the Precious Blood reflected on church involvement in progressive causes and claimed that some people reacted negatively to sister activism. But images of malnourished African babies and deceptions by companies led to widespread support for their actions.⁸¹ ICCR actually carried out most of the groundwork, writing briefs, attending (or crashing) board meetings, and testifying in courts or in front of Congress. Bristol-Myers agreed to settle even though they were not forced to do so by court action. The judge, in fact, declared that the plaintiff's case showed no harm by the proxy loss nor any causation "by the mere solicitation of votes," and that ruling against the company would be "unwarranted," according to precedent, and "would lead courts to engage, as in this case, in empty judicial exercises."⁸² He ruled in favor of Bristol-Myers' request that all materials collected by the plaintiff be struck from the record: the nuns had "larded the record with a mass of irrelevancies." The Sisters contemplated appealing this ruling in 1977, but out of court the company agreed to the mailing, which included grim details of Third World infant pathology.

The question remained, then, why did Bristol-Myers, the large, global pharmaceutical company, settle the case? Even when the Ford and Rockefeller

81 See Christine Winter, "Tempo: Nuns Storming the Boardroom to Save Babies' Lives Tempo Nuns Tackle Profit Motive to Promote Social Justice in Third World Nations," Chicago Tribune (1963-Current File), April 8, 1978.

82 Sisters of the Precious Blood, Inc. v. Bristol-Myers Company, No. 76, CIV. 173 (MP) and 431 F. Supp. 385 (1977).

Foundations expressed their discomfort with the company, and several large investors held private meetings with management, Bristol-Myers executives were not persuaded. The U.S. Security and Exchange Commission (SEC), though, had a problem with the judge's ruling. In effect, the Commission believed that the case established that it was acceptable to lie to stockholders on company annual statements. When the SEC filed a Friend of Court affidavit, Bristol-Myers decided to settle with the plaintiffs and allowed the dissemination of disparaging, graphic information about infant formula in developing countries.⁸³ The company also agreed to end marketing products directly to consumers and to halt their use of Mothercraft nurses. According to Chetley, the suit ignited the issue beyond the industry's attempt to quash it. The importance of gathering proof of violations across the globe, of obtaining sworn affidavits from ordinary people in developing countries, and monitoring company promotional activities, gave pressure groups additional experience in how to organize and maintain global networks.

Even after Bristol-Myers settled the lawsuit with Sisters of the Precious Blood and the July 4, 1977 beginning of the boycott, ICCR continued with proxy resolutions. In 1978, after four years of pushing shareholder resolutions against formula companies, the group sought nationwide support for its proxy campaign against American Home Products (AHP) and its subsidiary Wyeth International.⁸⁴ ICCR hoped large institutional and individual investors would find common cause with their aims, which included demanded that AHP create a committee "to review its marketing and promotional

83 Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods: Successful Challenges to an International Marketing Strategy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 50-2. Chetley noted that "Under U.S. law, proxy statements cannot be incorrect or misleading." See also, Ann Crittenden, "Infant Formula at Issue," New York Times, April 3, 1977, 118, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

84 Judith Miller, "Infant Formula: A Proxy Issue," New York Times, April 9, 1978, F8, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

practices" in developing countries. ICCR mailed out hundreds of proxy solicitation to major stakeholders. AHP denounced the critics' claims and asked its large investors to ignore these resolutions. AHP secretary Carol Emerling claimed that the company was guided by principle, and that "if it only takes a tiny minority of the shareholders to call into question the company's management, we're no longer fully in charge of the company." The church groups within ICCR's mandate owned 82,690 shares, "valued at more than \$2.3 million." INFACT, meanwhile, pushed the Minnesota State Board of Investments, owners of at least 260,000 shares, and the University of Minnesota's Committee for Social Responsibility in Investments, to support the resolution.⁸⁵

Shareholder activism, UN conferences, congressional hearings and lawsuits played an important role in baby food politics, but ordinary people sympathetic to the issue often expressed a desire to do something specific about the problem. Once they learned about corporate infant food and Third World malnutrition, women as mothers and consumers, middle class activists, church members, shoppers, and college students wanted to take action. The story of grassroots consumer activism truly began with the declaration of a boycott in 1977, initiated in Minnesota and eventually encompassing an influential global network.

Building an International Boycott: American Consumerism Goes Global

In January 1977, Leah Margulies of ICCR and her colleagues at the Infant Formula Action Coalition (INFACT) in Minneapolis decided to make infant formula the focus of their work. They began showing Peter Krieg's film Bottle Babies to church and

⁸⁵ Judith Miller, "Infant Formula," F8.

community groups, and to local Democratic Party organizations, "anywhere they could." INFAC's initial thrust aimed to raise funds for ICCR and its shareholder resolutions.⁸⁶ Doug Johnson noted that INFAC met "on the level of conference calls that were funded by ICCR's budget," and shared their community-building experiences from around the country. Local groups desired to see the film and they began showing Bottle Babies fifteen or twenty times a week, talking about Bristol Myers and Abbott, "and people started to murmur about Nestlé." Ordinary community members began saying that they weren't going to buy Nestlé products any longer, and there was a surge in pro-boycott sentiment. "We began to actually experience a kind of grassroots swelling of a call for a boycott," Johnson recalled. He pointed out that in the 1970s "the notion of a boycott had been greatly popularized by the grape boycott." He emphasized that "it was a very easy thing for people to think about as a natural tactic and as an expression" of what one "could do as an individual." According to Johnson, the popular sentiment among the concerned public was "you either start this boycott or we're going to do it." Johnson and the other activists were influenced by Cesar Chavez' grape boycott against unethical growers, and by the ineluctability of the boycott impetus among their colleagues.⁸⁷

Doug Johnson's and Mark Ritchie's backgrounds influenced their decisions about activism around infant food. Johnson had traveled to Gandhi's ashram in India for the

86 Ermann and Clements wrote that an ICCR member, Chris Cowap, representing the NCC at a World Council of Churches gathering in Nairobi, Kenya in 1975, saw Bottle Babies and brought it back to the United States. See Ermann and Clements, "ICCR," 1984, 191.

87 Doug Johnson, Interview with Author, December 2007, and Johnson, "Interview with Doug Johnson"; Leah Margulies, Interview with the Author, December 2007; Isserman and Kazin, 125-130; for an insightful essay on Bottle Babies, a quote by Frederic Engels, and a "dialectic between engendered desire and multinational commercial exploitation," see Howard Z. Lorber and Margo Cornelius, "Bottle Babies: Grave Markers," Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media, 1982 [2005], <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC27folder/BottleBabies.html>.

one-hundredth year of Gandhi's birth, where he first read articles about infant formula. He worked in Kenya on a social justice project for the Catholic Church and was dismayed at the corporate advertising and the "diffusion of Western civilization" in East Africa, especially Nestlé's infant formula marketing. Johnson's travels in Africa and Asia, and his questions and fears about American society, radicalized him and fed his political direction. As awareness of American economic presence around the world increased, Johnson wanted to be, as he put it in an interview, "working locally but influencing globally."⁸⁸

Johnson became interested in development issues and transnational work, and started a group at the University of Minnesota's Newman Center, which served the school's Catholic community, to focus and act on issues of global hunger. This focus on food included "the role of corporate America transferring wealth and undermining the capacity of people to feed themselves."⁸⁹ As had Leah Margulies, Johnson made international contacts, attending the World Food Congress in Rome in 1974 and the meeting in Palacios, Texas, where he met Mark Ritchie and Leah Margulies. The activists worked within the established institutions such as churches to act on hunger, poverty and what many saw as corporate crimes against humanity.

From the Newman Center and neighborhood living rooms, a global network germinated. In Minneapolis, people left screenings of Bottle Babies, meetings and talks determined to stop buying Nestlé products. As Chetley noted, there was a surge in pro-boycott sentiment. From swim-a-thons to leafleting, house meetings and petitions, the

⁸⁸ Doug Johnson, Interview with Author, December 2007, and Johnson, "Interview with Doug Johnson.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

group worked tirelessly at the grassroots level to manipulate the cultural and economic fissures, hoping to widen them toward their vision of social change. "A set of conversations, nationally and internationally, and then a lot of intense activities in Minnesota on a community level. That led to launching the boycott in July, 1977."⁹⁰ Personal commitment for many individuals, and popular momentum, continued to build; Margulies focused on implementing a boycott, and thus the boycott "bubbled" out of the world hunger, co-op movement in Minneapolis and around the country.⁹¹

From the Swiss and Bristol-Myers court cases and early involvement by UN agencies, the issue had firmly moved into the broader public sphere. With new technologies in communication, transportation and travel contributing to a global community, regular citizens, pressure groups and international organizations increasingly turned their interpretations and fears into an integrated political movement. Over the next year, INFACt labored "to build grassroots support for the boycott around the country," and, by direct action protests, support from major organizations, and media coverage, they had organized "about 300 identified INFACt chapters in the United States. It spread very quickly."⁹²

90 Johnson, "The Interview," 1997; see also Sethi, Multinational Corporations, 160-167.

91 Many scholars, especially sociologists and political scientists, have written about boycotts as a forceful and necessary tool to help bring about social change. "In the midst of globalization," Gary Minda has written, nongovernmental citizen groups have employed international civil pressure in order to "change the behavior of global corporations responsible for the activities that damage the environment and cause human misery." Boycotts and international pressure groups became fixtures in the world, and by "performing the traditional regulatory function of nation-states" they helped focus on "human rights and environmental responsibility." See Gary Minda, Boycott in America: How Imagination and Ideology Shape the Legal Mind, (Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press, 1999), 184.

92 Ibid.

Like Doug Johnson, INFAC⁹³ leader Mark Ritchie also came from a world hunger and human rights background. Ritchie "spent most of my life working to end hunger, starting out early as an activist in my Methodist Church in my small hometown in Iowa."⁹³ Ritchie's father had witnessed extreme starvation during World War II, dedicated his life to "helping people create more food," and became a biochemist at Iowa State University working on curing animal diseases.⁹⁴ After graduating from Iowa State in 1971, Ritchie became a food co-op activist, and founded the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, an NGO in Minneapolis. He was one of the first to understand the ramifications of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and, within the rubric of food, health and global survival, loudly sounded the alarm.⁹⁵ Utne Reader called

93 Mark Ritchie, Interview with the Author, December 6, 2007; email from Mark Ritchie, November 21, 2007.

94 Iowa State University has a long history of important agricultural research and innovation, including cutting edge work on sustainable agriculture, led by Frederick L. Kirschenmann, a professor at Iowa State and Distinguished Fellow at the Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture. Kirschenmann covered many aspects of food and global society, from rural America and its agriculture, food co-ops, "productivity and competition," genetically modified foods, organic farming, and the need for possessing what he called an "ecological conscience." See Frederick Kirschenmann, Cultivating an Ecological Conscience: Essays from a Farmer Philosopher (Lexington, Kentucky: The University of Kentucky Press, 2010), 143.

95 See Mark Ritchie GATT chapter, "Gleaning the GATT," covering multilateral trade agreements - the Uruguay Round in 1986 - international agricultural trade, consumer safety, pesticide use, food safety, and more, in Susan A. Aaronson, Taking Trade to the Streets: the Lost History of Public Efforts to Shape Globalization (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 142-173. For another historical angle that uncovered similar global connections during the "American Century," see David Kinkela, DDT and the American Century: Global Health, Environmental Politics, and the Pesticide That Changed the World, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), a necessary read for understanding American power, health policies, consumer protection, and the history of capitalism.

Ritchie a "Midwestern activist who is a latter-day Paul Revere" for sounding off early against GATT, when few people understood its consequences.⁹⁶

Minnesota was a propitious site for founding a global food boycott. Ritchie noted that an activist tradition with the churches, its progressive local politics, an international population, and a world-class university, contributed to the area's fertile ground for a corporate boycott.⁹⁷ Additionally, food, agricultural and big business united in the Twin Cities. Minnesota was an economic and distributive hub for the Great Basin, especially its grain production. Several large multinational corporations based their operations there, including grain giants Cargill and General Mills. The city evolved into a "nature's metropolis" in its own right, as had Chicago, existing in an interconnected fabric of farm production, commerce and finance that created global networks, and citizens whose daily eating habits were affected by corporate agriculture production. As Cargill spread across the globe trading grain with communists, socialists and capitalists in a broad profit and survival network, so had INFACT's boycott against giant food and pharmaceutical concerns.⁹⁸ Minneapolis suburban moms stopped buying Nestlé products, protested on

96 Ritchie believed the possible and necessary successes of a global civil society against entrenched power. He cited the Nestlé boycott, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the WHO Code, and the Food and Agriculture Organization as exemplars because "they all came about" because "civil society organized and pressured our global institutions for change." Mark Ritchie Interview with the Author; Lief Utne, "A Midwestern activist who is a latter-day Paul Revere," Utne Reader, Globalism Section, November/December, 2001. See also William Korey, NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, (New York, 1998); Stanley Meisler, United Nations: The First Fifty Years (New York, 1995); and Werner J. Feld, Multinational Corporations and U.N. Politics: The Quest for Codes of Conduct (New York, 1980).

97 Ritchie added to his list former Minnesota Republican governor Harry LeVander who won the office in 1966, and who created the Pollution Control Agency and "the country's first Human Rights Department," which have remained "important to Minnesota's well-being to this day."

98 Of course, see William Cronon, Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991), and all his ecological history writing, such as "Modes of Prophecy and Production: Placing Nature in History," The Journal of American History 76, no. 4 (March 1, 1990): 1122–31, and "The Densest, Richest, Most Suggestive 19 Pages I Know." Environmental

the streets in front of grocery stores, corporate offices, and restaurant chains owned by Nestlé. Many consumers, labor organizers, and church groups also formed local INFAC T organizations in cities across the United States, and the boycott impulse began to transition far beyond Minneapolis.

College students were also drawn to the baby food controversy, and the Nestlé boycott spread through American and European universities. In a 1978 Newsweek article called "Campus Crunch," a protest button with infant skull and baby bottles with teats crossed for crossbones proclaimed "Crunch Nestlé Quick: Boycott Nestlé," with plays on Nestlé chocolate bar Crunch and Nestlé powdered chocolate milk powder Quick.⁹⁹ Campus organizers agitated to get Nestlé products out of their schools, boycotting Nestea and Nestlé chocolate, including students at Wellesley, University of Minnesota, Yale, Providence College, Harvard, and more. "At Providence College, organizer Chris Correia, 18, persuaded the food-services director to stop serving Nestlé hot chocolate in the cafeterias. Correia had won the same concession from the Fall River, Massachusetts, public-school system. Shortly before an anti- Nestlé petition at Harvard gathered 1,850 student signatures, the university discontinued hot chocolate in the dining rooms."¹⁰⁰ And, because of this nutrition, public health, and food activism, the companies responded.

History 10, no. 4 (October 1, 2005): 679–81. For newer ecological history inspired by his work, see Shane Hamilton, "Cold Capitalism: The Political Ecology of Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice." Agricultural History 77, no. 4 (October 1, 2003): 557–81, and his dissertation to book, Trucking Country: The Road to America's Wal-Mart Economy. Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), including books from one of the best writing on global political ecology: Mike Davis, Ecology of Fear: Los Angeles and the Imagination of Disaster (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998), Planet of Slums (London ; New York: Verso, 2006), and Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism (New York: New Press : Distributed by W.W. Norton & Co, 2007).

99 Newsweek, "Campus Crunch," Education section, Newsweek November 27, 1978.

100 Ibid.

Formula companies promised to meet with activists and WHO/UNICEF at a conference to produce a draft corporate code of conduct, and Nestlé agreed to abide by whatever resulted from the meeting.

Mass media coverage proliferated, reporting from corporate boardrooms, Third World slums, and college campuses. This increased publicity, and INFACT's tactic of encouraging its members, organizations and regular citizens to write their congressmen, caused Senator Edward Kennedy to take notice. Kennedy, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, decided to hold hearings on the subject of "marketing and promotion of infant formula in the developing nations."¹⁰¹ Earlier, he had explored the problem of pharmaceuticals and international regulation, and thus had some experience in a similar kind of global politics. In May 1978 he brought together diverse experts within the baby food controversy, including Leah Margulies, Doug Johnson, church representatives, corporate executives, public health professionals, doctors and field workers in developing countries.

Kennedy opened the investigation into this "enormous human tragedy" with a quote from Rabindranath Tagore. "Every child comes with the message that God is not yet discouraged of man," he said, and proceeded to quote child mortality statistics. Children were the "innocent victims" of individual, national and humanity's indifference. Kennedy's colleague Dick Clark (D-Iowa) discussed the "unusually large volume of mail" he had received from concerned Americans. In a society "based on an ideology of consumerism" the links between public health and corporate marketing potentially

101 An impressive 1500-page compendium of reports, interviews, documents, scientific evidence, and testimony came out of the process. See "Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations," Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research on the Committee on Human Resources, U.S. Senate, 95th Congress, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 23, 1978).

created sickness from false needs. Also, Clark added a plug for INFACT, noting "that the national conference of . . . The Infant Formula Action Coalition will be held" in June that year at Iowa State University.¹⁰²

Kennedy quickly realized that an American, unilateral condemnation of big business would not stand with his fellow congressmen. More than that, after hours of conflicting testimony and thousands of pages of reports and "scientific" proofs, few clear solutions emerged. He concluded that an international forum would engage the issue more effectively. Kennedy's desire to involve the WHO agreed with industry executives, who wanted to escape popular pressure in America and turn to the supposedly staid environment of Geneva and its international negotiating processes.

The Gathering of Dissimilar Minds: On the Road to the Code

The October 1979 Joint WHO/UNICEF Meeting on Infant and Young Child Feeding resulted from the Kennedy Hearings. Televised in the United States, the hearings became a public relations disaster for Nestlé, increasing public attention on the issue rather than diminishing it as industry had hoped. Furthermore, the hearings legitimized the critics of the formula industry - their science, their beliefs, and their focused attack on Nestlé. Caught off guard, Nestlé hoped to diffuse some of the activist energy within the United States. Kennedy believed the issue was too complex for U.S. agencies to handle on their own, while industry imagined it could control events in the "respectable" atmosphere in Geneva.¹⁰³ Sociologist Nitsan Chorev noted, "Nestlé favored an

¹⁰² Kennedy Hearings, 1978, 1-3.

¹⁰³ See Andrew Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods: Successful Challenges to an International Marketing Strategy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), Nitsan Chorev, The World Health

international conference under the auspices of the WHO" because reasonable company men "could more easily influence the course of events in international forums."

Foreshadowing the WHO's neoliberal turn when deciding world health policy, the formula industry wanted to negotiate in Geneva "since the industry had just appointed Dr. Stanislas Flasche, a former deputy director-general of the WHO, to be the executive director of the International Council of Infant Food Industries."¹⁰⁴

The process did not unfold the way the formula industry desired; formula companies could not command the discourse surrounding the event. Both Leah Margulies and Andy Chetley detailed how the WHO approached the controversy in a way that allied with the NGOs. Nestlé and the other companies did not foresee that outside critics would be allowed to attend the meeting. Additionally, the "Conference Statement considered infant feeding within the larger context of the call for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) and affirmed the right of member states to collectively regulate the practices of multinational corporations."¹⁰⁵ The result of the meeting became a code recommendation and a WHO resolution to adopt such a code. Industry became

Organization between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 104-07. For dissenting and quite critical views of industry critics not published by Nestlé, see John Dobbing, Infant Feeding: Anatomy of a Controversy, 1973-1984 (London ; New York: Springer-Verlag, 1988), and Fred Dycus Miller, Out of the Mouths of Babes: The Infant Formula Controversy (Transaction Publishers, 1983).

104. Chorev, The World Health Organization between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 106.

105 Chorev, The World Health Organization Between North and South, 2012, 106. The actual document noted that the issue of breast-milk substitutes and baby food politics, within the auspices of growing market presence and corporate investments, "is part of the wider issues of poverty, lack of resources, social injustice and ecological degradation; it cannot be considered apart from social and economic development and the need for a new international economic order." See "Statement and Recommendations of the Joint WHO/UNICEF Meeting on infant and Young Child Feeding," United Nations University archives, <http://archive.unu.edu/unupress/food/8F023e/8F023E04.htm> (accessed March 20, 2014).

entrenched in a wider political contest. The activists, validated within the global health body and the UN, took a seat at the international negotiating table and a formal place in deciding worldwide health and economic justice issues, a position they would not relinquish.

INFACT, ICCR, War on Want, and other NGOs at the Joint Meeting worked within the global food crisis and anxieties about multinational corporations. The corporations were correct in many aspects of the controversy, including their belief that the activists possessed anti-corporate ideas about power, wealth and the distribution of resources. Testifying before Congress about their role at the October meeting, the consumer groups presented their ideological and material core. "We operate only in a very tiny aspect of the enormous struggle to provide appropriate and adequate food for every man, woman and child on earth," and "we are fundamentally concerned with the question of who controls which resources for what ends."¹⁰⁶ When industry representatives heard such language, and encountered the force of boycotts, lawsuits, congressional hearings, attempts at codes, and UN investigations, they reacted viscerally. The formula companies circled the wagons in many ways, and name-called critics, from "Marxists marching under the banner of Christ" to collectivists, anti-market, anti-American and even anti-infant.

Both sides published their views the day before the meeting. ICIFI printed a full-page advertisement in the International Herald Tribune, and the activists produced a report called "Infant Formula Promotion, 1979." This particular report consisted of alleged inappropriate marketing of formula in various parts of Africa, compiled by Doug

106 Leah Margulies and Douglas Johnson, "Joint Prepared Statement," Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula, 50-51.

Clements, INFACT's first paid staff member, and its "coordinator of international research, who had spent four months fact-finding in Africa." International research meant traveling around South Africa and Kenya and finding violations of WHO agreements. This method became the principal monitoring technique employed by consumer groups. Industry vigorously criticized and derided this practice as unscientific. At one point, critics of industry reported the findings of a tourist who noticed some promotional posters. Though this type of fact-finding activism might seem unscientific, it maintained pressure on companies concerned about their corporate image. Furthermore, WHO and UNICEF, church groups and activists, and pediatric societies took their collected evidence seriously.

The six NGOs that met with government and industry in Geneva in 1979 understood that to combat multinational corporations, they needed to create an efficient international movement. The Swiss group TWAG, ICCR, INFACT, IOCU from Malaysia, Oxfam and War on Want realized their common cause, and their ability to forge new types of international connections. Attacks by the formula industry reinforced the pressure groups' reliance on one another. Thus united, the group became the International Baby Food Action Coalition (IBFAN), a force within WHO monitoring the formula industry and helping set global health policy. IBFAN worked hard as a counterweight to private enterprise within WHO.¹⁰⁷

Nobody knew what direction IBFAN would take, how its members hoped to work, or its strong role within WHO affecting and even creating policy. One participant

107 In 1981, Sethi noted, "the number of participating groups grew from six to over 81." Today, according to IBFAN, there are over 200 international NGOs in 100 countries working under the IBFAN banner. Various offshoots such as INFACT/Canada and Corporate Accountability International (CAI), based in Boston as the transformed original INFACT group, continued the activist tradition.

noted that IBFAN proved to be an "illusion," in that it did not possess any recognizable central organization, no hierarchical leaders, and "no formal membership." Andrew Chetley wrote that the network "both existed and did not exist at the same time."¹⁰⁸ Matthew Hilton, an historian of international consumerism, observed that "historically, we can regard the networks that began to emerge in the 1970s as a distinct period" that helps scholars apprehend the bridge between movement organizing in the 1960s and the mass mobilizations of NGO's in the present."¹⁰⁹ IBFAN, "with no staff and no funds" began monitoring corporations with the resources provided by its member groups.

For some, the IOCU represented the growing global power of a unified consumer movement, one that created networks across the First and Third Worlds. Based in Malaysia and in The Hague, the IOCU quickly became a strong presence within the UN after its founding in 1960. In addition to working on the baby food issue, the organization published works against tobacco, such as The Lung Goodbye (1983), by longtime anti-tobacco activist Simon Chapman, and Robert Ledogar's Hungry for Profits (1975), an expose on corporate food and drugs in Latin American. In 1984, after the mass death chemical leak in Bhopal, India, IOCU launched the No-More-Bhopals Network.

Persistently tackling such issues, well-educated middle class activists in Malaysia and in Europe helped build networks that challenged the formula industry's prerogatives. Importantly, according to Hilton, "three of the most prominent and long-lasting networks

¹⁰⁸ Chetley, 71.

¹⁰⁹ See Matthew Hilton, Prosperity for All: Consumer Activism in an Era of Globalization, (Cornell University Press, 2009), 136. Hilton offered the "first international history of consumer activism" and demonstrated the political understanding behind the term "consumer," versus merely shoppers amid affluence. Hilton argued that anti-regulation, as evinced especially by the Reagan Administration in the U.S. and Margaret Thatcher in Britain, shifted the politics of consumption from the above view to one of choice, where consumer-citizens negotiate the market by, say, buying Fair Trade products instead of sweat-shopped ones.

established and administered by IOCU" were IBFAN, formed in 1979 as we have seen, Health Action International (HAI) formed in 1981, and Pesticide Action Network (PAN) formed in 1982. "All three campaigns represented specific problems around the world" that attracted many different kinds of NGOs in multiple countries. Furthermore, the three networks dealt with potentially dangerous products that highlighted tensions between regulations and free markets, between products and health, between local and global communities. These products also "had long histories of attracting social reformers," often stemming from nineteenth-century movements, covering foods, medicines, pharmaceuticals and issues of private manufacturing without oversight, profit and individual health.¹¹⁰

In the 1980s, fresh from success with the WHO Code, activists still showed optimism about their global efficacy. Consumer activist energies within the IBFAN umbrella had a "powerful impact," Chetley emphasized, as the groups published monitoring reports and spread information about corporate abuses, in addition to establishing contacts with national health agencies. This work forced the corporations "to fight on several different battlegrounds at once." Consumer organizations "in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Pacific, North America and Europe were getting fresh information," and using that material to tarnish brands, shame the formula companies, and force senior corporate executives to the negotiating table. As Nestlé and the other companies, coming out of the Kennedy Hearings, hoped to contain the issue by directing it to WHO, the activists instead saw that the 1979 meetings "started brush fires all over the world," especially through the information networks IBFAN established.

110 See Hilton, Prosperity for All, 136-146; and the book as a whole for an excellent understanding of the IOCU.

This flow of information and pressure on the companies became "a headache for industry." Shortly after the Joint Meeting, Ernest Saunders, president of the International Council of Infant Food Industries (ICIFI) and a vice-president at Nestlé, declared industry's frustration with the consumer groups, declaring their work a "propaganda campaign," while acknowledging the "professionalism of the forces involved."¹¹¹ He and the other members of ICIFI worried that industry might "win the battle in the U.S. and lose the war as a result of the determined pressure on Third World governments and medical authorities." Writing in the 1980s, Chetley believed that consumer pressure on companies and the resultant international code illustrated victory. Over the longer term, however, the companies in fact absorbed this pressure and stilled its negative impact on the bottom line and on critiques of privatized infant health.

Conservative opinion, from industry to the mainstream press, derided the activists and defended "multinational capitalism."¹¹² As the next chapter shows, Nestlé and the other companies fought strenuously and successfully to contain the boycott and maintain dominance in the cultural, political and economic realms. Rafael Pagan, President of the Nestlé Coordination Center for Nutrition (NCCN) declared, for example, that the company focused on "carrying the fight to the critics of multinational capitalism," and, significantly, that those aligned with the free enterprise system were "in the right" and "most in league with the future." If this boycott and all discursive battles took place based on science, technology, or economics, "there would be no contest." Indeed,

111 Baby Milk Action Coalition, Nestlegate: Secret Memo Reveals Corporate Cover-up (Cambridge; 1981), quoted in Chetley, 71-2.

112 Raphael Pagan, "Carrying the Fight to the Critics of Multinational Capitalism," speech to the Public Affairs Council, April 22, 1982, in ACA Collection, Box 24, MHS.

"multinational capitalism" was the only system "in league with the future."¹¹³ In 1979, as the international code took shape and Kennedy's hearings had concluded, the Wall Street Journal reacted to the "million deaths a year" tactic by consumer groups. Actually, the newspaper claimed, "the Nestlé Boycott kills babies."¹¹⁴ The paper called for an end to the boycott.

Activists, health professionals and some scholars answered such editorials, condemning conservatives for arguing along ideological lines. Boston University Professor James Post, who researched the economics of the formula industry and the boycott and served on the Nestlé Infant Formula Audit Commission (NIFAC), defended the boycott and criticized the Journal.¹¹⁵ Post noted that he testified at the Kennedy Hearings, and that the industry approached \$2 billion in "global sales," with LDCs accounting for half of this number in 1979. At the time Post was writing, industry, the WHO, and activists were working vigorously to draft a corporate code of compliance. The draft code induced the Journal's call for an end to the boycott. Post reminded the paper that the draft code was "not precise," not yet "formalized into a code," and "unenforceable by any world political body." After intense struggle, and arguments over language, the 1981 Code indeed proved imprecise and unenforceable, leading to multiple WHO resolutions attempting to refine language and corral industry. This process worked

113 Rafael D. Pagan, "Carrying the Fight to Critics of Multinational Capitalism," Speech Delivered to the Public Affairs Council (New York, April 22, 1982), copy in Samuel Hirsch Papers, Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, WAG 51, Box 30, Tamiment Library, New York University.

114 Editorial, Wall Street Journal, "The Nestlé Boycott Kills Babies," November 1, 1979.

115 James Post, Typescript, Letter to the Editor, November 13, 1979, Tamiment Library Boxed Newspapers Collection, Box 189, INFAC NEWS Folder, Tamiment Library New York University.

only marginally, and as effective as the boycott proved to be, nonetheless industry powerfully co-opted the process and continued to dominate the structures of global health.

Nestlé approached boycott coalition members to persuade them to quit the boycott. The company met with the United Methodist Church, teachers unions, and others, claiming that Nestlé adhered to the new code, that many activists were emotional and unscientific, and that respectable institutions like the NCC should drop the boycott against the company. This "divide and conquer" strategy worked well enough to convince the critics of the formula companies that they needed a unified front. In fall 1979, twenty-two national "church, health, labor, consumer and women's groups" gathered to discuss industry's methods at a meeting sponsored by INFACT and the Hunger Concerns Coordination Council of the NCC. The groups formed the International Nestlé Boycott Committee (INBC), which focused on negotiating with the company and monitoring its compliance with the Code.¹¹⁶ Reverend William Howard, President of NCC, said that Nestlé seemed to "trying to separate the 'good' boycotters from the 'bad,' so that it can break the force of our united front." INBC became the voice for the entire coalition, and succeeded in bringing the company to a series of meetings that would eventually lead to the end of the boycott's first phase.

INBC continued pressure on Nestlé and threatened to expand the boycott unless the company joined negotiations with boycott groups and WHO/UNICEF.¹¹⁷ In

116 *INFACT News*, "Who We Are: The International Boycott Committee," 3, April 1982. Tamiment Collection.

117 INBC, "Letter to Arthur Furer, Managing Director, Nestlé S.A.," December 5, 1979, Tamiment Library Boxed Newspapers Collection, Box 189, INFACT NEWS Folder, Tamiment Library New York University. At this point, it is necessary to provide a partial list of those groups

December 1979, after a WHO/UNICEF Joint Meeting, the organized critics of Nestlé pushed for a meeting with the company in order to discuss the results of the combined efforts to establish industry guidelines. Nestlé refused to meet with INBC, and in response the denounced Nestlé, reaffirmed that the boycott would continue, underscored INBC's unified front, and demanded to know how Nestlé would implement the results from the Joint Meeting. Nestlé Managing Director Arthur Furer refused to meet with boycotters, and insisted in an interview with Swiss newspaper Tages Anzeiger that the company already complied with all the requirements of the Joint Meeting.¹¹⁸

Additionally, Nestlé claimed that demands singling out the company were unfair, and that any changes had to be adopted by the entire formula industry. Given that ICIFI had

that supported the boycott and that were listed on the margin of INBC letterhead, in addition to the members of INBC. This list is instructive of the broad support and the cultural and political impact of the first-wave Nestlé Boycott: American Association of Evangelical Students, American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees, American Federation of Teachers - AFL-CIO, American for Democratic Action, American Medical Students Association, Anglican Church of Canada, Canadian Council of Churches, Canada INFAC, Catholic Coalition for Responsible Investment, Church of the Brethren, Clergy and Laity Concerned, Dominican Fathers and Brothers, Province of St. Albert the Great, Infant Formula Action Coalition, International Ladies Garments Workers Union (ILGWU), International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Maryknoll Fathers & Brothers, Methodist Federation of Social Action, National Assembly of Women Religious, National Campus Ministry Association, National Catholic Coalition for Responsible Investment, National Council for International Health, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., National Organization of Women (NOW), National Women's Health Network, National Women's Political Caucus, OXFAM-America, Presbyterian Church in the United States, Sisters of Loretto, Sisters of the Precious Blood, Socialist Party, USA, International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America - UAW, United Church of Canada, United Church of Christ, United Farm Workers of America, United Methodist Church Board of Global Ministries, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Unitarian Universalist Association, Unitarian Universalist Service Association, Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, Young Women's Christian Association. Many more groups joined the coalition, especially as it evolved internationally. Groups also dropped out with official proclamations and press releases. The United Methodist Church and the American Federation of Teachers abandoned the boycott, for example, pending further precise evidence. Nestlé, especially through NCCN, approached groups and attempted to convince them to drop the boycott.

118 INBC, "Letter to Arthur Furer, Managing Director, Nestlé S.A.," December 5, 1979, Tamiment Library Boxed Newspapers Collection, Box 189, INFAC NEWS Folder, Tamiment Library New York University.

adopted its code during the Bern trial, and that companies such as AHP and Nestlé created their own internal codes, this view seemed feasible to the activists. Because of this position, the "specific elaboration" of points drafted at the Joint Meeting would have to wait for "a code process" that would be brought about by WHO's and UNICEF's Secretariats - the drafting of the WHO Code in Geneva. INBC threatened to "continue and expand" the boycott, which would negatively impact "the Nestlé system."

INFACT's propaganda did in fact demonstrate what industry claimed throughout. Namely, that activists used emotional arguments and disturbing images in their direct action approaches. For fundraising, consciousness raising, and encouragement to join the boycott, INFACT shocked Western, middle class sensibilities. One postcard disseminated widely in the early 1980s showed a malnourished infant supine in a clinic crib. On the back of the postcard, besides a rectangular indicator for the stamp, nutrition expert Michael Latham, who ran the USAID study on infant feeding in developing countries with Penny Van Esterik, declared "when I see an emaciated, dehydrated, seriously ill baby . . . When I find that the mother was persuaded to bottle feed rather than breast feed because of the immoral promotion of infant formula then I do become angry."¹¹⁹ Direct mailing postcards including solicitation for funds, and addresses of "friends" who might support INFACT's work against such a "scandal." Postcards included a partial list of

119 Michael Latham and INFACT, Postcard Quote, November 1978, Henry Andersen Papers, Call Number 07 1219c, Box 33, Folders 16, 28, 34, 39, 41, Presbyterian Historical Society (PHS), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Latham, who directed the USAID study mentioned elsewhere in this chapter, was Director of the Program on International Nutrition at Cornell University. The postcard listed "some partners in INFACT's Nestlé Boycott," that included national organizations such as the United Farm Workers and the National Organization for Women; other categories included national and regional religious organizations, individual health personnel (including Dr. Benjamin Spock), health institutions, women's organizations, political leaders (such as California Democratic congressman Ron Dellums and consumer organizer Ralph Nader), student organizations, labor groups, development agencies, research centers, and consumer organizations.

boycott supporters, and of Nestlé products middle class shoppers should boycott. These mailings demonstrated the use of advanced technologies and organizing techniques in the 1970s and 1980s.

In May 1982, Raphael Pagan, president of the NCCN, announced the formation of an audit commission aimed to address code violations against Nestlé, and introduced Ed Muskie.¹²⁰ Pagan claimed that the commission, and Nestlé's agreement to adhere to the code a year earlier, marked "a very important historical event in corporate history."¹²¹ The Nestlé Infant Formula Audit Commission (NIFAC) and Muskie, widely covered in the press, announced in its first quarterly report that Nestlé was "cleared" of failing to comply with the International Code.¹²² The liberal Mother Jones magazine voiced its skepticism about the audit commission, asserting that Muskie, a Democrat, was acting like the Reagan Administration,¹²³ Doug Johnson and other activists declared that the commission represented "a flawed approach" because Nestlé funded NIFAC, and NIFAC

120 See "Transcript of the Proceedings, Press Conference with Rafael D. Pagan, Jr. and Honorable Edmund S. Muskie," Nestlé Coordination Center for Nutrition, announcement of the formation of NIFAC, and Introduction of Ed Muskie, May, 3, 1982, PHS. The press conference took place in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington DC, where in two years INBC and Nestlé would announce the end of the boycott.

121 Pagan, NCCN Press Conference, May 3, 1982, NCC Group 4, Box 36, PHS.

122 Newspapers, and Nestlé Infant Formula Audit Commission (NIFAC), Annual Report, 1983, Henry Anderson Papers, PHS; The announcement of the first quarterly report included "revised instructions to companies of the Nestlé Group, the NIFAC Charter, By-Laws and Procedures of NIFAC, a transcript of the press coverage, photographs from the field, and some news clippings.

123 Mark Dowie, "Muskie and the Bottle," Mother Jones, Frontline, November 1982, 12, article copy in Presbyterian Historical Society. President Jimmy Carter appointed Muskie Secretary of State in 1980. Muskie quit public office when Ronald Reagan ousted the Carter administration. Muskie had served in the Senate. He ran for president in 1972. He was a prominent, well-liked national figure who could have been president.

had no power to "to affect company policy."¹²⁴ Dr. Avery Post, a leading figure in the church constituency and President of the United Church of Christ, turned down an offer to join the commission.¹²⁵

Nestlé claimed that it was abiding by the Code, and sent marketing injunctions to sales personnel in the Third World. Post and Johnson, however, argued that these instructions came from Nestlé 's interpretations of the Code, and applied "to a very few of Nestlé 's major markets."¹²⁶ Johnson emphasized that the boycott would continue, despite protests from industry that companies had helped draft and sign the Code, the Code passed, and therefore the boycott should end. Critics maintained that they "had little confidence" in NIFAC.¹²⁷ Summarizing the political and economic conflict, Johnson said that critics hoped "that a man with Senator Muskie's prestige will prevail upon Nestlé to adopt the WHO/UNICEF Code, not adapt it." The State Department under Carter's Administration had pushed for full implementation of the Code, Johnson continued, and therefore Muskie should do the same. Congressman Tom Harken (D-Iowa) also reaffirmed the continued boycott.

124 Doug Johnson, INFACT Update, Box 33, Folders 16 and 28, Presbyterian Historical Society.

125 Many newspapers covered the formation of NIFAC and criticisms of it. See United Press International (UPI) report in San Francisco Chronicle, "Nestlé Names Panel to Study Infant Formula Controversy," May 4, 1982, and a critical report in INFACT Update, May 3, 1982, in PHS Collection.

126 Johnson reiterated that Nestlé 's own marketing instructions were a "distorted, self-interested version of the HOW/UNICEF Code," and thus "the Commission's mandate is to audit Nestlé 's compliance with its own weak instructions. It is giving the Commission members an intentionally shortened ethical yardstick with which to measure." In INFACT Update, May 3, 1982, in PHS.

127 Dr. Avery Post in INFACT Update, May 3, 1982.

The Code process reflected victory for those critics who forced the formula industry to the negotiating table. Harken noted that "the Nestlé Boycott is testimony to the power of committed citizens to influence even large multinational firms. Nestlé is a Swiss company located in Geneva, but they still felt the pressure of the people in Iowa."¹²⁸ Actor Ed Asner spoke out in favor of the Nestlé boycott, and a telegram sent to Nestlé from the United Steelworkers of America, carbon copied to Asner, exclaimed "Million-Strong Steelworkers of America Urge Nestlé to Negotiate."¹²⁹ Belita Cowan, Executive Director of the National Women's Health Network (NWHN), wrote the NCCN requesting that Nestlé negotiate with the INBC, as part of INFACT's campaign to keep pressuring the company after the Code.

In the aftermath of the Code's creation, throughout 1982, critics assembled evidence that Nestlé continued to violate the code and resisted INBC's efforts for a general meeting. The National Council of Churches, INBC and others stressed Nestlé's refusal to meet with INBC, and the company's continued violations in the field. ICCR exposed Nestlé operations in the Philippines, targeting midwives in rural areas who had access to mothers giving birth in their homes. "The boycott must continue," noted INFACT, "it is the only responsible thing to do." At the National Press Club in March that year, Dr. Stephen Joseph, former Senior Health Advisor at USAID who resigned when the Reagan Administration voted against the Code in 1981, spoke of the need to

128 Tom Harkin, "Help Representative Harkin Continue the Nestlé Boycott," INFACT News, April 1982, Robert Wagner Labor Archives, Tamiment Library, New York University.

129 United Steelworkers of America, telegram sent to Nestlé and Ed Asner, INFACT News, April 1982, Tamiment Library Collection. The union - "1.3 million members" - wrote "if you are truly serious in your desire to abide by the World Health Organization Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes, you will sit down with the trade union-led coalition of organization to negotiate enforceable protections against abuses." Nestlé's "failure" to negotiate after the Code's passage underscored "the doubts and concerns that union members and untold others around the world have about" the company's true appreciation of its role in infant illness.

continue the boycott until Nestlé 's showed its sincerity on the ground in the developing world. He reminded listeners that Nestlé "did everything they could" to "sabotage the passage of the WHO Code," and the company had vigorously denied any correlation between formula and infant malnutrition.¹³⁰ Thus, industry hoped that signing the code in 1981 would free it from international scrutiny. Monitoring by critics increased, however, and became an institutional method for dealing with the formula controversy through the rest of the twentieth century.¹³¹

INFACT received support from fellow travelers in the struggle to corral multinational corporations. The Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), a progressive think tank in Washington awarded INFACT the Letelier-Moffitt Human Rights Award.¹³² The

130 Dr. Stephen Joseph, "Speech to the National Press Club," March 18, 1982, included in INFACT News, April 1982, Tamiment Collection.

131 INFACT News, Monitoring Report from Philippines, NCC quotes, and INBC complete List of Supporters, April 1982, 3, Tamiment Collection.

132 Brian O' Shaughnessy and Maureen Casey, "Letter to Supporters," Capital District INFACT, September 1, 1982, in Tamiment Library. The human rights award came from the Letelier-Moffitt Memorial Fund for Human Rights within IPS. The fund began in 1977 in the name of Orlando Letelier and Ronnie Karpen Moffitt, who were assassinated in Washington DC by Chilean agents of Augusto Pinochet. For a list of winners of the award - including The Free South Africa Movement, Richard Trumka, President of the United Mine Workers, and Seymour Hersh among many others - from 1978 to 2012, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Letelier-Moffitt_Human_Rights_Award (accessed February 14, 2014). For information on the assassination from the IPS point of view, see Peter Weiss, Human Rights and Vital Needs, Transnational Institute, Sept. 1977, and "Orland Letelier and Ronni Karpen Moffitt," articles, speeches, prayers, poems and photographs," IPS publications, (undated). Transnational Institute began within IPS to work on MNC and international capitalism, and became based in Amsterdam. Letelier was a "leading Chilean diplomat" under Salvador Allende and was a leading critique of Pinochet. He published books with IPS, such as Chile: Economic "Freedom" and Political Repression and The International Economic Order.

Barbara Ehrenreich, author of many books important for a cultural reading of the era, published for IPS: Institute for Policy Studies. Toward Economic Justice for Women: A National Agenda For change (Washington, D.C: Institute for Policy Studies, 1985); see Barbara Ehrenreich, For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women, (Garden City, N.Y: Anchor Press, 1978), and The American Health Empire: Power, Profits, and Politics (New York: Vintage Books, 1971). The Heritage Foundation notably attacked IPS, and to some "won" the battle between "ideological" think tanks. For a few examples, see "Campaign for Economic Democracy Part II: The Institute for Policy Studies Network," The Heritage Foundation

award came with context, ideology and history of its own, and demonstrated INFACT's place in a trajectory of New Left activism and concerns about MNCs in the developing world. Former Chilean diplomat under Salvador Allende, Orlando Letelier, and Ronnie Moffitt, a human rights activist, critiqued the military regime of Augusto Pinochet, and Chilean special agents assassinated them in Washington, DC.¹³³ The award, coming out of IPS, also illustrated links between Leah Margulies's work at the Yale Economic Growth Center as she began investigating large multinational firms. Her labors contributed to IPS criticisms of multinational corporations and the growing consolidation of neoliberalism. Richard Barnett, one of the founders of IPS, used her studies for his bestselling Global Reach, which in turn influenced popular opinion and fears about multinational capitalism, and in particular Senator Frank Church's well-known, multiyear

(Accessed February 20, 2014). <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/1981/04/campaign-for-economic-democracy-part-ii-the-institute-for-policy-studies-network>, "The Attack on the Corporation." The Heritage Foundation. (Accessed February 20, 2014). <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/1981/09/the-attack-on-the-corporation>. See also "The Corporate Democracy Act and Big Business Day: Rhetoric vs. Reality," Heritage Foundation, March 11, 1980, in Hall-Hoag Collection of Extremist Propaganda, Hay Library, Brown University.

133 A few days before Orlando Letelier and Ronnie Moffitt were murdered by Augusto Pinochet's agents, Letelier wrote an op-ed in the New York Times in which he outlined "Decree No. 588" that stripped Letelier of his citizenship, "the patriotic obligation of all Chileans is to contribute to the end of the dictatorship." He and other exiles fought for democracy and human rights "as members of a nation and as inheritors of a tradition of freedom to which the Pinochets do not belong." Letelier, who had been Foreign Minister and Ambassador to the US, was exiled from the country and led a resistance movement from Washington. See Letelier, Orlando. "A Testament." New York Times. September 27, 1976. <http://search.proquest.com>, and "Justice and the Letelier Bombers." New York Times. September 30, 1980. Times, DAVID BINDER Special to The New York. "Opponent of Chilean Junta Slain In Washington by Bomb in His Auto: CHILEAN JUNTA FOE SLAIN IN WASHINGTON." New York Times. September 22, 1976. <http://search.proquest.com>, (accessed March 10, 2014). The mainstream press reported on this case throughout the 1980s, and 1990s and 2000s, especially after the overthrow of Pinochet in 1992 and his death in 2006. For example, see "New Documents Link Kissinger, Bush Senior to Letelier Assassination - World Socialist Web Site." (Accessed March 11, 2014). <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2010/04/lete-a20.html>, and Service, Louise Hidalgo BBC World. "Blown Apart in the US Capital." BBC News. (Accessed March 11, 2014). <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-14994035>.

investigations of MNCs and their influence on foreign policy within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (see Chapter 4 for a deeper exploration of these connections).

IPS also sparked a response from the right wing. Nestlé and the formula companies, as well as conservative think tanks such as the Heritage Foundation, paid close attention to the boycott, and argued that the activists were part of a New Left plot. Infamously, Nestlé pushed this criticism during the Kennedy Hearings in 1978, claiming that the boycotters represented a conspiracy against global liberty and free enterprise, giving rise to Kennedy's ridicule (see Chapter Four). Still, industry's defense gained power over time. Some have argued that Nestlé's economic position strengthened, while the boycott agenda weakened, and furthermore, that IPS lost the ideological wars within a global struggle over capitalist triumphalism to the Heritage Foundation.¹³⁴

The connection between breastfeeding, right-wing extremist terrorism within the United States and throughout Central America, and IPS prioritizing human rights abuses underscored the concerns many activists brought to the boycott era. The known connections between churches and abuses in Latin America, of political violence, corporate investments in such countries, and ties to American agencies helps explain why activists and church groups brought such intensity to this issue. At the ceremony for the IPS award, Doug Johnson mentioned INFACT's "years of struggle, commitment and dedication to the health of babies and women," and reiterated the group's continuing pressure against the formula industry's marketing practices. An INFACT letter to

134 For a representation of this view, see Thomas Matthew Medvetz, Think Tanks in America (University of Chicago Press, 2012). Also note Angus Burgin, The Great Persuasion: Reinventing Free Markets since the Depression (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), and historian and theorist Fred Block's essay on the "different dimensions of the triumphal rise of free market ideas," in Fred Block, "Think Tanks, Free Market Academics, and the Triumph of the Right," Theory and Society 42, no. 6 (November 1, 2013): 647–651.

constituents urged attendance for a "public re-commitment" to the rights of women and children around the world.

The Boycott Ends, and, The Never-Ending Boycott

In October 1984, the International Nestlé Boycott Committee (INBC) and Nestlé agreed to suspend the boycott.¹³⁵ During the press conference announcing the boycott's end, Dr. Niels Christiansen of Nestlé distributed Nestlé Crunch bars to INBC and Doug Johnson, who took a bite in front of cameras. The ritual of chocolate consumption, according to Nestlé, signaled "the end of the boycott of Nestlé products."¹³⁶ Dr. Carl Angst, executive vice president of Nestlé, expressed Nestlé's willingness to lead by example and support the Code. William Thompson of the Presbyterian Church and others made joint statements declaring the suspension of the boycott. Still, the issues were not entirely settled by the Code: four contentious points of the WHO code remained, and Johnson and others stressed that violations continued on the ground, and continued monitoring would be necessary.

The four points of contention reflected uncertainty about sufficient adherence to the terms of the Code in the future: "educational materials, hazards warnings on labels,

135 INFACT News, the group's newspaper, where baby formula and dying babies in the Third World merged with the marketing practices of global giants, representing "global survival" at stake, along with mailings to supporters, labor groups, teachers unions press releases and invites to parties. The newspapers exist in scattered archives, from the Minnesota Historical Society ACA Collection, the Tamiment Library, New York University, and the Wisconsin Historical Society.

136 Nestlé News, "Boycott Ends," 1984, 4.

gifts to health professionals and free supplies to hospitals."¹³⁷ INBC hoped that the company would adhere to the Code without a continued boycott, but substantial ambiguity remained. On gifts to health professionals, the Code stipulated that "material inducements to health professionals for the purpose of promoting infant formula" were prohibited.¹³⁸ Nestlé therefore argued that it should be allowed to offer calendars, ball point pens and key rings, for example, whereas INBC demanded zero gifts. UNICEF decided that "inexpensive gifts of professional utility," such as tape measures and tongue depressors, would be allowed.¹³⁹ Leaving a large space for continued promotional activities in hospitals, Nestlé argued that the company left it to hospital professionals to distribute its formulas and baby foods.

By 1984 the boycott seemed over for good. "It's final!" shouted INFACT's announcement in a special supplement of INFACT News.¹⁴⁰ INFACT sent out invitations to "national endorsing organizations and prominent supporters of INFACT," for its Nestlé boycott victory celebration, held in February. On one invitation, Johnson wrote to long-time labor activist Samuel Hirsch, "can you believe it, finally. Come celebrate with us

137 Joint Statement, INBC and Nestlé, in Nestlé News, January 1984, 3. Nestlé News was published by Raphael Pagan and NCCN.

138 WHO International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes, Article 7.3, governing health workers and MNC access to them "or members of their families."

139 Nestlé News, "Joint Meeting With UNICEF Resolves Issue," January 1984, 3. For comparison of the issue, see "News Brief," INFACT, February 1984, about negotiations with Nestlé in Mexico City with the International Baby Food Conference. This conference, and threats to expand the boycott even more, captured Nestlé's attention. Up to this point, INBC concluded that negotiations with Nestlé since 1979 had proven "fruitless." Samuel Hirsch Collection, Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, WAG 51, Boxes 30 and 45, Tamiment Library.

140 INFACT News Special Supplement, "Nestlé Boycott Ends," Tamiment Library Boxed Newspapers Collection, Box 189, INFACT NEWS Folder, Tamiment Library New York University.

and tell me what's next!?!"¹⁴¹ The Amalgamated Clothing & Textile Workers Union, a staunch supporter and advocate of the boycott, hosted the event in New York; the invitation read "you are personally invited to celebrate the joyous occasion of winning our long, unprecedented struggle on behalf of infants of the Third World." Speeches, articles, press conferences, Joint Statements, and a party: the boycott was supposed to slide into history.¹⁴²

INFACT's transition in 1984 revealed tensions within the organization. The organization split into nuclear arms agitation and a boycott of General Electric (GE) on the one hand, and renewed formula activism under a new name on the other. Ambivalence between baby food and nuclear warheads actually intensified the global focus of baby food activism, because IBFAN as an umbrella network for hundreds of NGO's became the center of this activism. Many participants desired to push their critique of capitalism to other causes, with pharmaceuticals and pesticides joining nuclear proliferation as global threats, and with infant formula as an important issue but not the only one.¹⁴³ The divergence also contributed to an impressive chain of events that eventually challenged the big tobacco companies in the 1990s and utilized the World Bank to help corral

141 INFACT Victory Party Invitation to Samuel Hirsch, Samuel Hirsch Collection, Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, WAG 51, Boxes 30 and 45, Tamiment Library.

142 INFACT News Special Supplement, p. 3.

143 Jurg Gerber, "From Bottles to Bombs: The Transformation of a Social Movement Organization," Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology (Washington State University, 1988), 96-99. Gerber studied INFACT's transition from formula to nuclear arms and the peace movement from a sociological, movement formation perspective.

privatized water, which featured Nestlé SA.¹⁴⁴ One faction of IBFAN called itself Action for Corporate Accountability, focused on infant formula, and remained in Minnesota. The corporate accountability group moved its headquarters from Minnesota to Boston, became Corporate Accountability International (CAI), and centered its energies on the nuclear arms race.¹⁴⁵ Staff concerned with baby food abuses organized their activities around continued monitoring. Monitoring, and working with UN organizations, became the principal methods employed by these groups over the next several decades.

INBC monitored Nestlé after signing the Joint Agreement for eight months to determine the company's compliance in the field. With representatives from member countries meeting in late September 1984, INFACT declared its satisfaction with the Joint Appeal. The committee expressed its eagerness to pursue American formula companies such as Bristol-Myers and Abbott Industries, in addition to corporations within the military industrial complex, manufacturing nuclear weapons that threatened global omnicide.¹⁴⁶ "For the Babies, For Global Survival," its newsletter declared as the group hoped to move "beyond victory."¹⁴⁷

144 I touch on this transformation in the Epilogue, where CAI has evolved into one of the most important organizations in the corporate accountability movement and a strong critical voice of global corporate capitalism.

145 Action for Corporate Accountability, "Historical Note," ACA Collection, MHS.

146 Jeffrey L. Fox, "International Group Suspends Nestlé Boycott," *Science*, New Series 223, No. 4636 (Feb. 10, 1984), 569, and INFACT News, Tamiment Library; and Jurg Gerber, "From Bottles to Bombs." Ideas of omnicide and total nuclear annihilation were rampant in the 1980s, as reflected by activist coalitions such as Mobilization for Survival (MFS). See MFS Collection in Tamiment Library, NYU. There was some coordination between INFACT and MFS, and some crossover between membership.

147 *INFACT News*, "For the Children, For Ourselves," Tamiment Library Boxed Newspaper Collection, Box 189.

Boycott field monitors in the developing world focused on Nestlé's competitors. The American companies Abbott/Ross Labs, American Home Produces/Wyeth, and Bristol-Myers/Mead Johnson faced renewed attention, while also consciously targeting these new markets. According to monitors, Abbott increased its free sample giveaways in hospitals, "cutting into Nestlé's market share." In Peru, AHP moved aggressively into Nestlé's market, increasing its free formula and discharge packs to mothers; and in the Philippines, Bristol-Myers violated the International Code "by courting health workers with donations of expensive medical equipment, nurses' uniforms, and financial contributions."¹⁴⁸ Nestlé complained about losing market share because of its unilateral willingness to abide by certain elements of the code in particular areas. The company always hoped for industry-wide agreements, which it could never manage.¹⁴⁹ The American companies largely escaped the boycott's impact, and the Code itself, though they argued that their own internal codes were as stringent and effective. INFACT wrote that the American companies that moved into Nestlé's abandoned territory will face "coordinated international pressure" to adhere to the Code.¹⁵⁰

148 Ibid, INFACT News.

149 Dr. Carl Angst, Nestlé Executive Vice-President, wrote a telex to INFACT stating Nestlé's policy that "in order to remove even the slightest risk of discouraging breastfeeding and to prevent any possibility of even unwillingly promoting routinization of bottle-feeding, discharge packs should be stopped," to which INBC added that the activists were "aware of Nestlé's statement that a single member of industry can not bring about this change in isolation, and that therefore a cooperative effort is required." INFACT News, "Nestlé Boycott Ends," 1984.

150 INFACT News, Ibid. In his press conference, Doug Johnson said about corporate struggles over market share and regulation: "It's bad enough for these . . . companies to continue the marketing practices that the world's health authorities have identified as unsafe for babes. To steal that market from a company which has chosen to act ethically is most unconscionable and deserving of public sanctions."

The 1984 end of the boycott nonetheless left the door open for future attacks against Nestlé. Journalist Daniel Seligman wrote in Fortune in "Cause Wanted: A Crunch for Idealists," that people around the world in the "87 organizations participating in the seven-year boycott of Nestlé will find life much less interesting, and spiritual exaltation infinitely harder to attain" with the end of the boycott.¹⁵¹ Doug Johnson, too, could be "savaged" for the Crunch bar moment during the press conference. At last, Seligman continued, "Third World infancy" was now "liberated from the threat of 'commerciogenic malnutrition,'" a snarky dismissal of Derrick Jelliffe's phrase. "Instinctive bleeders for progressive causes" would miss the boycott and the "median idealists" of the middle class, after a pause, would find new reasons to attack multinationals. The article further suggested that adherence to the Code negatively impacted the lives of children around the world, that all factual claims were "suspect," and that people possessed of a "warm glow of righteousness" would not give up the chance to "beat up" on the largest multinational in the world. Though extreme, Seligman had a point, and the never-ending boycott became a part of the institutional fabric of nations, formula industry, and international organizations through the rest of the twentieth century.

Contemporaneous scholars, especially in sociology and political science, grappled with the Nestlé boycott, the initial code successes, and global social movements. INFACT became the subject of several attempts to theorize these movements and set them in historical context. But what sort of group was INFACT? One student of such organizations noted that traditional social movements contained groups "that comprise[d]

151 Daniel Seligman, "Cause Wanted: A Crunch for Idealists, CETA by the Sea, Sexism in Wyoming and Other Matters," in "Keeping Up," column in Fortune, February 20, 1984.

primarily 'beneficiaries,' that is people who would directly benefit from organizational success."¹⁵² The other category remained people who gave money to organizations - say those middle class suburban Americans who donated to save African babies - a category called "conscience" supporters. These "professional organizations" possessed paid "staff, primary reliance on financial support from institutions rather than their members, and organizational activities that do not typically require extensive involvement of their supporters." Most civil rights groups, for example, did not have paid staff, and they consisted of people "involved extensively in activities" important to themselves and their cause.¹⁵³

INFACT's ability to raise money contributed to its successes and failures as an organization. The organization's support base relied "primarily on grassroots members for its financial support." The archives demonstrated this fact and showed the fundraising methods: many funds arrived via direct mail appeals, with envelopes sent to sympathizers along with INFACT News or Updates, a few examples of corporate malfeasance, a pictures of a malnourished infant next to a bottle, and a list of recent achievements.¹⁵⁴ Additionally, such mailings included a list of the expansive Nestlé product list, from Nescafe to its chocolate bars. Gerber noted that "INFACT's highest

152 Gerber, 80-2; and he cited McCarthy and Zald, and even Charles Tilly, From Mobilization to Revolution, Reading, MA, 1978; John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, "The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization, Morristown, N.J., 1973, "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory," American Journal of Sociology 82, 1212-41, and see Luther Gerlach, an anthropologist at the University of Minnesota who formed an early interest in the boycott partly because of his proximity to its beginnings. He wrote several articles in this field, Luther Gerlach, "Corporate Groups and Movement Networks in Urban America," Anthropological Quarterly 43, No3, Urbanism and Corporate Groups, (July, 1970), 123-145.

153 Gerber, 81.

154 See INFACT Updates newsletters, Tamiment Library.

annual revenue to date was in 1984, during which it raised \$540,242." Almost all of that amount came from direct appeals, of the sort outlined by Cmiel - direct mail, some telephone solicitations and other methods. The remainder of the money arrived "from sources such as special fundraising events and sale of promotional material." INFACT did not raise money from large contributions. According to the IRS and INFACT's treasurer during that era, the groups funding remained roughly the same from 1979 through 1985.¹⁵⁵

In this particular case, INFACT represented the social history from below, of an outsider trying to take on large food and pharmaceutical companies, standing against corporate transgressions, tied to a network of other such institutions. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, a true and powerful challenge to corporate capitalism seemed a possibility. Much of their success came from media coverage and people on the ground in cities such as Boston, Cleveland, Philadelphia and New York engaging in direct action - and of course the many people in the U.S. and across the Atlantic who refused to buy Nestlé products. These consumers were willing to identify which companies and subsidiaries in a large web of integration Nestlé actually owned, and what products the company distributed.

Monitoring the Multinational Moment

Monitoring global corporations became the dominant strategy for progressive activists after the 1981 Code. IBFAM, INFACT, ICCR and many others converged with consumer groups under the Ralph Nader umbrella, with the corporate democracy movement, the

¹⁵⁵ Internal Revenue Service reported in Gerber, dissertation; in consecutive order from 1979, they raised in US dollars: 471,772, 234,646; 369,118; 455,789; 521,146; 540,242; 367,597.

anti-proliferation movement, and environmentalism at the moment when big business first became a universal monster. Nader's new magazine, the Multinational Monitor, over its twenty-nine-year run (1978-2009), presented a list of corporate evils, consumer concerns, and interpretations of globalization from one particular perspective. The magazine chronicled the rise of global corporate capitalism and the problems of accountability and governance.

But at the same time, the Monitor mapped the rise of international consumer networks and those voices that challenged corporate prerogatives. In early 1985, almost one year after Nestlé and the International Nestlé Boycott Committee declared the termination of the boycott, the Monitor reported on IBFAN'S research of the global feeding scene and catalog of code violations.¹⁵⁶ IBFAN's "Breaking the Rules" for 1984 informed the Monitor's liberal readers that formula companies remained the savages they were purported to be. The American formula companies, "Bristol Myers, Abbott/Ross, and American Home Products among them," became the focus after the first boycott concluded and Nestlé seemed temporarily absolved. In a "fourteen-country survey of marketing practices" the leading monitors, with activists on the ground in Third World countries taking pictures, writing notes, and sending them to the core groups, "found over 400 violations of the WHO code."¹⁵⁷ The science of activist and consumer code watching comprised local observations, clinic visits, shared photographs and publishing these findings.

¹⁵⁶ The Multinational Monitor, "Babies At Risk: Companies Still Violate Infant Formula Code," 5-6, Nos. 12 and 1, December 1984/January 1985, <http://www.multinationalmonitor.org/hyper/issues/1984/12/babies-at-risk.html>, accessed April 2013.

¹⁵⁷ Multinational Monitor, 1984.

IBFAN published code monitoring guidelines, and maintained a repository called the International Code Documentation Centre (ICDC) in Penang, Malaysia.¹⁵⁸ Record keeping, monitoring and knowledge creation in order to know your enemy contributed to the politics of breastfeeding, and "planet dialectics" within the struggle to save the world during the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁵⁹ As violations in 1984 persisted, the WHO Code maintained that there should be zero advertising to consumers, in language that expressed "no direct promotion or advertising of infant feeding products or utensil to the public." Industry basically scoffed at this provision throughout the code-crafting process.

Companies continued to violate the Code in clinics, families and neighborhoods around the world. IBFAN focused on monitoring the point of sale, "visiting shops, supermarkets, pharmacies and other locations where baby milks and feeding bottles are sold," and published instructions on how to monitor.¹⁶⁰ Specific code violations occurred in Third World clinics: "In Santo Domingo, Abbott donates 120 ready-to-feed bottles of

158 IBFAN, Code Monitoring Guidelines, <http://www.ibfan.org/code-monitoring.html>, accessed May 15, 2013. The monitoring became increasingly sophisticated, and IBFAN established itself as a vital voice of expertise within WHO and UNICEF, advocating breastfeeding and supporting the International Code. ACA, too, continued to find abuses of the code, including direct marketing to pregnant women, with discharge packs a favored method. The ACA Collection possessed many photographs, posters, and formula products sent from the field documenting such abuses. See Action for Corporate Accountability Collection, 142.E.8.6, Box 39, MHS.

159 For instructive contributions to this type of analysis, see John S. Dryzek, Rational Ecology: Environment and Political Economy (Oxford ; New York: B. Blackwell, 1987), and Dryzek's The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), Hal Rothman, Saving the Planet: The American Response to the Environment in the Twentieth Century. The American Ways Series (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000). The phrase "planet dialectics" comes from scholar of global ecology, development critic and long-time environmental activist Wolfgang Sachs, Planet Dialectics: Explorations in Environment and Development (New York: Zed Books, 1999). Sachs discussed "the archaeology of the development idea," the problems with sustainability, the image of the planet, and "the gospel of global efficiency." Add the classic The Idea of Progress, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1955) by Charles Van Doren, to the above list and an excellent framework for thinking about the Nestlé Boycott and capitalism emerges.

160 IBFAN Code Monitoring Guidelines, "Why Monitor the International Code?" at IBFAN website, <http://www.ibfan.org/code-monitoring.html> (accessed May 15 2013).

Similac every week. The donated milk is fed to all of the 50-70 babies born monthly." In another clinic, over 200 bottles of the same brand found the mouths of newborns. "All infants born here are bottle-fed from birth on Similac, and samples are given to mothers upon discharge." Abbott donated "excessive quantities" also in Hong Kong, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Taiwan (where they called it "Humanized Infant Food"). "Since 1982," IBFAN noted, "additional Resolutions clarifying and amplifying the International Code have been adopted every two years. Under Article 11.4 of the International Code NGOs are assigned the role of monitoring and reporting the activities of the manufacturers and distributors of baby foods, bottles and teats."¹⁶¹ Therefore, NGOs, food activists and health experts should continue "monitoring around the world." Reports on code violations arrived at IBFAN's main offices, their international affiliates, and to UN agencies.

The monitoring data was included in reports published by IBFAN, the WHO, newspapers and magazines. Companies could not escape mounting public pressure, and in 1984 corporations seemed to bend. Codes of conduct and corporate accountability demanded a new kind of politics and social responsibility. Capitalism in the 1970s and 1980s was forced to confront the global economic recession, the oil embargo, growing inequality, regional famine and a world food crisis (with widely-disseminated photographs of malnourished babies). Perhaps the UN system in the transnational sphere, and global social movements, really could bring multinationals into a more ethical and

161 IBFAN Code Monitoring Guidelines, "Why Monitor the International Code?" The UN specifically included NGOs in their activities, institutionalizing their work and their existence within the UN system, and in the political economy of global health and growth. IBFAN additionally reported that the 1996 Resolution 49.15 strongly emphasized breastfeeding as the universal option, showing the vigor with which breastfeeding advocates pressed their cause, and why some, including feminists, decried this view as patriarchal, draconian and a method of social control. This particular resolution maintained that "all complementary foods" should be "marketed or used in ways that do not undermine exclusive and sustained breastfeeding." <http://www.ibfan.org/code-monitoring.html>

sustainable realm. Nestlé complained whenever it could that the activists misrepresented facts, relying on emotionalism, Marxist ideals, and hysteria while the formula industry truly desired to save babies and adhere to the code.

The individual companies, the organized formula industry, and even capitalism itself experienced attacks. Their brands tarnished and bottom lines negatively affected, they spent millions of dollars attempting to manage the agitation against them. They ignored initial critics, then attempted to control the discourse, while still expanding market share and flagrantly violating the Code. They hired public relations firms, created departments and centers, published countervailing materials and outright propaganda, hired their own scientific experts, appealed to women, lobbied Congress, and continued to grow, develop and expand. Ultimately, it could be said that industry "won" the short-term battles as well as the long-term war. There can be no question that formula companies, pharmaceutical and food giants, and even capitalism writ large emerged stronger and more vibrant than ever: feeding more babies, reaching more individuals, and creating universal health policies that situated them at the intersection of food, health, and development. How they did this, which choices they made, who the principal individuals were, and why companies fought the way they did remains the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

"The Business of Life Itself": The Formula Industry Defends Corporate Morality and Grows the World's Children

A twenty-six-year-old mother of three girls, "Grace," married to a laborer, moved to Nairobi from her rural family home in the 1970s. She and her family lived in a mud house with no bathroom or electricity. Most families purchased water from a privately-owned tap connected to the city's water supply. For Grace, clean water was "an expensive, precious commodity." She breastfed her daughters for about three months, alternating with local porridge, sugar water and commercial infant formula. Health workers at a nearby clinic told her to supplement her breastmilk, so she bought one canister of S-26 for almost three dollars, which "made a big demand on the family's small income."¹

A majority of the women in the Nairobi shantytowns believed that breastfeeding took more time than other kinds of feeding. For some, the bottle-fed baby "feeds itself." According to one woman quoted in a USAID ethnography report, "you do not have to feed the baby yourself. You can just prop the bottle with pillow and the baby will feed itself. The bottle is better because I am always very busy."² Health professionals and formula companies maintained that using a cup and spoon was safer for alternative baby foods. Yet, ninety-two percent of the women studied by America's foreign aid agency

¹ This portrait of Grace, her children and Nairobi supplied in Penny Van Esterik, Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 36-50. See also Beverly Winikoff, Michael C. Latham, and Giorgio Solimano, et al., The Infant Feeding Study: Nairobi Site Report, United States Aid for International Development (USAID), 1983.

² USAID Nairobi Site Report, 39.

used a bottle for formula, and a large percentage for cow's milk as well. Women's attitudes about formula revealed that most viewed the breastmilk substitute as a routine, even necessary, part of their feeding arsenal, when they could afford it.

For Grace and many women like her, daily struggles to survive necessitated long trips by foot. A few times a week, Grace traveled to a major Nairobi market, purchased her goods, and then returned home to set up a vegetable stall in front of her house, where she resold the staples to other local women. Women like Grace typically sold food, including infant formula, in this manner, purchasing supplies at market kiosks and transporting them back home. In this way, infant formula canisters, plastic bottles and rubber teats also made it from city supermarkets to rural and shantytown street hawkers. Keeping small livestock remained illegal for shantytown residents, though ordinary people broke the law to raise chickens and goats. Food networks thus depended upon locals such as Grace, who had to walk several kilometers to reach a highway and bus route into Nairobi.

British imperialists had established Nairobi in 1899 as an important railway hub, and for the local colonial administration. At the time of the USAID study, Nairobi, a city "of over a million," experienced rapid growth and development that mirrored Kenya's "3.9 percent annual rate of population growth." The country's population escalation was "the highest rate of increase in the world." Kenya's growth mirrored that of other African countries in the 1960s and 1970s, other nations in the Global South, and, significantly, the global human population as a whole, which has blossomed from three billion in 1975 to seven billion today.³ Anthropologist Penny Van Esterik noted that by the time of the

³ Ibid, 39.

Nestlé boycott in the 1970s, fewer than five percent "of adults had been born in the city," and most retained their rural connections, migrating back and forth depending on the season, and on employment possibilities.⁴ Into this mixture of rapid human expansion and potential for economic growth stepped Western capitalists hoping to profit.

Marketing Growth and Development

Expansive urbanization and population increase attracted the infant formula multinationals, especially those from western countries with declining populations, where the infant formula market was shrinking every year. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate how companies such as Wyeth, Abbott/Ross and Nestlé marketed their products in Third World locations to "developing" mothers and babies, what their corporate world values were and how these values influenced company decisions. The chapter explores how these companies defended themselves from criticism and attack. In telling this story, I argue that multinational food and pharmaceutical enterprises consolidated cultural and political power by lobbying national governments at home and in host countries, such as Kenya, and by aggressively asserting their agenda within international organizations such as the WHO. By the 1980s, the largest food and drug companies had become the most powerful voice in setting global health policy.

The formula MNCs battled in the political and economic realms, but also fought to master the discursive sphere, to claim knowledge, and to produce and sell ideas in addition to products. The companies, like the very activists who opposed them, possessed their own versions of "saving the world." By feeding infants, providing proper nutrition

⁴ Penny Van Esterik, *Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy*, 48-9.

to developing countries, and expanding their own industry, the formula companies in this study claimed that they improved bodies and thus created a healthy human population on a healthy planet. Formula companies asserted their authority over the proper growth and development of global babies.

Nairobi, a major market for the infant foods industry as well as a site of manufacturing, offers a telling illustration. MNCs carefully observed the "population size, growth rates, and cash incomes" in Kenya and endeavored to shape, and then meet, demand. British firms, such as Cow & Gate, established an early presence in Nairobi because of Kenya's heritage as a colony of England. Among British and American food and pharmaceutical companies, however, Nestlé controlled Nairobi's market.⁵ Market researchers working in Nairobi showed that the company was "the unquestioned leader," accounting for "more than 60 percent of infant formula sales and 80 percent of baby cereal sales." Many of the women in Nairobi recognized brand names, but advertising reached them in ambiguous, complicated ways. For one, Nestlé and the other companies promoted their products mostly in hospitals and clinics, as the industry made "regular and frequent contact with nurses, administrators, and pediatricians." Free gifts and samples to mothers remained "modest," with the majority of free supplies going to the health professionals.

Most formula manufacturers produced their products within Kenya, because the government restricted imported baby foods.⁶ Like mothers themselves, then, formula company behavior responded to the exigencies of the local economy. Because the

⁵ Winikoff, "Determinants of Infant Feeding Practices: Marketing of Infant Foods," USAID Nairobi Site Report, 76-9.

⁶ Winikoff, USAID, Nairobi Site Report, 80.

companies manufactured baby foods in Kenya, they dealt with "problems of occasional milk shortages and state regulated price controls." Price controls were a regular feature in the 1970s, and companies had to apply to the government for products they hoped to sell at a given price. These particular external influences changed over time, and differed among cities, regions and countries across the global South. Furthermore, state influence on the market led Cow and Gate to leave Kenya, and prompted the American company, Abbott and Wyeth, to import their products.⁷ All raw milk products, required in the production of formula, flowed through local suppliers Kenya Cooperative Creameries (KCC), which also competed with the MNCs. Producers and sellers of formula products answered these changes, adapted to them, and attempted to rationally anticipate and even regulate their markets for greater efficiency. USAID's audit of retail locations found widespread availability of formula products and paraphernalia.⁸ Not only did companies honestly hope to provide healthy food for developing infants, while making a profit, they also had to engage different rules, regulations and producing environments around the world. They reacted to consumer groups and health critics with mixtures of outright ire and calculated pragmatism.

In Kenya, where Nestlé controlled the market with its locally produced Lactogen, advertising and promotions illustrated a more contingent environment than usually presented in the bottle-breast dichotomy. Companies claimed to adhere to the WHO Code wherever they engaged business, but especially in LDCs such as Kenya. Those selling

⁷ Ibid, 83.

⁸ USAID Retail Audit, Nairobi Site Report, 76-7. Researchers found eight brands, with Nan and Lactogen coming from "Food Specialties, Kenya, Ltd, a Nestlé subsidiary, Ostermilk from Glaxo, Cow and Gate Baby Milk Plus, SMA/S-26 from Wyeth and Similac/Isomil from Abbott Laboratories. Nestlé exhibited the greatest market penetration in Kenya, with its Lactogen brand the most popular.

formula in Nairobi followed industry codes or internal codes, including directives to field agents. Kenya itself provided standards that industry influenced. Furthermore, the Kenya Ministry of Health created a code that resembled the WHO Code. The site report noted, "no mass media advertising existed in the 1970s, with television, radio, and magazine efforts rare or non-existent."⁹ Industry representatives argued throughout the controversy, especially after signing the WHO Code in 1981, that they conformed to national codes and local law. When pressure groups monitored corporate activities, related to ambiguous terms within the international code, companies emphasized their adherence to local law and health policies in both the developed and developing world.

Why Boycott the Universal Monster?

Many activists and ordinary people alike came to focus on a monster-corporation called Nestlé. The other formula companies did not escape consumer focus, investigations, or lawsuits, but the boycott never targeted their brands the way the baby food coalition attacked Nestlé. Indeed, the attack on Nestlé had become an industry in itself.¹⁰ And yet, for many observers it was stunning how a long-running global boycott of a single company with a recognized brand did not affect Nestlé's growth, its appropriation of natural water resources, nor its exploration into other food and drug realms (See Epilogue). The company's political, economic and public relations competitive edge helped it overcome the boycott battles and consolidate its global market position.

⁹ USAID Nairobi Site Report, 81.

¹⁰ See Michael Skapinker, "How Baby Milk Marketing Fed a Long-Life Campaign," Financial Times (London, May, 26, 2004), 16.

In the worldview adopted by many anti-corporate activists, “Big Business” came to represent an omnipresent evil that required direct political combat and consumer pressure in order to tame its rampant impulses. Business as an uncomplicated monster joined Nestlé SA as global fiend, the “baby killer.” Sometimes it seemed as if all infant deaths, all pollution, and species-threatening nuclear weapons could be blamed on the corporations. Political conservatives, especially, played up this theme. “The only time a businessman makes the national media is when he is polluting streams, making obscene profits or corrupting a poor, innocent businessman,” Patrick Buchanan said in a speech at the California Trucking Association in 1976.¹¹ The businessman as type, according to cultural commentator Martin Marty, posed within the nation’s Rogue’s Gallery. The businessman as bandit in the 1970s represented a shift from acceptability in the 1950s.¹² How should we interpret the generalizations offered by critics of Big Business? Nestlé wondered similarly, and always argued that consumer groups unfairly singled out the company, when instead Nestlé’s scientific products saved babies instead of killed them, improved the world, and contributed to global growth and productivity.

Doug Johnson and others at INFAC worked with a more nuanced combination of the ideal and the practical. They never saw Nestlé’s greed as based on an inherent diabolical essence. Johnson claimed that the notion that Nestlé was evil and out to

¹¹ Martin E. Marty, “The Moralists and the Business Apologists Operate in Different Worlds and the Public is Caught Between Them,” *The Washington Post*, April 28, 1977, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Marty also wrote *Righteous Empire*, about American Protestantism, which won the National Book Award in 1972.

¹² However, studies in the 1950s by John Glower at Harvard Business School also showed increased critical thinking about big business. See John Desmond Glover, *The Attack on Big Business* (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1954). See also his *The Revolutionary Corporations: Engines of Plenty, Engines of Growth, Engines of Change* (Homewood, Ill: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1980).

destroy babies was "nonsense." In contrast to some who saw Nestlé as the universal corporate monster, he offered a much more pragmatic position. "It's quite easy to see how . . . marketing people are barreling along a certain set of assumptions and those assumptions are never challenged." Some ethical and health issues corporations never contemplated, and, according to Johnson, an action group's job was to make corporations and managers aware of the way they behaved in the world. Corporations, "simply because of their great power to do things quickly," often created "a problem that was unanticipated."¹³ Thus for Johnson and many of the activists at INFACT, constructing a simplistic corporate bogeyman was not the objective. For them, it was always important to understand the corporate point of view.

Nestlé opposed the activists, and resisted change, because infant formula was entrenched in the company's idea of itself. Infant formula had contributed to a corporate myth, which translated into its internationally presented ethos, of good food for life. Henri Nestlé founded his company after saving a baby. Johnson noted that this myth was based in the belief that Nestlé had "developed artificial feeding to save a baby's life," and the company used this as a foundation in its motto, its sensibility, its recruiting –the very

¹³ An internal ICCR memorandum from Director Tim Smith to the ICCR Work Group on Transnational Corporations provided an example of such methods, especially in the case of apartheid South Africa, agribusiness, infant formula, technology transfers, and foreign military sales. "Action steps" for the church responsible investments group, especially focused on U.S. banks operating in South Africa and in Chile, which had seen the socialist government of Salvador Allende overthrown by a military junta, involved: research, information-gathering, and publicity; public policy influence through Congress and the UN, "meetings with management" directly; stockholders actions, focused international networking. Stockholder actions included "disclosure resolutions, policy resolutions," and "withdrawal"; solicitations for help from large institutional investors, including such entities as the Ford Foundation and insurance companies; and co-filing with large institutions such as universities and trade unions. Withdrawal was "the most drastic request to place before a company." See Tim Smith to "The ICCR Work Group on Transnational Corporations," ICCR archives, July 31, 1978, at <http://kora.matrix.msu.edu/files/50/304/32-130-13C7-84-GMH%20ICCR%207-88memo.pdf> (accessed May 13, 2014).

fiber of its industrial essence. The infant formula controversy, Johnson surmised, "challenged the very basis of their orientation" of a hundred years. The boycott even disputed Nestlé's logo of a bird building a nest, a safe place to nurture the young.

Scholars have explored why Nestlé became the target of the boycott. Political scientist Kathryn Sikkink noted that the high visibility of Nestlé's product line, from Nescafe to Nestlé Quick to Taster's Choice coffee, its dominant control of infant formula markets in developing countries, and the fact that it was the largest food company in the world influenced activist decisions to focus on Nestlé.¹⁴ Doug Johnson and Andy Chetley corroborated this view, as did Nestlé executives.¹⁵ Additionally, the company blundered through its initial court case against Third World Action Group (TWAG), providing widespread publicity for the activist cause; the court case also inadvertently brought the issue of infant mortality in the Third World to a wider audience. Furthermore, many people reacted negatively to Nestlé's perceived intransigent position and insensitive marketing strategies. A vital part of this history displayed the transformation of self-awareness the company experienced, and its adaptations to changing political and cultural environments. The lessons and strategy shifts Nestlé displayed were crucial for understanding the entire controversy, and the consolidation of real power in global public health and corporate prerogatives.

¹⁴ Kathryn Sikkink and Margaret E. Keck, Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998), Kathryn Sikkink, "Codes of Conduct for Transnational Corporations: The Case of the WHO/UNICEF Code," International Organization 40, no. 4 (October 1, 1986): 815–40.

¹⁵ See Jack Mongoven (Nestlé-NCCN) and Doug Johnson (INFACT), "Confidential Discussion: Notes on a Discussion with Jack Mongoven, Vice-President, Nestlé Coordination for Nutrition," October 8 & 9, 1985, in ACA Collection, Box 25, MHS.

Furthermore, profits only increased for the formula companies. Chetley and Zelman noted that "Nestlé, Abbott/Ross, Bristol-Myers and American Home Products/Wyeth" controlled "over two-thirds of the world market while the other infant formula MNCs" remained under seven percent of market control. Nestlé controlled over 40% of the world market during the controversy. "Estimated sales for the company in 1989 were \$29 billion." Infant formula as commodity enjoyed rising demand and market presence. "In 1981, the world market was approximately \$2 billion . . . and by 1989, estimates were as high as \$5-6 billion."¹⁶ In a 1989 telephone interview with Channing Riggs of Nestlé Enterprises, Zelman wrote that Nestlé controlled 60% percent of formula sales in the Third World. The boycott itself principally affected Nestlé in the U.S., and achieved its greatest success in the West.¹⁷ Nestlé's promise to follow the code existed for U.S. Markets, with specific refusal to do so in Western Europe, all the while its greatest profits and market presence occurred in developing countries. The company fed the world, continued to grow, and re-injected profits back into its enterprises.

¹⁶ Stephen Solomon, "The Controversy Over Infant Formula," New York Times, December 6, 1981, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁷ Nancy Zelman, "The Nestlé Infant Formula Controversy: Restricting the Marketing Practice of Multinational Corporations in the Third World," Transnational Lawyer, 3 (1990), 110n, interview with Channing Riggs, Assistant Special Issues Director, Nestlé Enterprises, Inc., November 14, 1989; a list of formula companies, both food and pharmaceuticals, quoted from Zelman, is helpful for visualizing the corporate players involved in the baby food story, where "alleged marketing violators include: Wyeth-Ayerst Laboratories (division of American Home Products, Inc.), U.S., Carnation Co. (U.S. subsidiary of Nestlé S.A.), Switzerland, Ross Laboratories, Inc. (subsidiary of Abbott Laboratories), U.S., Bristol-Myers International Group's Mead Johnson (subsidiary of Bristol-Myers Co.), U.S., Cow & Gate (British subsidiary of Nutricia Nederland BV), Netherlands, Milupa AG, West Germany, Dumex A/S (subsidiary of Dumex, Ltd.), Denmark, Snow Brand Pillsbury, Inc. (Japanese subsidiary of Pillsbury Co.), U.S., Meiji Milk Products Co., Japan, Boots Cp. PLC, Britain, Lijempf/Kononklijke Wessanen NV, Netherlands, Evenflow Products Co., (subsidiary of Spalding & Evenflow Cos.), U.S., Morinaga Milk Industry Co., Japan, Maeil Dairy Products Co., South Korea, Wander, (subsidiary of Sandoz Ltd.) [note, the discoverer of LSD], Switzerland, Manyang Dairy Products Co.), South Korea, Humana AG, West Germany, Reckitt & Coleman, PLC, Britain. See list in "Not Only Nestlé Violates Code," Journal of Com. 1989.

Food Science and Feeding the World

Nestlé continuously asserted its beneficial presence in the Third World. One promotional document, Nestlé in the Developing Countries (1975) demonstrated the promotional lengths the company could explore when endeavoring to convince others of its social mission. On the front cover, Nestlé illustrated its global self-understanding: "While Nestlé is not a philanthropic society, facts and figures clearly prove that the nature of its activities in developing countries is self-evident as a factor that contributes to economic development."¹⁸ The book also touted Henri Nestlé's story of saving a baby in 1866 next to a color photograph of an African woman walking with a heavy sack on her head while carrying a suckling infant. "Today the name of Nestlé is associated with the future of hundreds of thousands of babies throughout the entire world."¹⁹ Graphs depicted growing profits and declining infant mortality rates. The company also produced a document illustrating its helpful and healthy transforming of raw materials into food products for the modern home. In Nestlé Transforms Fresh, Perishable Raw Materials into Foods with Good Keeping Qualities, full-color photographs showed the company's alchemical power over the natural world, and its contribution to global human welfare.

Turning raw materials into products for markets around the world, within a vision of growth, health and survival, was a source of pride for Nestlé. The company's principal

¹⁸ Nestlé S.A., Nestlé in the Developing Countries (Vevey, 1975), ACA Collection, Company Records, Box 25, MHS. See also Nestlé publications by Maggie McComas, Geoffrey Fookes, and George Taucher, The Dilemma of Third World Nutrition: Nestlé and the Role of Infant Formula, Nestlé SA (Vevey: 1983), H.R.M. Muller and M.C. Secretin, Nestlé Nutrition Services, n.d.; Nestlé supplied many expert articles that supported its position, one of the best representatives being Charles D. May, "The 'Infant Formula Controversy': A Notorious Threat to Reason in Matters of Health," Pediatrics 68, No. 3 (September 1981).

¹⁹ Nestlé S.A., Nestlé in the Developing Countries, ACA Collection, Box 25, MHS.

task, in fact its "sole activity," illustrated food science and technology at its most advanced, turning "animal and vegetable origin" into products that lasted, that withstood long storage and all manner of "distribution conditions."²⁰ Global population growth and expanding industrialization mandated that Nestlé apply new, "revolutionary" technologies to the task of feeding the world with its many, diversified products. "In fact there is no category of food known to mankind to which we have not lent our technological skill and reputation," declared the company. All five continents and most countries had their own national Nestlé Company and manufacturing plants. Nestlé's technological skill helped people take the "extraordinary complexity of Nature's products" and reconstruct them for wide distribution, preserving nutritional qualities within them, and preserving human bodies who consumed them. Images of laboratories, employees in white lab coats, and chemists hunched over their workbenches illustrated food technology, and "food engineering," at the cutting edge of human endeavor.²¹

Susan George, an Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) author who studied world food networks and MNCs, noted Nestlé's moves toward consolidating access to natural resources.²² Buying local raw materials, and then processing them for global markets

²⁰ Nestlé S.A., Nestlé Transforms Fresh, Perishable Raw Materials into Foods with Good Keeping Qualities, n.d., ACA Collection, Company Files, Box 25, MHS.

²¹ See H. R. Muller and M.C. Secretin, "Food Composition and Nutritional Status in Infants," Nestlé Nutrition Services, n.d., 36, in ACA Collection, Company Files, Box 25, MHS.

²² Susan George detailed the tension between raw materials and product diversification. See especially Susan George, "Nestlé Alimentana SA: The Limits to Public Relations," Economic and Political Weekly 13, No. 37 (Sept. 16, 1978), 1601, where she analyzed production overseas (67 factories in Latin America, for example) and repatriation of profits, Nestlé subsidiaries, and a critical reading of a Nestlé public relations document. The company showed how it contributed to local economies by purchasing locally produced agricultural goods. George, who often wrote for the Institute for Policy Studies, remained eminently critical. See also Susan George, How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger (Montclair, N.J: Allanheld, Osmun, 1977),

engaged a process of "added value," of maximizing returns on the raw materials. Chocolates, powdered milks, bottled water and infant formula represented the quintessential product diversification that contributed to billions of dollars in profits. By dividing raw materials in this way, "the consumer pays more for each gram of protein . . . or any other nutrient . . . in the product."²³ Along with advertising and added value methods, profits appeared like magic. The incorporation of eating and of health conjoined to create new spaces - spaces for growth, for capital, for nature, for human bodies. For many activists and critics, the incorporation of humanity seemed at hand, and this development represented the end of days.

Though Nestlé trumpeted these method in annual reports and company propaganda, they never convinced activists like Andy Chetley of War on Want. He highlighted the fact that, "Nestlé, as one of the leading milk companies despite not owning a single milk cow," has succeeded in the manufacturing, processing and packaging of milk products. George wrote that, "plain pasteurized milk has a very low added value and Nestlé never sell it - preferring to concentrate on powdered milk, infant formulas, ice cream, yoghurt and the like."²⁴ The company also negotiated state market regulation around the world, including Brazil, which had price controls for raw milk. But not for "milk derivatives."²⁵

and Institute for Policy Studies, Feeding the Few: Corporate Control of Food (Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1978).

²³ Chetley, 28.

²⁴ Susan George, 1601.

²⁵ Chetley, 28.

The company, in its annual reports for 1976 and 1978, for example, trumpeted their market access and rising profits, and the EEC's export subsidies.²⁶ From 1970-1976, Nestlé grew at a faster rate than other food companies and supermarket chains; the company's sales "showed a total increase of 146 percent."²⁷ Activists complained about the company's methods of doing business in the "global farm system," such as encouraging "farmers to switch from traditional crops to dairying" in some Third World countries. The new global system amounted to coercion within the food and survival economies.²⁸ Other methods of agricultural discipline included supplying "seeds, fertilizers and pesticides," and expensive farm machinery, extending credit to farmers, then expanding markets and both creating and satisfying demand.²⁹

Critics like Susan George, however, did not find any evidence of a favorable working and consuming relationship, neither for individual babies nor for LDC

²⁶ See Nestlé News: Special Report on 1976 (White Plains, NY: Nestlé Company, March-April, 1977), a summation of the state of the company and state of the world. Nestlé News was a bimonthly magazine published by the U.S. subsidiary in White Plains, NY. The cover depicted a mother bird feeding three opened-beaked birds in a nest with an American flag. David Guerrant, Nestlé president, wrote "a record billion dollars in sales for 1976 is difficult to visualize." It was the company's first "billion-dollar sale year in the United States," ACA Collection, Company Records, Box 25, MHS.

²⁷ Nestlé News, 19.

²⁸ Doug Clement of INFACIT wrote in a New Internationalist piece that called for global action against Nestlé, that the company was "still firmly attached to processing cow's milk for much of its profit." Cow's milk, a natural resource for its home nation Switzerland, contributed to powdered milks, infant formula, cheeses, yogurt, chocolates, chocolate milk and other products. See Doug Clement, "Action," New Internationalist, <http://newint.org/features/1982/04/01/action/> (accessed April 20, 2014).

²⁹ This broad stroke of the international agriculture and trade network activists emphasized throughout their critique of MNCs, including Andy Chetley, 26-7. Many of the food and hunger books of the 1970s underscored this rising system of food and profits, such as the Susan George books, Ledogar's Hungry for Profits (1975), William Paddock, Famine, 1975! America's Decision: Who Will Survive? (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967). Michael Watts, Silent Violence: Food, Famine, & Peasantry in Northern Nigeria (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

economies as a whole. She tried to show that the company's labors in developing countries had been "harmful where the promotion of its infant foods is concerned."³⁰ She traced how local subsidiaries bought agricultural ingredients such as cow's milk, pressured farmers and workers to maintain low prices, and profited from the various phenomena of declining breastfeeding rates, expectations of modernity, and growing populations. Added to that, the company paid "bargain prices . . . for local raw materials and salary levels," which gave Nestlé "every incentive to increase production in these countries." Therefore, the company's "contribution to development," and its global vision of health, "was a matter of enlightened self-interest."

This self-interest, though, led to research into new products that demonstrated added value, but also saved babies in the process. Tom McCullough, Ross's Research Specialist for the Third World, commenting in a confidential discussion with company executives, noted a new product that promised to solve the infant formula controversy. Because of the critics' claims about diluted formula use, illiterate women incapable of mixing complicated formulas, and the issue of polluted local water, Abbot/Ross Laboratories developed a "pre-mixed, single feeding" formula bottle.³¹ Hyper processed foods in individual packaging were the company answer to the problems of product suffusion and malnutrition. "We have already solved the problem of sterilization and hygiene with these single-feeding bottles," he said. "They are safe to use anywhere." Companies often answered consumer criticism about health with new products, not

³⁰ Susan George, 1602.

³¹ Tom McCullough, "Conversations with Several Executives at Ross Labs," Abbott/Ross Laboratories, Company Files, ACA Collection, Box 23, MHS.

changing practices or stopping product lines. Consumers should be able to choose from a wide variety using their own intelligence.³²

In a speech, Nestlé Chairman Pierre Liotard-Vogt discussed the rhetorical and material aspects of the food giant in several ways. First, he covered company products and their overall value to the company. He mentioned that sweetened condensed milk, upon which Nestlé built its company for the first fifty years, was "no longer considered a modern product," and shareholders "should not be ashamed" of this fact. However, "instant milk powder" the company exported in expanding quantities, especially to countries without a dairy industry, such as "most of the Middle East and some parts of Africa." The company also produced the most infant food in the world. Demand continued to grow, as consumers had "not been dissuaded in the slightest by the absurd defamatory attacks" against the company. For coffee, Nescafé had "become part of our everyday life." Frozen food, such as their Stouffer brand, reflected modern living and preservation.

Liotard-Vogt then moved to the global monetary system, as the company made most of its profits in other countries. Liotard-Vogt mentioned the contradiction of free trade in a multinational world, namely that when the company tried to grow, occasionally it was denied access to markets or individual companies; sometimes they were refused opportunities "to expand our existing activity in new directions." Given the quirks of the global economy, Nestlé nonetheless expanded through acquisitions; growth and progress as a core injunction. Liotard-Vogt claimed that "not to advance is to retreat," that modernity continued to seek invention. This demanded continual change, and "growth is

³² Nestlé SA, Raw Materials booklet, 2, ACA Manuscript Collection, MNHS, Box 25.

an objective to which we should not be ashamed to confess." A company satisfied with the status quo "will soon be in difficulty." Disciplined employees, managers and executives should be especially rewarded during difficult events such as a corporate boycott.

The chairman addressed the boycott at great length, including the problem of being a multinational during uncertain geopolitical times. On the boycott, he said, "this subject would perhaps best be treated by being ignored since that is what it merits." But the company had to address the issue. Nestlé remained defiant, claiming that the activists were spiteful, but also that their accusations against the company reflected only "futility." As he summarized the situation in 1980, Liotard-Vogt acknowledged that the greatest potency of the boycott was in the U.S., and that boycott energies continued to decline. More importantly, "the practical effect of the boycott can be considered to be nil . . . our sales have not been affected in the slightest, even at the height of the campaign."³³ The company, in fact, enjoyed discussions with critics, sharing knowledge, and helping to save babies if those critics expressed reason and competence.

A year later, however, this rosy corporate picture began to dim. In the summer of 1981, Nestlé claimed to experience profit loss because of the boycott. In Advertising Age, the company noted that its stockholder meeting in Lausanne presented a frightening corporate picture, which in addition to "sliding profits" included bomb threats. Liotard-Vogt noted that the company produced \$11 billion, but that profits declined. The annual meeting experienced shareholder protests, as well. Liotard-Vogt claimed that terrorists threatened the company; and he reported on a fire at a Stouffer hotel in New York, a

³³ Ibid., 11.

chain that it owned, that killed twenty-six people, including eleven Nestlé executives.³⁴

"Vevey 'could be next on the list,'" threatened the anti-corporate terrorist. In July of 1981, the newspaper also commented on Nestlé's "shake-up" of advertising firms, companies such as J. Walter Thompson Company, McCann-Erickson, Leo Burnett Company, and N. W. Ayer, noting that the companies covered Nestlé in over fifty countries. Burnett claimed \$25 million dollars in accounts, and many millions more went to the other firms, promoting products such as chocolates, cheeses and bottled water.³⁵

The Business of Saving Babies, Nations, and the Global Economy

The companies representing the infant formula industry as a whole, whether pharmaceutical or food, consistently asserted that they provided proper nutrition for growing babies and growing nations. Typically, this assertion came in the form of glossy pamphlets and other industry propaganda. But it also entered the public record in other ways: in testimony before Congress and in court, when companies were sued. Bristol-Myers represented the industry, including Nestlé, when executives testified in front of Congress, and defended themselves in court against the Sisters of the Precious Blood. Directing his comments to Senator Kennedy, Frank Sprole, Vice-Chairman of the Board, noted his company's values, its public relations rhetoric, and rational planning for the entire world. Sprole noted that his firm labored as "carefully and as diligently as we can . . . to provide the nutrition essential to good health and to life itself. This is the business

³⁴ Bruce Vandervort, "Protests, profit loss hit Nestlé, exec says," Advertising Age (May 18, 1981).

³⁵ Advertising Age, "Nestlé Realigns Brands," (July 6, 1981), ACA Collection, Box 25 MHS.

we are in, and we are proud of it."³⁶ Bristol-Myers reflected an understanding of business and life, plenty and not scarcity, while helping to improve nutrition, regional economies, and medical services.

Mead Johnson's advertising and promotion of infant food included a range of products and child ages, culminating in Enfamil. "For almost 70 years," its formal testimony claimed," the company produced infant nutrition and contributed to healthy babies. The company introduced "Dextri-Maltose in 1910, Standardized Cod Liver Oil in 1924, Sobee - the first soybean-based formula - in 1929, Pablum in 1933, and many other medically significant infant formula products over the years, culminating in Enfamil." The history of alternative foods for infants and babies demonstrated a need for such food. Formula and other breastmilk substitutes came out of industrial processes, new technologies, and clean laboratories, catering to modern women and utilizing a position of the expert.³⁷ Research, medicine, and science was there, ready to supply quality nutrition. But only "when breast feeding is unsuccessful, inappropriate or stopped early." Mead Johnson supported breast milk, but always claimed its right, its appropriate knowledge and benevolent position, to step in when breast milk failed or children, for whatever reason, could not tolerate breast milk.

Mead Johnson, a subsidiary of Bristol-Myers, provided over fifty health professional testimonials from the developing world supporting the productive, improving, healthy contribution "Mothercraft" nurses made to various clinics and hospitals. Some health experts noted that pharmaceutical and drug companies promoted

³⁶ Senate Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources, Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations, (Kennedy Hearings), 95th Cong., 2nd Sess., May 23, 1978, 140-143.

³⁷ Mead Johnson Testimony, Kennedy Hearings, 143.

their products with a more "medical" rather than food-based marketing technique.

Companies such as Bristol Myers preferred to focus on health professionals rather than grocery markets for promoting their products.³⁸ A central defense for industry maintained that "the decision to breast feed or not rests with the medical professional and the mother alone." The company hired an auditing firm to monitor its advertising "to insure that our policy is faithfully followed." And the many doctors in their attached answers to industry questionnaires asserted that company "nurses" served "as a valuable adjunct to their work." All the same, even with the multiple questionnaires and answers appended to the full report, the company discontinued Mothercraft nurses in 1977 "in an orderly business fashion."

Wyeth represented the quintessential pharmaceutical company in the infant formula business. Historian Michael Willrich, who wrote a global history of smallpox and vaccination regimes, covered Wyeth's early pharmaceuticals and vaccines. Vaccines could save but also kill, engendering cultural responses pro and con, and political reactions at the state, federal, and international levels. The health of children pushed much of the politics of smallpox, as the healthy baby influenced the politics of breastfeeding. When faced with the long histories and extensive global reach of these companies, senators, WHO and some activists thought any change to corporate behavior remained close to impossible.³⁹ And central to industry's defense, after expressing shock

³⁸ One "Third World" doctor currently practicing claimed that breastfeeding is best and why give formula to mothers in poor regions with no money and no water. But, this doctor noted, if the "companies wanted to give me free formula I would take it," because it might help him make people better in certain, dire situations. Milton Ocheang, Interview with the Author, June 11, 2013.

³⁹ "In 1980, American Home Products (AHP) was the sixteenth-largest advertiser in the United States with an expenditure of \$197 million." The company had a strong presence on television,

that anyone should challenge its authority, expertise, and goodwill, was the fact that doctors and health agencies never complained about formula until American and European NGOs and church groups entered the debate.

Nowhere in this global patchwork did nations or agencies demand that companies curtail their commercial activities. "None of these countries has ever asked us to cease marketing of our infant formula products -- we market in many of the countries with the specific approval of the governments. One African country is presently seeking our know-how and technical assistance to construct an infant formula manufacturing plant in that country." Industry positioned formula as a modern, beneficial provider of nutrition, saving babies, and healing less developed countries in the process.⁴⁰

The formula industry's defense of its practices included their own codes of ethics, and their compliance with both the ICIFI code and the joint FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius.⁴¹ AHP's executive expressed the dominant sentiment of every company of his day, namely that AHP's "share of the market which we would lose would simply be taken over by other manufacturers and often by nutritionally inferior products." AHP's view of social responsibility, then, echoed Milton Friedman's – that the company saved

especially, fourth behind Proctor and Gamble, General Foods, and Ford, mostly selling its pharmaceuticals. Source from R. Roncagliolo and N. Janus, "Advertising and the Democratisation of Communications," *Development Dialogue* 2 (1981), 37, quoted in Chetley, 33.

⁴⁰ Baby food politics illustrated at least one principal aspect of foreign direct investment. Most of the formula the company used in foreign markets they in fact manufactured overseas. At least 83% of its formulas "are either made locally in the countries themselves or they are supplied from our other international production facilities. In marketing of these products, here and abroad, we have for many years emphasized that breast feeding is the preferred method of feeding infants." Stafford produced a "declaration of policy" from the president of Wyeth, distributed in 1955.

⁴¹ John S. Stafford Testimony, AHP-Wyeth, 156-173. In the "Guidelines for Wyeth Activities," the company listed as "Don'ts," promotion directly to mothers, clinics, or public advertising "where only breast feeding should be strongly emphasized." Mothers were off limits, "unless authorized by the clinic, physician, nurse, health visitor, midwife, etc."

babies from malnutrition by appearing in foreign markets with its superior baby food at all.

Surplus value was extracted from the land, livestock, and human beings and returned to the incorporated infant as an investment on future returns, and future growth. Abbott/Ross Laboratories continued with expert testimony on proper feeding. "Growth and development are the ultimate determinants of adequate nutrition," otherwise weight gain will suffer and lead to "resignation to a very limited life."⁴² Baby bodies were measured, tested, and inspected for developmental trends, and compared to infants in Boston, reminding one of nineteenth-century physiognomy examinations and the work of phrenologists. Scientists compared Mexican babies to "American breast-fed male babies." With greater breastmilk volume, and proper supplementation after three months, increased caloric and protein intake resulted in "higher values for arm circumference, weight and height." Many companies supplied such evidence, contrary to Jelliffe's studies and other scientific experts. The dialectic of competing experts in the modern age, like competing diets, led many to wonder which expert to trust. The complex issue required further medical evaluation, or, additional market research.

David Cox, president of the Ross Division of Abbott Laboratories, wrote Kennedy within a month after the hearings and reiterated his company's multiple positions. For one, he pointed to Chile's state-run supplemental feeding, its "nutritional intervention," and the success of lowering infant mortality with powdered milk.⁴³ The

⁴² Ross Laboratories, "The Volume of Breast Milk," Kennedy Hearings, 399.

⁴³ David O. Cox, "Letter to Senator Edward Kennedy," (June 16, 1978) in Kennedy Hearings, 447. Cox cited Dr. Fernando Monckeberg, Director of the Institute for Child Health and Development, University of Chile, and Chile's program to eradicate infant mortality and malnutrition. Importantly, the program expanded under socialist Salvador Allende's government.

World Bank and the U.S. Department of Agriculture studied the Chilean nutrition supplement scheme as well.⁴⁴ As we saw with Alan Berg's The Nutrition Factor, institutions such as WHO and the World Bank monitored national babies for their growth, prospects and qualities of life.⁴⁵ Abbott/Ross often helped such programs, and cooperated with governments and international organizations.

In addition to state feeding interventions, Cox turned to company market share in developing countries, which he noted was lower than activists claimed.⁴⁶ When discussing the potential market for Abbot, Cox claimed that it was difficult to rationalize "because of the growth of the human race."⁴⁷ He also discussed the "question of potable water," and concluded that the issue should have been moot, as boiling water "has been the heart of food preparation for hundreds of years." Regarding the activist's central theme -- that marketing in the Third World was irresponsible, and the potential for

I analyze Monckeberg and Chile's national infant feeding programs in Chapter 4. Cox employed experts who wrote trenchantly about Chile, nutrition and health: See Peter Hakim and G. Solimano, Development, Reform, and Malnutrition in Chile. International Nutrition Policy Series 4 (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1978), and Peter Hakim and G. Solimano, "Supplemental Feeding as a Nutritional Intervention: The Chilean Experience in the Distribution of Milk," *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics*, Monograph 46 (August 1976), 185-202.

⁴⁴ See Lloyd Harbert and Pasquale L. Scandizzo, "Food Distribution and Nutrition Intervention The Case of Chile," World Bank Staff Working Papers, No. 12, Washington, D.C. (May 1982).

⁴⁵ According to experts in the field, over 100 countries had infant and child supplemental feeding programs, which counted "for more than 95 percent of all resources directed to child nutrition." Furthermore, USAID also provided 18 million kilograms of powdered milk to Chile in the 1960s. These statistics did not dissuade consumer groups, however, who argued that companies still should not market formula. But should provide it when doctors or clinics requested alternatives. See Hakim and Solimano, "Supplemental Feeding as a Nutritional Intervention," 1976, 185-197. See Alan Berg, The Nutrition Factor: Its Role in National Development (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1973).

⁴⁶ Abbott Industries total sales in 1977 were \$1.245 billion; formula commodities equaled \$222 million, of which "less than 10 percent" were sold in the Third World. Abbott Industries Press Release, (May 23, 1978), in Kennedy Hearings, 197.

⁴⁷ David Cox Testimony, Kennedy Hearings, 208.

product misuse remained high in the developing world - Cox added to the company's defense the numerous state and agency bids for Ross formula. He cited LDCs such as Nigeria, Iran, Libya and Ghana; agencies such as UNICEF, the EEC, and the U.S. Government, all of which provided millions of pounds of various milk products and supplements. Church groups, municipalities and voluntary agencies also ran milk programs.⁴⁸

The privatization of health and survival became a structural reality during the 1970s and 80s. Pharmaceutical companies recognized the potential market for infant formula in developing countries, and firms such as Abbott, Glaxo, and Bristol-Myers/Wyeth capitalized "on their pharmaceutical reputations in their approach to doctors." Food corporations, on the other hand, had to create their own "link with the medical profession." Nestlé, for instance, ran health and feeding workshops for professionals and published their expert findings, and sponsored "conferences on nutrition and allied fields and . . . helped to organize courses for pediatricians on nutrition either as a company or through the medium of the Nestlé Foundation."⁴⁹ Nestlé

⁴⁸ To experience what the companies were up against in the scientific and rhetorical fields, see the incredibly active and global Dr. Roy Brown, who traveled widely saving babies, and who presented a prolific publishing career. Plus, articles such as "Failure to Thrive," and a book called Starving Children: The Tyranny of Hunger (New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc., 1977) reflected the rhetorical power that allowed activists to claim such effective international attention. Brown lobbied the Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee in 1978 to explain the problems of marketing in the Third World. Reading his CV in the public record presents an awesome example of knowledge, power and saving the world. Roy Brown's collection in Kennedy Hearings, 461-500.

⁴⁹ Muller, The Baby Killer, 8. Nestlé expert production and influence on health with its foundation is impressive. Additionally, the company, as had others, became experts in global health, with the money to support programs, refugee relief, and other incursions into developing country health issues, and eventually established themselves within the UN system as deeply as any NGO. See titles from Nestlé Nutrition such as Leo Stern, ed., Feeding the Sick Infant, Nestlé Nutrition, Vevey Switzerland, (New York: Raven Press, 1987); Michael Gracey and Frank Falkner, eds., Nutritional Needs and Assessment of Normal Growth, Nestlé Nutrition, Vevey,

Foundation Workshops were sometimes co-sponsored by groups such as the International Organization for the Study of Human Development, which once published a booklet called Food, Man and Society (1976).

In addition to Nestlé's impressive history of scientific research and development within the field of formula and other processed foods, the company maintained a constant, visible presence in health research and publication. The Nestlé Foundation, begun in 1966, ran workshops for medical and scientific professionals, publishing this expert output widely. Nestlé Nutrition published company research on the problems of nutrition in the world, headed by a council of five "internationally well-known scientists."⁵⁰ Additionally, the foundation provided money to local experts from developing countries.

Nestlé, as had many economists, equated individual, subjective bodily "growth retardation" with low-growth countries in one of its foundation workshops, where some countries pathologically appeared to possess growth disorders. The pharmaceutical industry, negotiating multiple legal and regulatory fields -- such as the U.S. Food and

Switzerland (New York: Raven Press, 1985); or a Nestlé-produced report called The Dilemma of Third World Nutrition: Nestlé and the role of Infant Formula: A Report, (Washington, D.C.), 1985; or note this impressive title from the Nestlé Foundation Workshop, The Impact of Malnutrition on Immune Defense in Parasitic Infestation: A Nestlé Foundation Workshop, (Bern: Huber, 1981); equating bodily illness with low economic growth in less developing countries, (short statures for low-growth nations), see Nestlé Nutrition, Linear Growth Retardation in Less Developed Countries, Nestlé Nutrition Workshop Series 14, (New York: Raven Press, 1988), a publication of collected papers that experts presented in Cha-am, Thailand, in March 1986.

⁵⁰ The Nestlé Foundation and workshop explored topics such as "The impact of malnutrition on immune defense in parasitic infestation," (Vern: Huber, 1981), and published papers presented at each workshop; Nestlé Nutrition published such works as Leo Stern, "Feeding the Sick Infant," Nestlé Nutrition (New York and Vevey, Switzerland: Raven Press, 1987), Michael Gracey and Frank Falkner, eds., Nutritional Needs and Assessment of Normal Growth (New York and Vevey: Raven Press, 1987), Linear Growth Retardation in Less Developed Countries (New York and Vevey, Raven Press, 1988). See also, Jean Heer, World Events 1866-1966: The First Hundred Years of Nestlé (Lausanne, Imprimeries Reunies, 1966); See the Foundation website, <http://www.Nestléfoundation.org/e/about.html> (accessed August, 29, 2013).

Drug Administration - successfully insinuated itself into bodily, economic and social health. Increasingly, doctors, wherever located, looked to corporations in addition to medical journals to stay "informed about advances in pharmaceuticals" and likewise became "increasingly dependent on the milk companies for information about infant feeding."⁵¹ Whereas War on Want presented this material as a criticism against industry, urbanization and multinational corporations more generally, these developments indicated the successful maneuverings of massive corporations across national borders, legal landscapes, and economic markets.

The Corporation Haters: "Marxists marching under the banner of Christ"

The presence of anti-capitalist and Marxist activists made it easy for corporate executives to find socialist rhetoric to attack when defending free enterprise. Doug Johnson quoted political economist Steven Langdon on the company's undue influence in the Third World. Langdon's analysis of soap in Kenya and the presence of MNCs included a litany of left-leaning interpretations inimical to these companies and their presence in developing nations. The huge companies proffering soap in postcolonial settings included many of the largest blue chip companies known. And, their "subsidiaries are largely directed and coordinated from head office," the corporate metropole in a large empire, ever expanding, and "are transferring a consumer 'package' to Kenya."⁵² Their heavy advertising [was] promoting taste transfer. This usually involves increasingly capital-

⁵¹ Muller, 8.

⁵² Steven Langdon, Multinational Corporations in the Political Economy of Kenya (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981), "Multinational Corporations, Taste Transfer and Under-Development: A Case Study from Kenya." Review of African Political Economy no. 2 (January 1, 1975): 12–35, "The State and Capitalism in Kenya." Review of African Political Economy no. 8 (January 1, 1977): 90–98.

intensive production techniques . . . and costly product differentiation . . . Surplus repatriation by subsidiaries is considerable. And their distribution effects increase social and regional inequality in Kenya. Most of the firms also have close relations with government and seem well able to influence the political economic environment they inhabit."⁵³ The formula companies pointed to these types of analyses as indicative of anti-capitalist rhetoric, even communist propaganda, and as reflections of what they were up against in their struggle to efficiently solve scarcity, increase wealth and therefore improve health. Not sickness and health; rather wealth, reduced poverty and improved living conditions. And bodily health indicated economic health, they argued, on the well-paved road toward growth and profits.⁵⁴

Industry rightly claimed that some of the consumer groups arrayed against formula companies exhibited anti-capitalist tendencies if not total hostilities. Using marketing abuses as their wedge, the activists encouraged Congress, WHO/UNICEF and other nations such as Kenya and Malaysia to investigate the formula industry. Accusations of false or misleading advertising these international institutions could address; claims of anti-market tendencies, labor injustice and economic inequalities

⁵³ Langdon, "Taste Transfer," 29.

⁵⁴ A vital and growing critique of global corporations and their contributions to sickness, social inequality, and disease existed in the 1970s and has reached a desperate pitch today, as seen in PIH, Paul Farmer's continued influence, books such as Paul Farmer, Aids and Accusation: Haiti and the Geography of Blame, Comparative Studies of Health Systems and Medical Care (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), Infections and Inequalities: The Modern Plagues (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor, California Series in Public Anthropology 4 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003). See Jim Yong Kim, Dying for Growth: Global Inequality and the Health of the Poor (Common Courage Press, 2000), and Sickness and Wealth: The Corporate Assault on Global Health, (Cambridge, Mass: South End Press, 2004). The wealth of nations converged with the health of nations, which resulted in a new cumulative understanding of the health and sickness of humanity.

proved nearly impossible to refute. Further, scientific research never demonstrated a correlation between formula promotion and declines in breastfeeding. Marketing and promotion issues provided an inroad to assail and condemn these companies for malnourished children, product dumping, and even the unequal distribution of wealth. Langdon presented a prime example of the anti-capitalist position in the 1970s, focusing on corporate advertising as one of the world's evils. "Advertising, then, has been crucial in generating local demand for sophisticated, well-packaged, MNC-type products." For historian Timothy Burke, these marketing incursions in Africa were tantamount to a kind of new civilizing mission, especially for soaps, toothpaste and infant formulas. Companies and their advertising and promotional arms existed for many observers as a new kind of invasive force. In the realm of health and sickness, growth and environmental damage, these issues presented the potential for global battles that always addressed much more than their local circumstances.⁵⁵

Industry methods to neutralize the boycott aimed to undermine the activist position by highlighting just how complicated the issue was in reality: that not all

⁵⁵ Langdon, 20. Timothy Burke employed Langdon and scholars like Giovanni Arrighi to aid his explorations in marketing, advertising and commodity promotions in Zimbabwe, and to help answer questions about local changes based on MNC interventions within a complex world system. These questions included, and are especially interesting when we consider formula marketing, baby food, questions of modernity and survival itself: "How do new needs develop? What makes a luxury into a necessity? What causes 'tastes' to 'transfer'? What changes the relationships between things and people? How do people acquire deeply felt and expressed desires for things they never had or wanted before?" Burke argued that Zimbabwe presented a perfect setting for answering these questions. In parts of Africa, including South Africa and Kenya, "capitalist manufacturing went through particularly rapid and significant expansion at the end of World War II. This expansion was accompanied by a wave of new activity in advertising, promotion and marketing directed at the indigenous peoples of the region and a simultaneous growth in the range and type of manufactured goods available to and 'needed' by African consumers. Most characterizations of what has variously been called 'modern,' 'monopoly,' or, more optimistically, 'late' capitalism agree that advertising and cultural hegemony have become increasingly crucial to its functioning." See Burke, Lifebuoy Men, Lux Women: Commodification, Consumption, and Cleanliness in Modern Zimbabwe. Body, Commodity, Text (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 2-3.

mothers breastfed, and that communities had kept infants alive through supplemental feeding since the beginning of human civilization. Nestlé's attempts to fight Peter Krieg's Bottle Babies film illustrated the pressure it applied to health professionals. Dr. Nimrod Bwibo was a Kenyan physician who appeared in "Bottle Babies," but did not feel comfortable with the activists' assertion that all formula was harmful. Nestlé seized upon his dissent to point out the exaggerations in Bottle Babies. Many physicians were similarly hesitant to take on Nestlé directly.

Dr. Bwibo's use as propaganda for both sides in many ways illustrated the disconnect between the Global North and South. He wrote director Peter Krieg and others voicing his displeasure about the film "Bottle Babies" and its supposedly biased interpretation of an extremely complex problem. Bwibo appeared in many shots, arguing against corporate marketing in Third World hospitals. Further, according to Doug Johnson and others, he personally worked to limit corporate access to clinics, mothers and babies. Johnson sent a strongly worded letter to Nestlé executive David Guerrant of Nestlé's US subsidiary, which, the company never tired of pointing out, did not produce formula.⁵⁶ To them, boycotting Nestlé USA reflected the emotional illogic of the activists. More than that, the activists believed that Nestlé specifically targeted and coerced Bwibo for his role in the film. The company apparently possessed a fair amount of influence over the pediatric association in Kenya, and used this leverage to at least extract a letter outlining industry's "it's complicated" baby feeding position. One thing is certain, the company provided the letter to those who investigated the formula

⁵⁶ See Doug Johnson, 'Letter to David Guerrant,' Kennedy Hearings. See their entire exchange, 623-635.

controversy, sent it to activists and church groups, and submitted it for the official record during the Kennedy hearings.⁵⁷

Nestlé supplied the Bwibo letter to the congressional subcommittee, to INFACT and other groups, and probably applied soft pressure on him. Geoffrey Fookes, Assistant to the Manager of Nestlé SA, traveled to Nairobi in January 1978 to meet with Bwibo. The latter's letter appeared afterwards.⁵⁸ "As a result of that meeting, Mr. Fookes reported to us on February 18 that Dr. Bwibo was 'angry' about the film and would be writing us a letter of 'condemnation.'" Additionally, "sources" informed INFACT that Bwibo "met with Nestlé officials in Switzerland" in February 1978.⁵⁹ This expensive and time-consuming tactic provided fuel for the boycott fire. Over time, Nestlé learned that the Bwibo tactics did not work, and they refined company strategies for fighting the boycott and any claims against its prerogatives.⁶⁰

Peter Krieg expressed shock toward Bwibo's supposed change of attitude. He claimed that "the President of Nestlé USA, Mr. David E. Guerrant is currently sending

⁵⁷ Doug Johnson Letter, 630-633.

⁵⁸ According to a Nestlé vice-president, Fookes was a marketing executive who took over the boycott issue accidentally. Over time the issue grew more complex and intense, and he ended up devoting all his time to it, becoming the company's feeding politics and boycott expert.

⁵⁹ Johnson to Guerrant, Kennedy Hearings, 629.

⁶⁰ Abbott/Ross Laboratories also produced a 16mm film in the late 1970s titled "Mothers in Conflict, Children in Need," which chronicled the difficulties of feeding children in developing countries. The company's nutritional anthropologist declared that breastfeeding in rural areas in places like Guatemala retained high breastfeeding rates, contrary to public rhetoric. Abbott distributed the film to church and community groups. The film explored issues such as rural living, the impact of urbanization, malnutrition, and the "effects of culture" in feeding decisions. Abbott/Ross Laboratories, "Mothers in Conflict, Children in Need," Promotional Materials, ACA Collection, Company Files, Box 23, MHS.

your letter around with a triumphant letter of his own."⁶¹ The company used Bwibo's "letter in a well organized campaign to discredit this film and with it the whole movement against bottle feeding in the U.S." However, Krieg did add material to the film after Bwibo's involvement, the six minutes that "was made after the first part was finished and added to the film as the Nestlé trial in Switzerland became suddenly a very important aspect of the whole issue." The film showed to hospitals in Africa in 1975, and the World Council of Churches Conference in Nairobi without the added polemical material.

Bwibo did not appreciate the added content and perhaps agreed with certain of Nestlé's points. Industry used rhetorical nuance as wedges to open up sympathy with the corporate position, especially among well-educated experts. The additional footage showed the Bern trial, mocked the company's proliferation of products, and overtly singled out Nestlé. Krieg wrote Dr. Elizabeth Hillman and Bwibo and reminded them that, "maybe you should say that the film is also available without those last six minutes, since many organizations unfortunately do not dare attack Nestlé that open . . ."⁶² Krieg spoke the truth about this point: many doctors and health professionals in the Third World encouraged breastfeeding, and hoped that the companies would stop promoting in hospitals and to poor mothers. However, most refused to openly criticize the companies because they worked with the companies more often than not.

Some doctors in Kenya, employed by the government, refused to cooperate with activists. One wrote about the baby food issue and the milk companies that a doctor

⁶¹ Peter Krieg to Professor Nimrod O. Bwibo, Department of Pediatrics, Kenyatta National Hospital, Nairobi, Kenya, May 21, 1978, in Kennedy Hearings testimonies, 637.

⁶² Krieg to Dr. Elizabeth Hillman and Prof. Bwibo, November 17, 1975. Hillman worked with Bwibo and Krieg, participated in the film organized many events and worked against promotional advertising in the local hospitals and for large institutions. She was Senior Lecturer in Paediatrics, University of Nairobi, Faculty of Medicine, in the Department of Paediatrics.

would have to obtain "consent and cooperation from the people in the Kenyan Government" and that "some of these officers are not willing to" provide help to the activists because "they are already under pressure from the milk companies themselves." As others have noted about post-independence Africa, multinationals placed themselves at the center of many vital economic and political considerations, especially within the realms of food, energy, and mining. Johnson relayed to the Kennedy subcommittee that Nestlé's new production plant outside Nairobi aimed at being "a major purchaser of Kenyan products - an industry already controlled by the political and economic elite of that country." Similar to the general story of colonialism, a national elite often supported and benefited from foreign presence in host countries.⁶³

David Guerrant, the President of the Nestlé Company, Inc., the American subsidiary, wrote to Timothy Smith, president of ICCR, and complained about emotional tactics, about "unjust and reckless oversimplification of the world hunger problem." He requested that ICCR withdraw Bottle Babies from circulating as an activist tool, and copied his letter to some significant players in American politics and church groups. He included Senators Kennedy and Frank Church, industry leaders from the main companies, CBS's Janet Roach, Notre Dame University's president, Ambassador to Kenya Charles Maine, anthropologist Dana Raphael, the governor of Minnesota Rudy Perpich, the Swiss embassy in Washington, and Clergy & Laity Concerned (CALC). These types of letters formed one element of Nestlé's approach to containing the boycott.⁶⁴ Reasonable and responsible church leaders must ensure that "Christian

⁶³ Johnson Testimony, Kennedy Hearings, 631.

⁶⁴ See David Guerrant, "Letter to Timothy Smith," May 5, 1978, Kennedy Hearings, 1443-44.

organizations . . . should comply with the highest possible standards of honesty and objectivity." Many of these businessmen, incidentally, considered themselves good family men, community leaders, and Christians. Christianity and capitalism went together, especially in matters of global health policy and practice.

During the Kennedy Hearings in 1978, Oswaldo Ballarin, Chairman and President of Nestlé-Brazil, provided one of the pivotal moments in the entire controversy. Ballarin had worked in the UN and in the Third World for fifty years. He evinced real-world experience and empathy for real human beings. Yet, he expressed the essential idea of industry: critics of formula companies were against free market capitalism; leave the companies alone to do their good work, because efficient growth and growth alone, within the profit paradigm, would answer scarcity and want.⁶⁵ He summarized the activist side of the argument, and noted that "based on my personal experience in many developing countries, the claims "are quite misleading and inaccurate." The American subsidiary, makers of chocolate and coffee, "advised me that their research indicates this is actually an indirect attack on the free world's economic system. A worldwide church organization, with the stated purpose of undermining the free enterprise system, is in the forefront of this activity." Kennedy interrupted and said, "Now, you cannot seriously," but was interrupted as derisive laughter and clapping erupted in the room. After Ballarin's testimony, Nestlé attempted to regain the moral status and reasoned integrity that business embodied.

But in 1978, businessmen were not cultural heroes, especially when they made comments that denigrated nuns, health care professionals and ordinary people. Kennedy

⁶⁵ Oswaldo Ballarin testimony, Kennedy Hearing, 126-130.

called the room to order, and launched into a segment of lambast. Kennedy listed the "nurses, doctors who have served in the Third World, many of them in some of the most remote areas of the world . . . the National Council of Churches" and "14 Protestant denominations, including the Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, the Lutheran Church, the Baptist Church, the Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, as well as 150 orders of the Roman Catholic Church, that they are involved in some worldwide conspiracy to undermine or attack the free world's economic system?"⁶⁶ In the 1970s, Nestlé did not possess the cultural power to fight on behalf of Big Business with this kind of rhetoric.

Contrarily, Kennedy voiced his opinion that the consumer groups, churches and activists worked with a genuine concern for health, and with hopes of bettering the world while encouraging companies to improve their social responsibility in a newly, vigorously complicated global world. "It seemed to me," he said, "that they were expressing a very deep compassion and concern about the well-being of infants, the most vulnerable people on the face of this world, and expressing it on the basis of information and scientific knowledge, understanding and care and compassion."⁶⁷ Rhode Island senator Chafee joined him, and stated that the only undermining going on was not to the free market system, but to Nestlé's argument. Ballarin defended himself by pointing to two facts, that the boycott was "made against one company which does not manufacture these products in the United States," and because of Peter Krieg's film "Bottle Babies."

⁶⁶ Kennedy Hearing, 127.

⁶⁷ Edward Kennedy, in Kennedy Hearings, 128.

Kennedy iterated the perspective that the entire controversy, boycott, consumer advocacy, church investments, and competing ideologies - all demonstrated capitalist hegemony and the move toward attempted total market penetration. The controversy reflected attempts at the efficient management of billions of people. When chiding Ballarin, Kennedy noted, "the boycott is a recognized tool in a free economic, democratic system, and it is used in our society, and it is not recognized as being a part of an international kind of conspiracy to bring the free world's economic system down."⁶⁸ Reformism within the dominant system, in other words, and not radical revolution, illustrated the dominant activist position. Ballarin, however, quoted the NCC: "The attempt within a Christian framework to evaluate and offer an adequate response to the reality of transnational corporations must be a radically new approach to the political and economic structure of society, and demands liberation from the present unjust international economic system." The first wave of boycott took place squarely within the story of newly independent countries removed from imperialism, and attempts by the Group of 77 and others to offer alternatives to rampant capitalism. "That is why I thought there was something there," Ballarin said. "If I were you," chimed Chafee, "I would skip over the part on undermining the world's economic system."

Nestlé continued lobbying American politicians, increased its public relations budget markedly, and gave money to conservative think tanks. These efforts did not always work smoothly, and sometimes created public embarrassment. An event some called "Nestlégate" demonstrated this particular ineffectual combat. The Ethics and Public Policy Center (EPPC), begun in 1976 by political analyst Ernest Lefever,

⁶⁸ Kennedy Hearings, 128.

published research and advocacy papers from the right wing. Previously, Lefever worked with the Brookings Institution on U.S. foreign policy in the Third World. He authored many books, articles and speeches, argued for increased morality in American public and private life, and presented an unflinching anti-communist position.

As a Reagan appointee for assistant secretary of state for human rights and humanitarian affairs, he explicitly countermanded Jimmy Carter's human rights policies. Testifying in front of the Foreign Relations Committee in 1981, Lefever believed that the U.S. did not possess the right to demand human rights in other countries.⁶⁹ He also claimed objectivity and neutrality when he hired a Fortune editor, Herman Nickel, to write an article about the formula issue called "The Corporation Haters." His think tank, however, received funding from Nestlé SA, which was not lost on consumer groups, especially after an expose appeared in the Washington Post. (Bristol-Myers and Abbott Laboratories also contributed to the EPPC.) Lefever noted that Nestlé was "not a dominant" subscriber," providing seven percent of the Center's funding."⁷⁰ But his insipid handling of formula funding convinced the senators to offer a bipartisan negative vote.

In the summer of 1980, Nestlé SA sent Ernest Saunders, a company vice president, head of Nestlé Nutrition Division, and the president of ICIFI, to the United States on a counter-boycott mission. Saunders hoped to find "third party" voices that could damper the boycott's effect, especially experts publishing in magazines and professional journals. Nickel wrote the Fortune article titled with a phrase supplied by

⁶⁹ See Senate Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Nomination of Ernest W. Lefever to be Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, 97th Cong., 1st Sess., May-June, 1981, 345, 485, and 497-514. Also note Douglas Martin, "Ernest W. Lefever, Rejected as a Reagan Nominee, Dies at 89," Obituary, The New York Times (August 5, 2009).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 498.

one of the magazine's editors, describing the activists and the churches as "Marxists marching under the banner of Christ." Two editors defended the phrase as objective truth, and Nickel himself claimed in an interview that the characterization was "justified by the evidence."⁷¹ Doug Johnson of INFACT joined many loud voices against the article, claiming that Nickel saw "a red behind every bush."⁷² Derrick Jelliffe and his wife wrote to Fortune and claimed that Nickel merely constructed "a hagiography of misunderstood corporate saints ... battling to overcome evil destroyers of the free enterprise system," while preaching to the conservative choir.⁷³ The National Council of Churches also took offense, especially since Lefever had criticized the World Council of Churches in one of his books, describing the global church organization as communists out to threaten the free world.⁷⁴

⁷¹ See Morton Mintz, "Infant-Formula Maker Battles Boycotters by Painting Them Red," The Washington Post Jan. 4, 1981, A2, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, and U.S. Senate, Hearings on Ernest W. Lefever, (1981). Refer also to Herman Nickel, "The Corporation Haters," Fortune, June 16, 1980.

⁷² Many involved in the formula struggles advocated for a rejection. Jelliffe, for example, sent a mailgram to Edward Kennedy that stated, "earnestly request your support and influence blocking nomination," for the formula issue and Lefever's attacks on church groups. Nickel, when he realized Nestlé funded the infant formula study, abandoned a larger study for EPPC. Lefever alarmed the public when he claimed that Africa was "a female region, subject to penetration from outsiders." He also backed nuclear arms for Israel's enemies. President Reagan soon experienced the first appointment loss of his administration. See Derrick Jelliffe, "Mailgram to Senator Edward Kennedy," March 8, 1981 in Kennedy Hearings.

⁷³ Derrick and E.F.P. Jelliffe, "The Corporation Critics; Letter to Fortune Magazine," (June 24, 1980), in Infant Formula Issue Research Literature, ACA Collection, Box 4, MHS.

⁷⁴ The Boston Women's Health Book Collective (BWHC), publishers of Our Bodies, Ourselves and a leading organization in the women's health movement, wrote its senators in Massachusetts, Paul Tsongas and Edward Kennedy, urging them to work against Lefever's appointment. They also pointed out that the EPPC received money from "South African front organizations." Herman Nickel had written an article defending corporations in South Africa. See BWHC, "Letter to Paul Tsongas," (April 10, 1981) Senate Hearing, Nomination of Ernest W. Lefever to be Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

More important than the rhetorical skirmish set off by the article, the strategies and tactics of Nestlé revealed another front in the war against the corporation haters. Saunders detailed his plans to Nestlé SA in Switzerland in a memo. This memo, according to the Washington Post, showed "an unusual behind-the-scenes glimpse of a large multinational company in combat with liberal critics."⁷⁵ The company disseminated the Fortune article, found ways around the shortage of Big Business credibility in the U.S., and noted "there must be maximum exploitation of the opportunities presented by the Fortune article." In July 1980, Bristol-Myers mailed the article to 80,000 shareholders; Abbott included the article in its communications with the public.⁷⁶ Prior to "Nestlégate," Saunders had voiced satisfaction with fewer anti-Nestlé petitions, negative letters to the company, or articles in the press. This political tranquility reflected the success of the "basic strategy" for anti-boycott maneuvers, such as the "containment of the awareness of the activists' campaign." However, Saunders, Lefever, and Nickel inadvertently gave new life to the boycotters, activists and churches.

Thus, Nestlé created another political and cultural blunder as it strove to protect itself. The company, though, became stronger because of these wounds. During this momentary setback in 1980-81, Nestlé strengthened industry presence within WHO to ensure its maintenance of power. Carlo Fedele, another Nestlé lawyer, demonstrated that Nestlé influenced WHO officials during the Code drafting process. Fedele was also a

⁷⁵ A Nestlé employee leaked the memo to INFAC in August 1980. INFAC Newsletter, ACA Collection, Box 18, MHS. Nestlé noted that during the Code-Lefever-Nickel period, "about a five month period," the Washington Post "carried 91 articles mentioning Nestlé and infant formula in a negative way. That is an incredible statistic," and to Doug Johnson, "you really must have been working those reporters hard. We had to turn that off. Eventually we did."

⁷⁶ "Summary Statement of Ernest Lefever's Relationship with the Nestlé Corporation," INFAC Newsletter, ACA Collection, Box 6, MHS.

former employee of WHO. As we will see in Chapter Five, the Code threatened to become stronger than the ICIFI code of ethics, and possibly become regulatory. Nestlé hired a former assistant director of WHO, Dr. Stanislaus Flache, as an executive, and Flache then worked alongside another WHO official, Dr. E.M. Demaeyer, in WHO's nutrition arm. Rather than reflecting anything conspiratorial, as the activists saw this influence, these events showed how Nestlé positioned itself within international organizations, hoping to influence global public health policy. The company was extremely effective at pressure and guidance. When activists and members of the press reacted to these developments, Nestlé used a New York public relations firms to handle the pressure.⁷⁷

The Healthy Corporate Family: The Metropole and Its Hinterlands

Nestlé's corporate family extended across the globe, and during the formula controversy, the parent company attempted to manage the boycott from the Swiss metropole, the center of Nestlé's private empire, while its flourishing children, subsidiaries such as the U.S. firm Nestlé Company, scrambled to deal with local issues. Unfortunately for the offspring in White Plains, it absorbed the majority of activists' attacks, press coverage, and direct action agitation. Nestlé USA scrambled to contain the damage caused by INFANT and others. The company's vice president and general counsel, John Donlan, testified before Congress that "our first line of defense is that we don't engage in the manufacture or sale of infant formula products. That does not seem to do any good.

⁷⁷ These events some called "Nestlégate," and can be found in the Lefever Hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, and in Mintz, "Infant-Formula Maker," New York Times (1981). Lefever experienced a turbulent and even harsh nominations hearing.

Consequently, we have to deal with charges that are made against the company involving this line of products which is not a U.S. line. We have got to learn the issues and policies that are established by our Swiss parent company. That is how this information comes to us, through the parent."⁷⁸ Company executives had not been trained to deal with boycott containment, and eventually out of frustration shipped all of the boycott materials in boxes to Switzerland. Nestlé SA soon hired professional political strategists to turn the tide on the American and international boycott movements. The American pharmaceutical companies, though, expressed greater sophistication and awareness of critics than their Swiss counterpart.

For example, AHP's response to shareholder resolutions demonstrated the American companies' determination not to cave to activist pressure of any kind.⁷⁹ Leah Margulies claimed that the American companies fought the hardest and refused to compromise. The New York Times reported in 1978 that AHP, was "digging in its heels and ardently opposing the resolution." The company's official line was, "we do not compete with breast milk, only with less suitable, less nutritious products," said Steven Bauer, vice president of Wyeth International, AHP's subsidiary that manufactures the infant formulas SMA, S26 and S28. American companies held firm principally because they saw themselves as different from Nestlé and other food companies. They were pharmaceuticals that dealt directly with health professionals and did not mass market

⁷⁸ John F. Donlan, Vice President and General Counsel, Nestlé Company, Inc., Congressional Testimony, Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in Developing Countries, Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., January 30 and February 11, 1980), 91.

⁷⁹ See Judith Miller's "Infant Formula: A Proxy Issue," New York Times, (April 9, 1978).

their products.⁸⁰ James Post, a professor of management policy, who covered the infant formula politics with help from the Rockefeller Foundation, and who frequently offered expert testimonies from the activist position, explained what this meant in practice. The American companies were "successors to medical research laboratories which developed humanized formulas between 1910 and 1920," he wrote. Furthermore, food multinationals preferred "to use consumer advertising," while "pharmaceutical companies" focused on "medical promotion." At least, that is, in the industrialized countries. In the Third World, according to Post, analysts noted both kinds of marketing, especially because of rising populations, from a company perspective, demanded market presence.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Abbott/Ross led the American corporate response to the problem coming out of the 1970-73 PAG meetings and later congressional hearings, while noting that the company insisted on its "enthusiastic endorsement of breast feeding as the formula of choice in developing countries by international agencies, the health care profession and industry." But the company ultimately possessed a close tie to doctors and health professionals because of its pharmaceuticals. Abbott's involvement in UN meetings, and its pragmatic agreement to cooperation and proper corporate social responsibility illustrated industry's hard work to ensure absolutely no restraints on free enterprise and market expansion. See Abbott Laboratories Statement on Infant Malnutrition, Breastfeeding and Infant Formulas in Developing Nations, Kennedy Hearings, May 23, 1978, 248-281. This detailed, well-argued paper outlined Abbott's, and most of the industry's, position on the issue in a more effective way than most corporate lobbying efforts. When one reads this document, it helps inform understanding on why Kennedy asked WHO to explore the issue. The company also contributed to the PAG Statement 23 and testified that "the centrality of the health care profession encouraging breastfeeding, and minimizing bottle feeding where inappropriate," in other words, not WHO or UNICEF, church groups or consumer activists.

⁸¹ James E. Post, Congressional Testimony, Kennedy Hearings, 116-25. Note, too, Mead Johnson/Bristol-Myers history with infant foods, offered by Gary Mize, vice president. "Mead Johnson researches, develops, manufactures, and markets several infant formula products in the United States. The Bristol-Myers Co. International divisions markets these infant formulas overseas and also conducts research, development, and manufacturing operations. Mead Johnson has been involved in infant nutrition since 1911 when it first marketed a product called Dextri-Maltose. Dextri-Maltose was a carbohydrate source for improving the calorie distribution of whole cow's milk which was widely used at the turn of the century for feeding infants who were not breast fed," in Gary Mize, Testimony in "Marketing and Promotion" Hearings, 22.

Fred Miller, a philosophy professor who sought a more balanced view of baby food politics, embodied a rising conservative discontent among critics with the "consumerist" position. Miller's book, published by the Social Philosophy and Policy Center at Bowling Green State University, concluded that "individual free choice" showed more promise than collectivism, and that "a free market alternative to the WHO code emerges as both ethically defensible and scientifically justifiable."⁸² His critique of groups such as INFACT constituted the position of big business in 1970s and 1980s. Such ideas, stridently defended by conservatives, found expression in formula company self-defense, but more importantly appeared in their political ties to governments and international organization, as well. Companies positioned themselves to fight for ideas, and market presence, transforming international economics in the process. Miller wrote in Barron's, the activists "betray a decided streak of paternalism, when they characterize Third World mothers as too uneducated and gullible to cope with Western advertising." Church groups and INFACT "would much prefer that decision about infant feeding be taken out of the hands of mothers and placed in the hands of government planners." The government should choose for mothers, and activist publications praised "economic collectivism, i.e., socialist regimes, under which high levels of breast-feeding persist." More than that, breastfeeding advocates and their allies detested the free market. Therefore "to prevent this from happening, they would centralize control of food production and distribution," not to forget reproduction.

And so, Miller asked implicitly, were child and maternal health best served by the market or by social provisioning by the state? And where did development ideology, with

⁸² Fred D. Miller, Out of the Mouths of Babes: The Infant Formula Controversy, (Bowling Green, Kentucky: The Social Philosophy and Policy Center, Bowling Green State University, 1983).

the Global North dragging up the Global South, fit with national growth?⁸³ Miller continued: the core "assumption of collectivism is that all of a nation's resources are collectively owned assets and should be subject to nationalized planning. Incredibly, the formula critics go so far as to apply the principle to mother's milk itself." However, recall that George Gilder had shared his understanding that "capitalism begins with the mother's breast." As much of modernity revealed, mass societies, in all states and with all political economic derivations, desired healthy, growing, productive babies.⁸⁴

In 1980, Nestlé had its own corporate consciousness raised by the events of the past few years. Henry Ciocca, the Manager of Nestlé Company's Office of Corporate Responsibility, spoke before the Institute of Food Technology and detailed "the Nestlé Boycott as a corporate learning experience."⁸⁵ He began his talk with a theme explored by Alfred Chandler in his work on MNC's at Harvard Business School: "I am a representative of a major international corporation. According to a recent public opinion

⁸³ On development ideology as "the focus of high aspiration and much organized effort, effective action in the name of development has mattered enormously," with "whole armies of professionals have devoted their careers to its study and implementation," tied to "development economics, modernization theory," theories of growth and development," and the convergence of global capitalism and species history. "The Brandt Commission estimated that 6,000 international meetings every year in New York and Geneva generated about a million pages of documents annually." I argue that the ideas and practices of development spanned an arc from infant to species in an era of increased planetary consciousness. See Francis Sutton, Tom Kessinger, James Grant and George Zeidenstein, "Development Ideology: Its Emergence and Decline," *Daedalus* 118, No. 1 (Jan. 1, 1989), 35-60. For an excellent book on American development and its civilizing mission, see David Ekbladh, The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

⁸⁴ See Fred D. Miller, "Out of the Mouths of Babes: Infant Formula, Global Politics and Ideology Don't Mix," Editorial Commentary, *Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly* (Sept., 26, 1983). In his attempt at mixing reasoned calm with polemical attack, his book offered an excellent template for the neoliberal view that conservatives brought to the controversy, and that the Reagan Administration would consolidate.

⁸⁵ Henry G. Ciocca, "The Nestlé Boycott as a Corporate Learning Experience," (March 18, 1980), in ACA Collection, Company Records, Box 25, MHS.

pool, this fact alone means that less than 1 in 5 of you will have a reasonable amount of confidence in what I am about to say." For Nestlé, the "well-organized" campaign against the company served as a "catalyst for the kind of social analysis and long term planning" that has helped the company survive, keep its label intact, and continue to grow. The "mystical" idea of corporate responsibility the company had been able to demystify, and then share with other corporate executives.

In Nestlé's view, the boycott emerged out of the culture and politics of the 1970s. America's roll, its manifest destiny as model for the globe, had grown diminished and had become tarnished. As many of those inside Nestlé saw it, American business bore too much blame for that tarnishing. "Business" was thrown together with what had become the standard list: stagflation, Vietnam and the oil embargo. People expected a "continuous increase in the standard of living," and now there were doubts. Uncertainties prevailed about American citizens, and those subjects in the rest of the world, and their ability to live in a "more efficient society." Thus, the supposed "age of ambivalence" and anxiety yielded "the age of activism."⁸⁶ Ethnic groups agitated, as did the youth, the Woodstock generation, making claims as citizens. Nestlé attempted to answer every single criticism against it, and to establish a dialogue with the activists; it also attempted to take the moral high ground away from the activists, and the agenda of all conversations, or knowledge production, about baby feeding. INFANT, in other words, did not know best. And, according to Ciocca, the group began searching for ways to sustain the boycott after "the public" began to see a more complex story.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 1-10.

Nestlé learned several vital lessons from the boycott and actively changed some of its policies and tactics. For Ciocca, a company's top management had to be committed to social responsibility, and every employee must absorb that obligation; a company must "establish its humanity with the public"; companies must "form alliances" with all elements of professional society such as government, academia and the churches; companies must insist that activists engage in "constructive criticism" so that everybody learns and society benefits; business, too, should help draft community codes of conduct for pressure groups, and hold them accountable. "Self-anointed experts" needed to be corralled. Finally, the "most important lesson" garnered from the boycott was that it was "an image crisis," and that "corporate credibility can be maintained and even improved."⁸⁷ Nestlé at first learned these lessons slowly. And then over time became a cooperate expert at containing image crises, controlling discourse, and becoming more political astute while continuing to grow at record rates.

The Biggest Business in the World

Industry members met in Zurich in 1975 to discuss a proposed common code of ethics. One of the International Council of Infant Food Industries (ICIFI) objectives was to "obtain recognition as a self regulatory body," which would act for the industry "throughout the world." ICIFI's leader contacted the activists at War on Want and asked that they stay on their "side," keeping misconduct allegations away from "the public until I have had the opportunity to verify facts with ICIFI membership." This method, "rational

⁸⁷ Ibid., 12. For more on Nestlé and public relations combat in a business society, see Nelson-Horchler, J. 1984, "Fighting a boycott: Image Rebuilding." Industry Week 220 (54), 54-56." And Milton Friedman, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits," The New York Times Magazine, September 13, 1970.

and expeditious," was the preferred method of dealing with infant malnutrition, because "I am sure that you will wish, just as we do, to protect the public from the risk of being exposed to incorrect or misleading information."⁸⁸

Industry hoped to move the political and rhetorical arguments out of the public sphere, considering the emotional tendencies within the Nestlé boycott, and into formal spaces that it might better control. Consumer groups and church critics clashed with industry representatives throughout the meeting, but the three principal constituencies nevertheless reached a tentative consensus by the end of the meeting. Although public bickering continued after the code's formal declaration, ICIFI declared the meeting successful, as it: "fulfilled its function admirably, which was to remove the important questions of infant nutrition from public polemics into constructive discussion in an impartial setting so that solutions could be found."⁸⁹ After making its own code of conduct, and believing that it had muted polemical arguments about baby food, the industry combatted activist pressure wherever and however it could. However, even when factually correct – the universal declines of infant mortality, for example – industry groups and individual companies had difficulty controlling discourse. Indeed, these "public polemics" demonstrated the economic and political terrain upon which the new corporate paradigm rested.

⁸⁸ Dr. Stanislas Flache, "Letter to Andy Chetley," (January 30, 1981), in ACA Collection, ICIFI Materials, Box 21, MHS. Such letters, reflecting a dominant technology of the era, flew around Europe and across the Atlantic in large numbers.

⁸⁹ Ian Barter, "Remarks on Meeting, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in Developing Countries, 96th Cong., 2nd Sess., January 30 and February 11 1980, 82. ICIFI formed in Zurich in November 1975 right before the Bern trial commenced.

Nestlé acknowledged its role in moving the hearings to WHO and away from the American public sphere. John Donlan, Vice President and General Counsel of Nestlé Enterprises, Inc. noted that after the Kennedy Hearing in May 1978, Kennedy met with industry leaders and decided on a proper course of action. Senator Kennedy "proposed that the United Nations unit with appropriate technical competence," namely the World Health Organization, should sponsor a meeting on baby feeding "and on the marketing and use of infant foods." Industry groups did not expect the activist NGOs to participate. Companies hoped to quiet the rhetorical noise around their products, and to rationalize doing business. "It was expected that by bringing this matter before an appropriate international forum, a clearer definition of the responsibilities of those involved in the formulation of infant feeding policy - including governments, the health professions and the infant food industry - would be reached. The dangerous oversimplification of issues regarding infant feeding propagated by activists groups made the convening of such a meeting a matter of urgency."⁹⁰ The American subsidiary noted in disseminated documents that infant malnutrition was a "shared responsibility," and that the WHO meeting represented a chance to improve infant health and developing countries.

American politicians, company executives and health experts at the UN were happy to bring the players together and hopefully resolve the controversy with finality. Kennedy believed that international health negotiations were better positioned to do so than the U.S. Congress. "WHO/UNICEF responded positively to the recommendations made by Senator Kennedy and invited some 150 representatives of governments, the

⁹⁰ John Donlan, Testimony, Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations, International Economic Policy, 80-2. See also, The Nestlé Company, Inc., "The Infant Formula Controversy: A Nestlé View," (White Plains, New York: The Nestlé Company, Inc.,) n.d., INFAC folder, WAG 51, Box 30. Tamiment Library, NYU, 2-3.

health professions, the infant food industry and activists groups to thrash out the many complex issues together." For ICIFI, Donlan noted, the trade group needed a strong presence at the WHO meeting because the companies labored "to establish a realistic framework within which the industry can operate." The companies within ICIFI at the time involved "over 85 percent of the infant formula used in the developing countries."

By the time of the WHO meeting, the corporate role in infant feeding had become a profoundly global political issue, and it served to symbolize the rise of multinational corporate power. Feeding babies had become the "biggest business in the world."⁹¹ Private enterprise, as demonstrated by the infant formula industry, had inserted itself into the most intimate human relations linked to individual survival: the feeding decisions of ordinary mothers and families. "Putting a stop to the sale of infant formulas," said an industry researcher defending his presence on such intimate political terrain, "is not going to solve the problems of malnourishment in Third World countries."⁹² Growth and development would help improve infant survival chances, as well as opening up markets for international investments.

The formula industry fought hard to substantiate their scientific claims and refute activist propaganda, hiring lawyers and public relations firms. But their rhetorical,

⁹¹Dr. Brock Chisholm, first Director-General of the World Health Organization, in Cicely Williams, "Focus on Child Health in the Tropics," The Journal of the Royal Society of Health 75 (1955), 765. Williams wrote this article while working in the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Chisholm said: "The biggest business in the world, the most important business in the world, and the most worthwhile business in the world is the business of raising babies." Williams believed that this framing reflected "the profound truth," and that medical professionals and state authorities should "mobilize their resources accordingly." Quoted in Baumslag, Primary Health Care Pioneer, (Geneva: World Federation of Public Health Associations and UNICEF, 1986), 103-111.

⁹² Christine Winter, "Tempo: Nuns Storming the Boardroom to Save Babies' Lives Tempo Nuns Tackle Profit Motive to Promote Social Justice in Third World Nations," Chicago Tribune, April 8, 1978.

ideological and political struggles represented a fight over global corporate power and the ideas of free enterprise, not necessarily breastmilk and proper infant feeding. Thomas Ward, a lawyer representing Nestlé, criticized Leah Margulies' letter to Congress, which included the "incidence of breast feeding in socialist countries."⁹³ Ward countered that Margulies knew "perfectly well the anti-trust implications of voluntary codes agreed to by competitive companies." Thus, ICIFI could not specifically corral, or even address, marketing practices by individual companies. Margulies also claimed that almost all women, "rich or poor," technically possessed the ability to breastfeed for the first six months, and that corporate marketing contributed to lowered breastfeeding rates. Ward cited the "WHO Collaborative Study" on infant feeding in nine countries that demonstrated the supplemental feeding of infants "even in areas where there is no commercial distribution of infant formula whatsoever."⁹⁴ Industry used this information to defend their search for markets.

The formula industry also tried to position their product as healthcare, not food, in order to keep discussion in the realm of the "scientific." Abbot Industries testified that their company was a pharmaceutical enterprise, not a food or milk purveyor. Furthermore, Abbot adopted its own "Code of Marketing Ethics for Developing Countries," which stipulated the company rejected "mass-media advertising" and explicitly directed promotion to the health care industry. The company's code also

⁹³ Thomas Ward, "Letter to Congressman Jonathan Bingham," Appendix 10, Marketing and Promotion, May 9, 1980, 153-65.

⁹⁴ Ward, Marketing and Promotion, 165.

emphasized breastfeeding, and mandated proper labeling on its products.⁹⁵ Abbott's David Cox emphasized that his company, and the executives and clinicians within it, were health professionals, involved in the health industry on a medical, scientific and knowledge level. In Guatemala, for example, Cox testified that he was "currently president of the Guatemala Pediatrics Association."⁹⁶ Company involvement in national health organizations reflected a strategic move into the international organizations such as WHO and UNICEF, where industry executives thought they could move the issue away from boycott publicity and into the safe confines of "respectable" negotiations. The companies' response to the boycott provided evidence of private-public connectivity on the local and global levels, and the ways that health and wealth combined manage individual and national growth.

Steve Korsen, a Nestlé manager of consumer affairs in the U.S., stated that the boycotters, including nuns and their allies, were "committed" to the cause. However, their cause, to many company executives, was not saving malnourished babies. Rather, ICCR's "real goal," employing "graphic, sensationalized" tactics, was to oppose "multinational companies on the grounds that we are creating economic dependence in Third World countries, and that their real target is all multinationals." The activists labored against the

⁹⁵ Abbott Code of Marketing Ethics for Developing Countries," Abbott Industries, (Winter, 1977), in Kennedy Hearings, 204. David Cox proudly presented aspect of its Code, but claimed that company ethics did not reflect a response to the pressure groups. "I don't wish to leave a false impression," he wrote, "that we agree with or accept many of the accusations or charges made against the industry," as "many of these charges are circumstantial, anecdotal, exaggerated or biased, although very effective in stimulating controversy."

⁹⁶ David Cox, Testimony Before Marketing and Promotion Hearings, 37.

free enterprise system, in other words. Nestlé always tried to discuss both sides of the issue with activists, according to Korsen.⁹⁷

Nestlé's next generation of public relations experts, after Nestlé realized it was "losing" the boycott campaign, worked hard to eradicate past damaging comments. Nestlé had employed outdated tactics, did not possess a clear strategy, and refused to believe that the activist possessed any real discursive or material power. But after sustaining real public relations damage, Nestlé began to focus the power of its board, executives, presence in hospitals around the world, and its money on the boycott. The company hired new minds and altered its overall anti-boycott strategy. The results achieved its corporate goals, and amounted to a clear alignment with the future direction of geopolitical and economic power. This "future," as outlined by Nestlé, involved an acceptance of multinational capitalism - its politics, its economics, and its culture.

In a talk before the Public Affairs Council in New York in April 1982, Raphael Pagan, a leading Nestlé public relations executive and President of the Nestlé Coordination Center for Nutrition (NCCN), outlined how global corporations should attack voices against their prerogatives.⁹⁸ Pagan, speaking on "international activism and

⁹⁷ David Cox of Abbott/Ross phrased it this way: "Business enterprise has shown itself to be flexible and creative in seeking solutions to hard problems. Answers to the questions raised by critics do not lie in more regulation and control as some suggest, but in frank and rigorous confrontation of those problems by those who possess tangible and intellectual resources. Informed businessmen are fully aware that corporations must operate in socially responsible, public ways, particularly in the era of consumerism and distrust of institutions." In Kennedy Hearings, 273.

⁹⁸ Nestlé Company, Inc., according to Nestlé, "was upset about NCCN; it was the first time in Nestlé's history that Vevey had established another base in a national territory that did not report to that region. We reported directly to Switzerland, to [Carl] Angst." See Jack Mongoven (Nestlé-NCCN) and Doug Johnson (INFACT), "Confidential Discussion: Notes on a Discussion with Jack Mongoven, Vice-President, Nestlé Coordination Center for Nutrition," October 8 & 9, 1985, in ACA Collection, Box 25, MHS.

multinational capitalism," illustrated the strength and determination of Nestlé to consolidate its power and dominate cultural discourse. One of the formula industry's aims, in efforts to counter the expanding presence of critical NGOs within the UN system, was to influence WHO and UN policies and to create its own NGO presence.

This goal the formula industry achieved with profound effect, so that scholars today may trace the rise of neoliberalism and privatization within the WHO and the UN work on food, health and the environment.⁹⁹ Political scientist Nitsan Chorev, for example, outlined the consolidation of neoliberal power within global corporate capitalism by detailing the historical shift from the New International Economic Order (NIEO) and G-77 worldview to the corporate capitalist worldview under Reagan, Thatcher and the leadership at the WHO. As much as IBFAN achieved expert status within the WHO, as outlined in Chapter Two, so did big business. Raphael Pagan's efforts demonstrated how they accomplished this co-optation of the world health and economic health conversations.

Pagan reflected the worldview of many business leaders as they worked to expand markets and consolidate the discursive authority of multinationals in the realms of human choice, freedom, and health. He argued, "Henrik Ibsen once said that those people are in the right who are most in league with the future." Nestlé, as the world's largest food company, helped determine just what "in the right" and the "future" would mean. Pagan emphasized how freedom and growth contributed to a better world, and claimed that

⁹⁹ See Michael G. Schechter, United Nations Global Conferences. Global Institutions Series (London ; New York: Routledge), 2005; also see Nitsan Chorev, Remaking U.S. Trade Policy: From Protectionism to Globalization (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), and The World Health Organization between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012). The September 2014 United Nations climate summit attracted 650 NGOs, labor groups and consumer organizations protesting the massive presence and influence of private enterprise.

capitalists needed to firmly establish freedom as meeting needs, rather than options "offered by the statists or by the no-growth small-is-better redistributionists." Placing industry groups within the UN system meant that capitalists were "going to have to swallow our own ideological predilections and work with international and national civil servants, not to defeat all regulation, but to create regulation that legitimizes and channels our rights, opportunities and contributions."

Pagan and those at NCCN instituted a program of divide and conquer in order to quell the boycott. He wrote letters to large institutional supporters of INFAC and slowly persuaded some of them to abandon allegiance with the consumer group. "Our primary goal is survival. Our secondary goal must be to separate the fanatic activist leaders -- people who deny that free wealth-creating institutions have any legitimate role to play in helping the third world to develop -- from the overwhelming majority of their followers -- decent concerned people who are willing to judge us on the basis of our openness and our usefulness." Some large churches and unions listened to Nestlé's argument, and pulled their support from the boycott.

Nestlé's method involved meeting with leaders, offering medical and scientific evidence against activist "misinformation," and then following up with letters and more evidence.¹⁰⁰ In writing the president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), for example, Pagan reiterated Nestlé's support of breastfeeding, the International Code, and national codes and laws. Further, he provided articles in The Lancet, a leading British medical journal, and Pediatrics that demonstrated the deep complexities in malnutrition,

¹⁰⁰ See Raphael Pagan, "Letter to Albert Shanker, President, American Federation of Teachers (AFT)," (Nov. 19, 1981), Wagner Collection, Folder 22, Box 30, Tamiment Library, NYU.

and the "significant documentation that . . . supplements are crucial to the nutritional needs of many infants in developing countries."¹⁰¹

Similar methods convinced the United Methodist Church and others to abandon the boycott. An editorial in the United Methods Reporter asked "can boycotting be used as a Christian method?" and concluded that, under the right ethical conditions, it could. However, Christians should ultimately not boycott because the tactic was "designed to force one's adversary to change his behavior," whereas the "normative Christian goal" remained "reconciliation" through the method of "persuasion."¹⁰² The church's "9-member Infant Formula Task Force" employed an "overall theological framework" for deciding whether to be involved in a corporate boycott, and after remaining calm and "even-handed" the corporation position achieved greater clarity. Pagan accentuated the need to "strip the activists of the moral authority they receive from their alliances with religious organizations." Pagan also called for the involvement of "the highest level of Nestlé executives" in dealing with church leaders first, and reluctant members of INFACF such as Doug Johnson. Company representatives singled out Leah Margulies as particularly troublesome and tried to ban her from meetings.

Nestlé's efforts to manage the boycott and its global image continued briskly in the early 1980s. In 1982 the company established an independent commission to investigate complaints against its marketing practices, called the Nestlé Infant Formula

¹⁰¹ Pagan, "Letter to Albert Shanker," AFT, Wagner Collection, NYU. The AFT executive council ended the union's support of the boycott in March 1983, arguing that agitation against the company "should be called off because the Nestlé Corporation has made substantial progress in changing those marketing procedures that the union found objectionable." The organization joined the boycott in 1979. See "News & Trends: Council votes to end Nestlé boycott," (March 10, 1983), INFACF Folder, WAG 51 Box 30, Wagner Collection, Tamiment Library, NYU.

¹⁰² United Methodist Church, "Editorial: Can boycotting be used as a Christian method?" United Methodist Reporter, (March 5, 1982), Wagner Collection, Folder 22, Tamiment Library, NYU.

Audit Commission, (NIFAC) headed by former U.S. Secretary of State Edmund Muskie.¹⁰³ Those in charge of creating the "outside legitimating group" for Nestlé saw that its chair had to be "someone prestigious and weighty."¹⁰⁴ Muskie emphasized NIFAC's impartiality and independence, but the new organization served mostly as a buffer between public criticism and the parent company. Carl Angst, executive vice-president of Nestlé, who appeared in NIFAC press conferences with Muskie, insisted upon the company's willingness to change. Though NIFAC had no enforcement mechanism, it was still original and new. "I think it's almost unique in the free enterprise system," Angst said. After all Nestlé had done, and with NIFAC monitoring the company, Nestlé executives could not believe that the boycott continued.

NIFAC acted as a buffer between global critics and Vevey, while maintaining that the company followed the Code, and upheld its social responsibilities. Muskie wrote in Quarterly Report No. 7, in 1984, that considerable time and expense went into exploring complaints throughout the Third World. In the Philippines, Kenya and Colombia, Commission meetings and research reached conclusions that once again demonstrated the complex issues involved in baby feeding. These issues with infant health and nutrition illustrated more than any other factor the "commendable, considerable efforts and the relative success of Nestlé's implementation of the WHO Code and Nestlé's publicly stated

¹⁰³ See NIFAC, Charter, Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws and Procedures (Washington, D. C., 1982); Fourth Quarterly Report, (1983), and Transcript of the Proceedings of Press Conference with Edmund S. Muskie and Dr. Carl Angst, (Washington, D.C., April 21, 1983), in Presbyterian Historical Society.

¹⁰⁴ Jack Mongoven (Nestlé) and Doug Johnson (INFAC), "Confidential Discussion: Notes on a Discussion with Jack Mongoven, Vice-President, Nestlé Coordination for Nutrition," October 8 & 9, 1985, in ACA Collection, Box 25, MHS. Mongoven noted that "we chose Muskie because he had been a Senator, and knew how to run a committee," and he could administer; "he would impose order." "In a situation of order, we would win; and within a situation of disorder, you would win."

commitments."¹⁰⁵ Hundreds of letters to NIFAC showed the effectiveness of organizing a letter-writing campaign, as regular citizens wrote Muskie with complaints, or encouragement to "do what you can to ensure that Nestlé abides by its commitment."¹⁰⁶

Press conferences in Geneva and elsewhere brought forward contentious questions from doubting observers of the entire enterprise. Muskie had to defend this latest stage of his career, one year after he served as Secretary of State. He upheld the integrity of his work, stating that NIFAC's members were not "patsies for the company," and "I've spent 35 years in public life establishing my credibility." In July that year he reiterated his claim for independence, and that "if it appears the company is attempting a cover-up, we'll report it."¹⁰⁷ A year later, after NIFAC's press conference, the commission asserted that Nestlé had changed its practices in the Third World.¹⁰⁸ Muskie did have a staunch progressive record, and was an early environmental advocate. Further, others on the commission maintained intense criticisms of Nestlé, the formula industry, and MNCs more generally. Economics professor James Post, for example, published many studies that posed a threat to Nestlé's polished image and repeatedly testified on behalf of the activist position. To that end, NIFAC probably worked as independently as possible. However, their actual job, spanning formula use and abuse across the globe, was

¹⁰⁵ NIFAC, Quarterly Report No. 7: Including Special Reports on Commission Meetings in the Philippines, Kenya and Colombia (Washington, D.C., March 31 1983), 14. ACA Collection, MHS.

¹⁰⁶ Reverend Conrad Putzig, "Letter to Edmund Muskie," February 1, 1987, in ACA Collection, INFAC materials, Box 21, MHS.

¹⁰⁷ United Press International (UPI), Patriot Ledger, "Muskie: Nestlé probe to remain independent," Portland, Maine, July 6, 1982. Muskie also emphasized that the work for the commission provided "a mixture of foreign policy and business that is natural to me."

¹⁰⁸ Philadelphia Enquirer, "Nestlé infant-formula marketing altered in Third World, panel says," October 14, 1983.

impossible. Its haphazard efforts reflected this difficulty, and its ultimate demise demonstrated the problematic reality of the monitoring program.

In 1983, after the WHO code had been signed, but before the activist organizations such as the INBC and the companies themselves declared the boycott over, Nestlé pressured the National Institutes of Health in the United States (NIH). A narrative of bioethics and bio-economics converged in January at the NIH. Nestlé, through the NCCN in Washington, lobbied administration officials and health experts within NIH and Health and Human Services (HHS) to stop discussion of infant formula as an ethics problem.¹⁰⁹ The company argued that NIH included no corporate representatives for the panel discussions, and that existing speakers were biased anti-corporate activists. The decision by NIH to abandon the decade-long controversy angered many within the organization. Some believed that "NIH leaders bowed to political pressure." One participant noted that "this decision goes to the heart of the principles of scientific freedom and open discussion." Nestlé initially agreed to participate, but ultimately argued that the NIH gathering was "thoroughly slanted against either the administration, the infant formula industry, or both." The letter reflected the new approach employed by Nestlé to counter the activists and resurrect its image, name and brand.

In keeping with historian Michael Lind's perspective regarding the Reagan Revolution as a central part of late globalization, Nestlé included in its letter a critique of NIH itself. They claimed that the professional science organization "had replaced Reagan

¹⁰⁹ Eliot Marshall, "Nestlé Letter Stops NIH Talk," *Science*, New Series, 219, No. 4584 (Feb. 4, 1983), 469.

Administration policy with a 'policy of bias against industry.'¹¹⁰ As scholars such as Kim Philips-Fein and Ben Waterhouse have suggested, this kind of lobbying by "organized business" existed as a central strategy in the rise of the new conservatism and global neoliberalism more generally. Nestlé learned the hard and expensive way that global political actors had taken on new, well-organized and well-informed forms.¹¹¹ But when the formula companies turned their full attention, and money, to deflecting criticism and attacking critics, they positioned themselves to influence international health policy and expand their markets with more efficiency than ever.

"The World is Full of Doug Johnsons": Nestlé Strategy Post-Boycott, 1985

The capitalists in the growing global food-production system showed that they were people, too, with real aspirations for their companies' longevity. And they fought for their political and cultural positions as hard as any activist. By the early and mid-1980s, too, Nestlé exhibited a new understanding of how to fight the boycotters. A private conversation between the leading activist Doug Johnson and Nestlé Vice-President Jack Mongoven occurred in October 1985, in Brazil. They had dinner and stayed up the entire night, talking about the campaign, its history, and strategies. Mongoven read Clausewitz and Sun Tzu, and "every work on strategy I could get my hands on, and applied them to political campaigns." Starting NCCN and NIFAC in the United States proved to be excellent moves on the part of Nestlé S.A. "Sun Tzu was very important to how we

¹¹⁰ Michael Lind, "Conservative Elites and the Counterrevolution Against the New Deal," in Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, Ruling America, 250-285; "Nestlé Letter Stops NIH Talk," Science.

¹¹¹ Kim Philips-Fein, Invisible Hands: The Making of the Conservative Movement from the New Deal to Reagan (New York: Norton & Company, 2009).

developed our campaign," he said, and that proved to be a problem for INFACT eventually. Because "in the early years . . . you were up against people in Switzerland who had no idea of strategy, and never developed one." As it occurred, Nestlé executives in Vevey repeatedly made public relations mistakes, and seemed surprised that anyone would criticize their baby-saving activities in developing countries.¹¹²

This document reveals some of the principles, tactics and strategies employed by Pagan and Mongoven at NCCN. Clausewitz and Sun Tzu met Mahatma Gandhi and Saul Alinsky in the conceptual realm of baby food geopolitics. These broad influences demonstrated the care and professional attention with which the boycott-containment professionals engaged the boycott. Mongoven and Pagan realized that "the key issue was how to get ahead of" the activists groups. "For so many years you had Nestlé reacting to you," and the "only way to win a campaign is to get out ahead." Nestlé's strategist in America had to chip away at INFACT's legitimacy. The teachers unions gave the group cultural power and status. The NEA, Mongoven said, "was crazy," and "we couldn't move NEA," so they worked on rival union American Federation of Teachers.¹¹³ The idea specialists figured out a plan for AFT, "which I'll never tell you," Mongoven told Johnson. Eventually, Nestlé and the formula industry accomplished the goal of

¹¹² Doug Johnson (INFACT) and Jack Mongoven (Nestlé), "Confidential Discussion: Notes on a Discussion with Jack Mongoven, Vice-President, Nestlé Coordination for Nutrition," October 8 & 9, 1985, in ACA Collection, MHS. Mongoven believed that Nestlé would eventually win the baby food campaign battles. At one point he said, "INFACT's materials were always aimed to the committed. Photocopies and mimeographs, or not very elaborate printing. That is all right for the committed." By contrast, Nestlé with its color publications tried to read doctors, politicians and church executives. "I was always afraid that INFACT would develop a two level communications program, one to your committed people, and another more targeted publication or approach to church leadership, etc., that made you look more disinterested and professional. You know, with Spock on the letterhead, medical quotes . . . thank God you never did."

¹¹³ Ibid., Johnson and Mongoven, "Confidential Discussion," 1985.

diminishing INFACT's legitimacy. Groups began to question their support of the boycott, and started to move away entirely. INBC knew immediately it had a problem, and soon after a major planning session in Mexico, the boycott began a descent towards closure. This closure, however, only lasted four years.

The company continued to provide examples of testimonials from consumers, doctors and health professionals from around the world in order to combat the boycotters. Between 1974 and 1979, in early attempts to control the boycott, Nestlé gave supportive materials to the press, individuals, and congressional committees. Other formula companies did the same. In the 1980s, with NIFAC, NCCN, and routine press conferences, Nestlé exhibited its own evolution and awareness about consumer boycotts, at least in the West. Robert S. Phillips, a doctor and fellow of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, responded to informational materials from the company defending itself. "I have received your letter and enclosures and have read them carefully and must admit that they make a very appropriate response to the charges levied by the INFACT organization." He wrote that his office would remove all materials about boycotting Nestlé that INFACT had sent his office. He thanked the company and said that he'd like to visit Nestlé SA were he ever in Switzerland.

Nestlé responded to every letter it received questioning its marketing practices. Mongoven noted that the company became proud of its calm and reasoned global letter writing campaign. In one 1979 case, Washington resident Annette Case wrote that she believed she had been misinformed by INFACT after receiving Nestlé's viewpoint. "I should have realized that a firm of the size and importance of Nestlé would be above scurrilous tactics. In the future I intend to be much less gullible" and she wrote, "I owe

you an apology." George Thompson, from Minneapolis, wrote, "I wonder why INFACT should libel your company and its products. They should be liable for damages done to you both real and punitive unless they can prove their statements."¹¹⁴ One writer, who identified himself as a Harvard M.A. and Ph.D., wrote from New Mexico that he read Nestlé's materials because it was "the least I could do after having accepted, believed, the other side's propaganda." He hoped that he never sent INFACT any contribution, which they had increasingly done through direct mail brochures. This writer reported that "we don't need to continue feeling ashamed or guilty for buying Stouffer products," and that other items of INFACT's "hit list" did not interest them anyhow. These types of reactions to the boycotters remained one part of Nestlé's total strategy.

Industry reactions illustrated the difficulties activists faced in their attempts to force corporate social behavior to change. Whether in the tobacco, chemical, mining, or baby formula industries, global corporations did not bow easily to outside, non-market pressures. As Sethi noted, corporate efforts to maintain legitimacy followed four steps. First, a given company did not "change performance," rather it "changed public perception of business performance through education and information"; second, of the public generally rejected this interpretation, a company shifted "the symbols used to describe business performance, thereby making it congruent with public perception. Note that no change in actual performance" occurred.¹¹⁵ This attempt, reflected by Nestlé's actions throughout the controversy, demonstrated mere shifts in language and perspective within the field of public relations. Critics of industry actions, especially INFACT,

¹¹⁴ "Excerpts from letters received by Nestlé from American consumers after they had compared the INFACT charges with Bernard Bersier's responses," Nestlé company materials, ACA Manuscript Collection, Company Files, Box 24, MHS.

¹¹⁵ S. Prakash Sethi, "A Conceptual Framework," (Jan., 1978), 65.

expressed their frustrations with such tactics. The third method involved actual political and cultural structural changes, as might be evidenced by America's near-wholesale acceptance of business and free enterprise as a way of life, with citizens inculcated in education systems, TV shows, advertising during sports events, and political argument between the two major parties.

America, in other words, seemed to become an unwavering defender of its version of global free enterprise in culture and political economy.¹¹⁶ On this point, Sethi wrote that a company might "attempt to change societal expectations of business performance through education and information." The last two words could encompass what might be called "propaganda," and in the case of the United States such cultural, political and economic efforts have been eminently successful. Lastly, if these particular strategies failed - and this failure often took an extremely long time to manifest - companies finally considered shifts in practice, where "business performance" would fall in line "with society's expectations." Activist Mark Ritchie of INFACT noted that companies, as they

¹¹⁶ For an excellent cultural history, winner of the 1964 Pulitzer Prize, and too often ignored in today's scholarship on capitalism, see Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in America (New York: Vintage, 1962), especially chapters "The Fate of the Reformer," (7), "The Rise of the Expert," (8) and "Business and Intellect," (9). Hofstadter wrote much about business culture and business civilization, including America's co-optation of all dissent and avant-garde movements, beatniks, hippies, Marxists, and more, as cool and capable of producing growth and development themselves. For example "the clash between business civilization and the values of art," and "'if wealth had accepted the intellectuals, it was only because the intellectuals had become tame, and no longer presumed to challenge wealth, engaging instead in 'some undignified prostrations' before it," 397; America demonstrated a broad "intellectual conformity," 397. This interpretation especially possessed significant power in the globalized era after World War II. American hegemony and its superpower status projected a business civilization of itself and for the rest of the globe. The US was the perfect empire for the age of capital. Capitalist modes of production created the colonies, and the early republic, and the burgeoning nation worked in concert with the expansionary impulses of capitalism writ large.

moved through these phases, were not necessarily "evil," merely that it took a long time for such companies to change direction, like aircraft carriers in the sea.¹¹⁷

In a post-boycott 1986 letter to Tim Smith, director of ICCR, Nestlé's Carl Angst indicated that the company was happy to continue a dialogue with critics. But that NCCN would close. Credit for ending the boycott rested with NIFAC, and with NCCN in Washington. Because the boycott terminated, "it was only to be expected that there would be a reduction in the frequency of contacts" between the company and the pressure groups. "As a logical consequence," the money and time spent keeping an office in the American capital "cannot any longer be justified." On January 1, 1986, NCCN closed, and Rafael Pagan started his own agency, Pagan International, so other troubled MNCs could benefit from his experience. To ICCR, Angst offered to keep the door open "to raise an issue with us," at any time.

The First Boycott Termination: Nestlé Fought to the End

Nestlé framed the termination of the boycott in its own way. Nestlé News, its public relations vehicle for "news from Nestlé about human nutrition," declared that the "Nestlé Boycott Is Over," and called Nestlé a model for the infant formula industry.¹¹⁸ Raphael

¹¹⁷ Sethi, 65, and Mark Ritchie comments, Author Interview, March 2007.

¹¹⁸ Nestlé News, "Nestlé Boycott Is Over," January 1984, in Presbyterian Historical Society Collection, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Presbyterian Church was involved in the boycott and in NIFAC and its archives possess some of the boycott materials, and the National Council of Churches materials related to social responsibility. An example of how networks within the boycott's expanse actually worked was reflected in the address label of Nestlé News housed in the Presbyterian Church Archives in Philadelphia: Dr. Henry Andersen of the Fairmount Presbyterian Church in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, and member of NIFAC, received this newsletter. Nestlé worked very hard to keep the church groups neutral and officially non-supportive of the boycott, hoping, rather, for the "cooperation that can result between people of good will from different points of view to solve worldwide misunderstandings, effectively and

Pagan, president of the Nestlé Coordination Center for Nutrition (NCCN), the company's public relations arm for answering boycott propaganda with its own "scientific" replies, underscored that the WHO Code "meant different things to different people" when passed, and there had been controversy ever since. The company, he said, always planned to implement the code in the Third World, and created directives for "its field personnel on how to implement the Code" in 1982. The newsletter also emphasized the many large church denominations had not boycotted the company and opted instead to help define specific lines in the document, and that other church groups had dropped the boycott once they knew more of the facts of the issue. As the activists noted throughout, industry's emphasis on the developing world conveniently overlooked that the Code applied to all nations in the world. Industry refused to abide by the code in the West. Nestlé, however, agreed to follow the code in the US and, for a time, ceded market share to the American companies. In struggles over language and specific definitions of words, paying attention to industry documents and battles over the wording of the code revealed the way industry and the activists defined their political territory. Nestlé News, announcing the boycott, showed this struggle over words, meanings and intentions.

The other formula companies took advantage of Nestlé's central role in a global boycott. Wyeth, the large pharmaceutical company already adept at negotiating local, state and global politics, filled the market vacuum. Wyeth easily shifted to formula manufacturing because the company already understood cows and farms, agriculture and chemicals, health care and capitalism. Thus, it moved into Peruvian hospitals "just two

peacefully." See Rafael D. Pagan, "Letter to Henry W. Andersen, Feb. 2, 1984," Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia. Chapter Four covers more on Nestlé's creation and use of NIFAC, and its membership in 1984.

months after Nestlé agreed to stop this practice." American Home Products, too, attempted "to capture a public hospital market" that Nestlé had cornered, "by taking advantage of Nestlé's promise to abide by the WHO code."¹¹⁹

Consumer groups targeted this method of market insinuation as deeply cynical. The companies argued that only those mothers who needed breastmilk substitutes should use them, at a doctor's discretion. Actual behavior varied greatly, however. The company remained poised within this ambiguous field, ready to continue offering its products directly to health professionals and mothers. The definition of infants who could not breastfeed remained "the key disagreement" between Nestlé and INBC, so UNICEF stated that it would devise a definition and both parties would agree to this definition "when it [was] was issued." Furthermore, Nestlé claimed that abiding by this article of the code required "action by health systems, doctors and national governments," and that "it would be impossible for it to fully implement this article of the Code without industry-wide cooperation." In the arena of language and binding agreements, this sort of finagling in grey areas meant that Nestlé had, for two of four points, not agreed to much.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ Multinational Monitor, 1984, "War Games"; and see Michael Willich, Pox, on pharmaceuticals and health care and the intense complications and frictions in the realm of saving lives and health care during an America pox epidemic. The parallels between smallpox vaccinations, infant formula and livestock agriculture help illustrate the bio-economic and survival realities of political economy, political ecology, and political culture - or the social and cultural systems human beings constructed on multiple levels over time and how these relationships shift and change.

¹²⁰ Nestlé News, "Joint Meeting With UNICEF Resolves Issue," January 1984, 3. For comparison of the issue, see "News Brief," INFACT, February 1984, about negotiations with Nestlé in Mexico City with the International Baby Food Conference. This conference, and threats to expand the boycott even more, captured Nestlé's attention. Up to this point, INBC concluded that negotiations with Nestlé since 1979 had proven "fruitless." Samuel Hirsch Collection, Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, WAG 51, Boxes 30 and 45, Tamiment Library, NYU.

Nestlé defended its ethics and its response the code. About the Joint Statement, INBC and its ethical activities, in Nestlé News for January 1984, the company stated that "our process of implementing the WHO Code has been a consistent one throughout the past three years, but it should be clear that this is a process that takes time, and it is well on the way," and, "Nestlé 's commitment to the WHO Code is and has been firm."¹²¹ Nestlé maintained that it worked "closely" with WHO and UNICEF. Finally, it thanked NIFAC and Edmund Muskie for helping the company deal effectively with understanding the Code: it stated "now that the public controversy stage of this issue is over, we should all turn out attention and efforts to fighting the real problems of the Third World - contaminated water, ignorance, poverty and inadequate health care."

In September 1984, Nestlé News published demonstrations of the company's compliance with the four points. On the cover, a photograph of Dr. Carl Angst, Executive Vice President of the Swiss parent company declared that Nestlé should "end routinized discharge packs."¹²² The company also worked to follow the Code, as well as national legal strictures and codes. The company trumpeted that INBC, its nemesis, held talks to end the boycott. Additionally, the company provided illustrations of its new labels. The labels included nutritional information, images for proper formula preparation, and warnings set in bold text: "Attention: Breastmilk is best for babies. Before you decide to use an infant formula consult your doctor or clinic for advice." The bold warning preceded plaudits for Nestogen, which could be used 'from the first days of life" and contained "all known essential vitamins and minerals." The labels also warned of other

¹²¹ Nestlé News, January 1984, 3, Presbyterian Historical Society. Nestlé News was published by Raphael Pagan and NCCN.

¹²² Nestlé News, "Nestlé Urges End to Discharge Packs," (Sept., 1984), 1-5. ACA Collection, Box 24, MHS.

dangers, such as unboiled water, dirty bottles, improper dilution, and others. The labels also implored mothers to follow preparation directions precisely. Nestlé met with experts at the Maternal and Child Health Division of WHO to determine the efficacy of the labels, and hired a consulting firm to field-test them. The new warnings were set to appear in "some countries" by the next year.

Nestlé's Worldview: Do Consumers Really Care?

In 1989, the presidents of Nestlé Enterprises, Inc., and Carnation Company introduced a new publication created by the Nestlé Information Service (NIS) in Washington, The Nestlé Worldview. Given that the "study of food and human nutrition" underwent a "major revolution" and that "scientists and technologists" further realized the connections between food consumption and world health. Therefore, the two companies decided to publish Worldview in an effort to "share our work with you . . . our research, education and outreach activities around the globe."¹²³ In an aerial shot of the Nestlé Research Center, its "world research hub," the complex looked like the Guggenheim Museum, modern, high-tech, and imposing. The 710,000 square-foot complex in Switzerland was "the largest facility of its kind in the world," devoted to the study of human nutrition and "man's total . . . well-being."¹²⁴ The company's distinctive global vision noted that "for

¹²³ James M. Biggar and Timm F. Crull, "Letter Introducing Nestlé Worldview," Nestlé Information Service, Washington DC, (May, 1989).

¹²⁴ Nestlé Worldview, "Nestlé's World Research Hub: Promoting Health and Well-being," 1, No. 1 (Spring 1989), Nestlé Information Service, Washington, DC, in ACA Collection, MHS. The research complex cost \$130 million, according to the company. Of special note, the Center was the "food industry's only complex devoted to pure scientific research and the first ever to study the total nutritional well-being of man from birth to old age." Nestlé' research center dedicated to mankind provided "an interdisciplinary mix of chemists, physicists, mathematicians, biologists, physiologists and psychologists." Further, "over 450 staff members representing 27 nationalities

more than 120 years, Nestlé has dedicated itself to finding the best ways of feeding the people of the world." Images in the magazine captured scientists at work in modern laboratories, declaring "from milk to molecular biology," and the centrality of knowledge. The research center provided apartments for human subjects, where scientists observed "how their bodies react[ed] metabolically to food intake." The company also noted that for much of the twentieth century, doctors and other experts interest in pediatric nutrition and developments with the field "have had a steady diet" of "timely . . . and practical information" in Annales Nestlé, a "unique medical journal published three times each year in five languages." Nestlé disseminated the journal gratis to over 60,000 students, doctors and health centers around the world. Importantly, in some Third World locations, Nestlé's journal was the only "source of new pediatric research and methods." Articles about weaning, blindness, and survival in the Philippines showed Nestlé at the center of a global struggle against infant mortality, and engaged in the steady march of progress, of using technology and science to improve living standards in many countries, including developed nations such as the United States. In addition to "food for life," (Nestlé's slogan), the Worldview showed Nestlé providing nutrition to AIDS patients, and studying nutrition and weightlessness in space aboard the space shuttle.¹²⁵

work intensively together - and with scientists at hospitals, universities and laboratories around the globe." Worldview, (Spring 1989), 4.

¹²⁵ Nestlé mastered this particular art of promotion, but it was not alone. Abbott Laboratories, the American pharmaceutical giant, published Abbott Times, a quarterly that the company sent to "250,000 readers in the United States," mostly health professionals. The company described the quarterly as the "voice" of Abbott, and could influence people by "moulding the physician's opinion of Abbott. The implications of having the physician think and speak well of Abbott, and engender the same attitude among his fellow MDs, among the druggists, and even the public, are incalculable. In effect, we are striving to make the physician a low-pressure salesman of Abbott." Originally used as a critique by the consumer groups in order to provide derisive evidence inimical to health. Quoted in Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods, 34.

Pagan's strategy to split the boycott coalitions worked to an extent. On the one hand, recognizing that disparate networks around the world were ineffective against such large institutional structures like MNCs, the boycotters consolidated their networking power.¹²⁶ Still, large institutions such as the United Methodist Church, recipients of continual communication from Nestlé, decided that they would not endorse the boycott.¹²⁷ In short, the large "respectable" institutions such as the churches, the more moderate, pragmatic boycotters such as Mark Ritchie, and even the socialist anti-corporate agitators all remained within the power dynamics of multinational capitalism - reformers and not radical revolutionaries. In this respect, and from the point of view of profits, later marketing strategies, and continued corporate misbehavior, Nestlé, and capitalism writ large, "won" the battle over artificial infant feeding. The capitalist and the activist dichotomies had shifted, never remaining static, and demonstrated struggle, compromise, and outright political conflict over the very systems needed to feed the world.

¹²⁶Pagan International, Inc., which Raphael Pagan started and for which John Mongoven worked, won a Silver Anvil of Public Relations Society of America award in 1986 for its work on the Nestlé boycott. Mongoven had sued Pagan's group, and Pagan countersued. Among financial claims, leaked confidential material for Shell Oil were involved. At their height after Nestlé, Mongoven and Pagan represented Shell Oil, Union Carbide, Ciba-Geigy Corp., Chevron and the Government of Puerto Rico. See O'Dwyer's Services Report, "Ex-Nestlé Firm Goes Bankrupt," (November, 1990) <http://www.scribd.com/doc/155238314/Ex-Nestle-firm-goes-bankrupt> (accessed October 1, 2014).

¹²⁷ See Monroe Friedman. Consumer Boycotts: Effecting Change through the Marketplace and the Media (New York: Routledge, 1999), 172-179.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Global Baby and America's Multinational Moment

The decadent international but individualistic capitalism, in the hands of which we found ourselves after the war, is not a success. It is not intelligent, it is not beautiful, it is not just, it is not virtuous – and it doesn't deliver the goods. In short, we dislike it, and we are beginning to despise it . . . John Maynard Keynes¹

We have to invent new wisdom for a new age. And in the meantime we must, if we are to do any good, appear unorthodox, troublesome, dangerous, and disobedient to them who begat us." Stephen Hymer²

The multinational corporation is a relatively new phenomenon. It has only recently become a part of the American public consciousness, despite the fact that American overseas investment has had an explosive growth in the year following World War II – Senator Frank Church.³

"In the last analysis, markets come out of the barrel of a gun, and to establish an integrated world economy on capitalist lines requires the international mobilization of political power," concluded radical industrial economist Stephen Hymer in a 1972 essay.⁴ His work reflected a cultural explosion that occurred in the United States after 1968, in

¹ John Maynard Keynes, The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money, London, 1964, 221.

² Stephen Hymer, Multinational Corporation: A Radical Approach, 273.

³ Senator Frank Church (D-Idaho), chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations and Foreign Policy, in U.S. Congress, Committee on Foreign Relations, Part I: p. 2, "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Ninety-Third Congress, 1st sess., on The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71, Report," U.S. Government Printing Office, March 20, 1973.

⁴ Stephen Hymer, "The Internationalization of Capital," The Journal of Economic Issues, 6, No. 1, (March, 1972), 92.

reaction to the dramatic increase in the size and reach of multinational corporations. To commentators like Hymer, these corporations appeared to be new phenomena, though they had begun expanding rapidly in the immediate postwar period, especially through foreign direct investment in Europe abetted by the Marshall Plan. However, by the 1970s American companies had grown large and influential enough, especially as they moved into new postcolonial territories in Africa, Asia and South America, to suddenly seem strange, complex and ungovernable. Few people understood them or their role in society. Whereas multinational corporate activities in the immediate postwar period evoked little popular excitement or policy attention, by the 1970s corporate investments, growth and productive capacity triggered near-panic reactions on all levels of society. New attention by activists, government, and other sectors produced a broad cultural investigation of American multinational corporations in the 1970s, something we might call a “multinational moment.” The multinational turn in the 1970s underscored a change in scale and scope of the corporations' reach, and an attendant alteration in the depth of popular, scholarly and political awareness, which prefigured debates in later decades about globalization.

Not only did concerned observers worry about the world food crisis or formula marketing in the Third World, they placed these particular issues within larger concerns about global corporate capitalism. In many ways, baby food executives were correct about their adversaries, namely that they used the formula issue to "attack" free enterprise around the world. Why did activists schooled in the New Left, antiwar and civil rights movements in the 1960s turn to direct confrontation with multinational companies? Why did large institutions such as Congress and the United Nations focus their considerable

attention on companies as well, often with infant food and national security as central concerns? This chapter aims to answer these questions while addressing institutional governance issues around infant feeding, public health, and the rise of a distinctly new cultural and political apprehension of multinational corporations (MNCs).

The International Division of Labor and Monitoring the Multinational

The period from 1968 to 1981 was especially defined by great anxiety about multinational corporations. The growth of multinational enterprises captured the attention of left wing and right wing pundits, from Ralph Nader's *Multinational Monitor* to Ron Paul's *The Libertarian*. This cultural roil comprised scholarly and popular articles, books, television shows, and constant coverage in newspapers and magazines. Most powerfully, politicians at all levels of government, in multiple nations and international organizations, attempted to grapple with the MNC phenomenon, especially members of Congress in the form of multiyear investigations in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. The multinational corporation (MNC) had been "discovered."

The United States government through such congressional investigations published thousands of pages of testimony, study, and analysis on multinational corporations in the 1970s. In part, this chapter addresses these publications to argue that the period after 1968 and before 1981 was an era of transformed social and political awareness about MNCs. Examining the cultural and social effects of multinational corporations helps substantiate several propositions. First, that increased anxiety about global capitalism, along with the energy crisis, inflation and unemployment ignited an

intense focus on the relationship between the American state and corporations, especially in the realm of national security. Second, that because of perceived newfound problems with multinational enterprises, corporate social responsibility grew as a concept and a practice, most notably in developing countries and within international organizations such as the World Health Organization. And third, that struggles over regulating global corporate capitalism illustrated the limited power of international organizations and states to check the growth and power of massive companies. The multinational moment helped scholars visualize the workings of civil society and international institutions during a period of rapid change and rupture, when bottle-feeding joined the oil crisis and nuclear weapons proliferation as major threats to global survival.

Hymer, a Canadian educated at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, helped define and study the structural changes brought about by multinational corporations. Multinationals, he wrote, were preceded in the 1880s and 1890s by the "national corporation created . . . when American capitalism developed a multicentric continent-wide marketing and manufacturing strategy." The national corporation, as described by Alfred Chandler and others, became elaborately structured and rationalized, giving rise to an administrative managerial class that organized "mass production and mass marketing in geographically dispersed branch plants and sales outlets."⁵ American national

⁵ Stephen Hymer, "Japanese Competition in the Pacific," in The Multinational Corporation: A Radical Approach: Papers by Stephen Herbert Hymer, Cambridge, 1979, 242; it is vital to note that Chandler was one of the first to detail the vertical integration of national firms in the nineteenth century and their continental reach, whereby corporations began to own the entire production process from resource extraction, through manufacturing, transportation, retail, marketing and sometimes even financing and banking, creating in the process a managerial class that learned to master the increasingly complicated tasks of running the mega-corporations. Railroads, mining companies, and Standard Oil were prime examples. Chandler's early work on national corporations is instrumental in forming our apprehension of the development of multinationals. Hymer recognized the importance of Chandler's analysis of the national

corporations, structured along the lines of the railroads, facilitated the division of labor and the highly specialized modes of production that helped American capitalism outpace European corporations. Hymer pointed out that American corporations quickly began international movements. But it was not until after 1960, and in part as a product of Hymer's dissertation, that "the term multinational came to prominence." In fact, a cursory examination of JSTOR holdings for the phrase "multinational corporation" for the decade of 1958-1967 yielded only fourteen results, whereas the next decade located over 2700 results, and the decade after that over 4000 books, articles and reviews covering multinationals in the social scientific and humanities fields.

With the transformation from a feudal economy to the industrial revolution, Hymer noted, capitalism moved with a "steady increase in the size of manufacturing firms from the workshop to the factory to the national corporation to the multidivisional corporation and now to the multinational corporation."⁶ Within this historical trajectory there were constant struggles over the terms and direction of society and the economy, especially concerning the contingent and contentious relationship between labor and capital. During the multinational moment and the infant feeding crisis, early anti-globalization factions fought against MNC prerogatives, and aimed for some form of regulatory control.

Hymer emphasized that a spatial vision was necessary to begin understanding these firms. "National firms," he wrote, "think in terms of the national market; multinational firms see the whole world as their market and plan manufacturing and

corporation, and thought that similar work was required for multinationals, a process that he began. His original vision, cut short by his early death, has yet to be entirely realized.

⁶ Stephen Hymer, "Multinational Corporations and the International Division of Labor," in Cohen et al, Multinational Corporations, 145.

marketing on a global scale." Scholars, businessmen and politicians throughout the 1970s debated this definition of MNCs, but Hymer considered his definition as fluid, as showing "a direction of change" in this new global landscape. For the purposes of this chapter, multinational corporations are understood to be private institutions or firms that organized their operations across multiple countries with a centralized headquarters based in a major metropolitan center.⁷

By the late 1960s and early 1970s these changes could no longer be ignored or viewed as natural. Reflecting this newly arrived consciousness, Hymer indicated that transportation and communications advancements contributed to the expansion of U.S. companies. Especially conspicuous were advances in commercial air travel and electronics, which dramatically increased global connectivity.⁸ Further material alterations occurred in postwar Europe, where the European Economic Community

⁷ My definition of multinational corporation follows the one offered by the "Multinational Corporation: Compendium of Papers. . .", Subcommittee on International Trade of the Senate Finance Committee, United States Congress, 1973, 43-44, which is based on "Professor Raymond Vernon of Harvard University . . . : a company that attempts to carry out its activities on an international scale, as though there were no national barriers, on the basis of a common strategy directed from a corporate center." Also, see Stephen Hymer, "The United States Multinational Corporations and Japanese Competition in the Pacific," in which he defines the phrase concisely: "the multinational corporation is a private organization that organizes one industry across many countries. Its polar opposite is a public institution that organizes many industries across one country, or better still across one region," 255.

⁸ In Chapter 2, I noted historian Ken Cmiel's take on new technologies and the rise of NGOs like Amnesty International. Additionally, appreciate Benedict Anderson's thesis in Imagined Communities and the rise of nationalism based on new technologies such as the newspaper. The miracle of print and the "coming of the book" more generally contributed to organizing communities and ideas of belonging. Air travel, transatlantic cables, and the Internet fostered an imagined global community, a unified Humanity, and a species under threat because of its own agency. I address this in my Introduction. See Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (London: Verso, 1983). While you're at it, please read Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, The Coming of the Book (London: Verso, 1976). Anderson asked, "what makes people love and die for nations?" (Or religions, for that matter.) I ask, what made people conceive of a single human species under threat and dedicate their lives to saving it? And why?

(EEC) and its Common Market, coupled with the rapid growth of the economy and European corporations, threatened American corporate dominance. American companies responded to this competitive pressure by investing directly in Europe with production facilities and subsidiaries, thereby retaining "their world market share" and their "base for future growth."⁹ American corporate incursions led to profound anxieties about the current epoch, which impelled a cultural explosion that covered everything from literature, politics, social justice movements, consumer advocacy agitation and continuous coverage by popular punditry.

At Harvard Business School during the 1970s, historians Alfred Chandler and Raymond Vernon studied the businessman as a cultural hero, and wondered about the evolution of business culture in the United States. The author of The Visible Hand, Strategy and Structure and many other publications worked in the history of capitalism at Harvard Business School, along with Vernon, who achieved wide notice with Sovereignty at Bay. Little known or appreciated, however, an impressive database on global corporations assisted Vernon and other researchers at Harvard.¹⁰ Vernon's

⁹ Cohen et al, The Multinational Corporation, 242.

¹⁰ The Harvard research on MNCs included: Raymond Vernon, The Economic and Political Consequences of Multinational Enterprise: An Anthology; "Economic Sovereignty at Bay, from Foreign Affairs, October 1968'; Foreign Trade and Foreign Investment: Hard Choices for Developing Countries, from Foreign Trade Review, January-March 1971; "The Economic Consequences of U.S. Foreign Direct Investment, from U.S. Commission for International Trade . . . Report to the President submitted by the Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy, 1971; "Multinational Enterprise and National Security," from Adelphi Papers, March 1971; "The Multinational Enterprise: Power Versus Sovereignty, from Foreign Affairs, July 1971; "Problems and Policies Regarding Multinational Enterprises, from U.S. Commission for International Trade . . . Report to The President submitted by the Commission on International trade and Investment Policy, 1971; "Future of the Multinational Enterprise, from The International Corporation, edited by Charles P. Kindleberger, 1970.

systematic study of multinational corporations offered a view of global enterprises, the role of the state, and other social, cultural and political influences.¹¹

At a 1975 conference on the "multi-unit enterprise," Chandler and other scholars grappled with the gigantic economic institutions that seemed to be growing larger, proliferating around the world like a "cancer," and creating problems that required sustained focus by an international community of researchers.¹² Scholars investigated cultural values such as those provided in an analysis on capitalist visions of growth, and "how culturally defined attitudes and values hasten or retard economic development." Changes that occurred with increasing rapidity during the entire postwar era began to excite examinations into the phenomenon of the MNC and its relationship to the environment. Chandler hoped that "naïve" answers to pressing problems would be replaced by expert analysis. Specific problems that loomed for the first time in the 1970s were to be "viewed as ones central to the rapid industrialization and urbanization of the modern world and not as local evidences of the activities of unthinking men." In other words, activists seeking blame often looked at local instances of greedy business decisions, whereas Chandler emphasized that the entire world was changing rapidly and experts needed to appreciate global forces and not the avarice or callousness of individual

¹¹ Raymond Vernon, Sovereignty At Bay, Big Business and the State: Changing Relations in Western Europe (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1974); Raymond Vernon, Sovereignty at Bay; the Multinational Spread of U.S. Enterprises, The Harvard Multinational Enterprise Series (New York: Basic Books, 1971); Storm over the Multinationals: The Real Issues (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977); The Economic and Political Consequences of Multinational Enterprise: An Anthology. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration (Harvard University, 1972).

¹² "The Multi-Unit Enterprise: A Historical and International Comparative Analysis and Summary" Chap. 9 in Harold F. Williamson, ed. Evolution of International Management Structures (1975), f 106.16, 1 of 5; see also "The Businessman as Cultural Hero," Baker Library Historical Collections Department, Arch GA 12.50.1, Box 106, Alfred D. Chandler Papers, 1945-1995' First, folder f 106-3, f106.16 (Box 106), 48.

businessmen. A global consciousness was required for proper analysis of political economy and political ecology.

For Chandler, studying the history of multinationals and global economic development was not a purely academic enterprise; it could also help alleviate some of the world's problems. Understanding "how the most powerful institution in the modern economy came into being" would help activists, politicians, and scholars determine the actual scope of the world cancer. Societies desired affluence and "modern creature comforts," and the MNC was culturally and economically structured to supply those particular demands. Chandler, the ultimate business historian, could not visualize how such massive institutions "whose whole purpose has been to assure high velocity production and distribution" in a global mass society, to feed mass consumption in a hyper-expanding, mass age, could also be the institutions employed to reverse the ill effects of growth. Especially in the 1970s, air and water around the world, from Tokyo to Los Angeles, from the Rhine to the Mississippi to the Yangtze, were polluted and toxic. The MNC directly led to worldwide "evidences of the cancer." For those fascinated with global corporations, ecological destruction presented a topic worth discussing. "The high-velocity, energy-consuming processes of mass production," wrote Chandler, "and mass distribution have vastly intensified the depletion of natural resources, while at the same time, spewing out huge quantities of non-biological resources."¹³

In the context of a stagnant economy, the Vietnam War, and the energy crisis, American anxieties about MNC dominance and loss of jobs reached a fever during the 1970s. Much of the multinational moment was characterized by a kind of collective

¹³ Ibid. 46-8.

angst. Hymer, along with Chandler and Vernon, demonstrated that there were "signs of strain in the system and a wave of reexamination and reconsideration of its basic framework," especially in "light of emerging contradictions and crises, national and international." He noted that there was "a certain unease" pulsing through many societies, especially in the West.¹⁴ Some of the researchers who had worked with Hymer at the Yale Economic Growth Center (YEGC) continued to express specific American disquietude after Hymer's death in 1974.¹⁵

Leah Margulies, a founder of the global boycott against the Nestlé Corporation, worked as a researcher at Yale for Hymer.¹⁶ Following the group's interests in capitalist exploitation in Ghana and the West Indies, she compiled information on the effects of investments in developing countries by huge multinationals. She noted that their research group imagined corporations as the "new economic, social and political structure" of the world.¹⁷ This insight remained vital for understanding of multinational debate, namely that MNCs were more than a mere reflection of capitalist investment opportunities. Rather, they represented a profound restructuring of social and cultural relations that affected almost everyone on the entire planet. Margulies began researching global corporations in the Pacific Rim. She emphasized that this was "during the Vietnam War"

¹⁴ Stephen Hymer, "International Politics," in Multinational Corporations, 261.

¹⁵ Obituary, "Dr. Stephen Hymer, Economics Teacher," New York Times Feb. 5, 1974, 40.

¹⁶ Margulies, whom Hymer hired in 1969, carried forward their investigations into global corporations, including mining companies, food companies and infant formula manufacturers. Their collaborations eventually surfaced in work by scholars, writers and politicians during the long-running Senate hearings on multinational corporations.

¹⁷ Leah Margulies, Interview with the Author, December 2, 2007.

and activists pursued a theory that American corporations would Americanize the world.¹⁸

Margulies and other researchers at Yale created a reader that showed, at least to the activists, that business planned to "replace the nation state." A favored phrase of the multinationals at the time was "the sun never sets on the global corporation." There existed fears that global corporations would "transcend the nation and not be subject to national laws," which ultimately manifested a profound subversion of democracy. Corporations underwent fervid efforts at globalizing management, and would "no longer be loyal to the United States." Eventually the reader became a 900-page book, which Margulies and her research group attempted to publish. Richard Barnet at the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) in Washington showed interest in the findings. He and his colleagues used the material as a basis for his book Global Reach (1974). Barnet and his co-author Ronald Muller contributed to the multinational moment not only through their bestseller, but also through multiple newspaper articles, talks around the country, and testimony during the Senate hearings on MNCs.¹⁹

¹⁸ Stephen Hymer, The Multinational Corporation: A Radical Approach: Papers by Stephen Herbert Hymer, edited by Robert B. Cohen, Nadine Felton, Morley Nkosi, and Jaap van Liere (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 14n, 316; see Leah Margulies, Judith Miller, Paul Semonin, and Florika Remetier, A Bibliography on the Multinational Corporation, San Francisco, 1977.

¹⁹ The literary explosion that influenced popular awareness, and which led directly to a string of Senate hearings, began with the 1968 international bestseller The American Challenge, by French journalist Jean-Jacque Servan-Schreiber. Europe in 1968 was wealthy and jockeying for global influence, but lacked U.S. innovation and "know-how," a term used ad infinitum in the Church subcommittee hearings. Economist C. P. Kindleberger, Hymer's thesis adviser, wrote that the principal argument of The American Challenge was that "the United States is ahead of Europe in space-technology, computers, nuclear energy, aviation and electronics, so that Europe is condemned to second place." Servan-Schreiber worried that Europe would go the way of "Arab civilization." C.P. Kindleberger, "Review of the American Challenge," Journal of Economic Literature, 7, No.1 (March, 1969), 114.

Margulies and Hymer studied multinational corporations and capitalist social structures in an era when many thinkers asked questions about a rising new paradigm. For instance, John Kenneth Galbraith argued for a new interpretation of the global economy as not exemplifying free enterprise. Rather, these massive institutions demonstrated something else, with advertising and marketing involved in the structures and administrations of human survival. Galbraith's The New Industrial State uncovered a mixed-economic, corporate state, and his work joined the many others in the historiography of the 1970s "capitalism studies."²⁰ The book pushed against the American-centric idea that the nation exemplified a free market society. Instead, Galbraith argued, the U.S. became a "structured state controlled by the largest companies." And advertising was "the means by which these companies manage[d] demand and create[d] consumer 'need' where none previously existed." The formula companies kept themselves alive by creating this need and feeding infants. "The goal of these companies is not the betterment of society, but immortality through an uninterrupted stream of earnings."²¹ This analytical framework drove the majority of activists concerned with the formula issue, and especially those pushing the boycott the hardest.

²⁰ Galbraith's contribution to this literature was immense. Utilized by cultural historians and Americanists of the postwar era mostly for his The Affluent Society, his other work places him at the center of the angst-ridden, biting and critical multinational moment literature, all of which asked humanity-level questions about the state of the species on the planet. The end was nigh. See John Kenneth Galbraith, American Capitalism, the Concept of Countervailing Power, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1952); Economic Development. (Sentry Edition: Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964); The Age of Uncertainty, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977); The New Industrial State, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978).

²¹ Galbraith blurb from http://books.google.com/books?id=X9qeAAAAIAAJ&source=gbs_ViewAPI, accessed August 10, 2013.

In addition to popular bestsellers and academic studies on multinational enterprises, one of America's foremost muckraking journalists investigated particular scandals precipitated by MNCs. Jack Anderson, who led a small team of investigative journalists crusading for accountability in Washington, wrote a syndicated column for many decades. During the multinational moment, Anderson labored to uncover illegal behavior by capitalists and politicians in everything from telecommunications to the petroleum industry.²² He especially strove to reveal how the state worked in conjunction with corporations to exploit poor nations, influence their local politics, and increase the hegemony of the American Way. Senator Frank Church, who spent years investigating multinational corporations after Anderson's disclosures, and who admired Barnet and Muller's book Global Reach, said it best in a review of the book in the Washington Post. "In the 25 years between 1948 and 1973," he wrote, "U.S. corporate investment abroad increased from \$9 billion to an estimated \$107 billion in book value, but the term 'multinational corporation' (MNC) did not become imprinted on the public consciousness until the late 1960s and early 1970s."²³ Anderson, often using leaked government and corporate materials, added fuel to the anti-MNC fire, and inspired Church to act.

²² Anderson's column in the Washington Merry-Go-Round was reported to reach 50 million readers at the height of his fame. Senator Frank Church, Introductory Comments, Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations and Foreign Policy, in U.S. Congress, Committee on Foreign Relations, Part I: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess., on The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71, Report," U.S. Government Printing Office, March 20, 1973, 2.

²³ Frank Church, "Profits of Doom," The Washington Post, January 19, 1975, 97. The Senate Finance Committee presented its own numbers: A report issued by the Senate Finance Committee in 1973 indicated the structural transformation occurring with the rise of MNCs. The document offered the following history: "Book value of U.S. direct investments more than doubled, rising from \$32 billion in 1960 to \$78 billion in 1970. The bulk of this investment was accounted for by direct investments by U.S.-based multinational corporations. Total long-term private investments,

"The More You Eat the More You Want": The Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations and Foreign Policy²⁴

The U.S. government heard the noise arising from the press, expert observers and the public. But also, Congress began to show legitimate concerns about national security and powerful global companies. Senator Church initiated the MNC proceedings on March 20, 1973 with an opening statement that demanded his fellow Americans achieve some understanding of this new entity called the multinational corporation.²⁵ A year earlier, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Senator Fulbright, reacted to prevailing popular turmoil over multinational activities and opened a multiyear inquiry into the role of multinationals and United States foreign policy. Their first hearings investigated allegations that the International Telephone & Telegraph Company (ITT) improperly

direct and other, rose from \$49 billion to \$120 billion over this period." See Compendium of Reports, Senate Finance Committee, 46.

²⁴ Senator Percy contributed his own insights "on this whole phenomenon, consumerism sweeping the Eastern European countries. I think Crackerjack has the slogan, 'The more you eat, the more you want.' Isn't that almost a phenomenon we have seen worldwide. It is not restricted to any nationality or religious faith, belief, or background, once they start seeing what consumer goods can do in bringing a better way of life." Exchange between Senator Percy and Kendell of Pepsi Co., Senate Subcommittee, Part 10, Investments By Multinational Companies in the Communist Bloc Countries, June-July, 1974, pp. 208-210. Additionally, note the irony of the ITT corporation, which worked stridently to subvert Allende's Socialist government in Chile, and yet, according to testimony during the Communist Bloc hearings, was asked whether during the Cold War it was advisable to build telephone infrastructure networks in the USSR, as well as "hotels and [the] establishment of rental car concessions" throughout Russia.

²⁵ On March 18, 1976, after the multinational subcommittee completed its investigations and had been "watered down," Church ran for President, along with Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale, Ronald Reagan and a host of other candidates. "Announcement of Candidacy for President of the United States," By Frank Church of Idaho. Delivered Idaho City, Idaho, March 18, 1976, (<http://www.4president.org/speeches/1976/frankchurch1976ann...>) from the Frank Church Collection, Boise State University Library); for a superb explication of the history leading to the Seattle globalization protests, and for a brief mention of the Church subcommittee hearings, see Robin Broad and Zahara Heckscher, "Before Seattle: The Historical Roots of the Current Movement against Corporate-Led Globalization," Third World Quarterly, 24, No. 4 (Aug. 2003), 713-728.

influenced the federal government, internal politics in Chile, and the CIA in order to protect their interests against expropriation. Dr. Salvador Allende, socialist presidential candidate, repeatedly declared during Chilean elections that he was going to nationalize industry and utilities. ITT tried to influence the elections. After Allende's victory, he began his expropriation agenda (and radical socialized health care), and still ITT worked to block his efforts, protect their investments, and ensure they could collect from U.S.-government-backed insurance against expropriation or war in foreign countries.²⁶

The multinational moment was also about calculators. After several hearings on petroleum companies, the subcommittee shifted its focus to American businessmen opening up economic pathways in communist countries. The Soviet Union sessions investigated the role of American trade relationships with the eastern bloc. Calculators, for J. Fred Bucy, Executive Vice President of Texas Instruments, represented incredible technological advances for American consumers, but also integrated circuit technology for advanced weaponry. The Texas Instruments executive warned the committee about potential Soviet applications of calculator technology. Bucy expressed his concerns about Soviets playing one corporation off another with the lure of exclusive access to the Soviet market, primarily in order to gain the "know-how" necessary for advanced operations of

²⁶ Church, Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations and Foreign Policy, The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71, 1973, 2-25, plus the Appendix; further, see n40, for ITT's role in developing the infrastructure of the USSR, while at the same time attempting to defeat Socialist Allende. Wall Street Journal. The GOP and conservative press aggressively reacted against the multinational subcommittee's work. The Wall Street Journal lauded former Attorney General John Mitchell and ITT President Harold Geneen for not giving "even a fraction of an inch to Senate Democrats" on the multinational subcommittee. The committee, in addition to probing ITT actions in Chile, looked at links between the Republican Party and government settlements of antitrust cases against the company. Conservatives pointed out, in the press and before the Senate Judiciary Committee, that Democrats routinely accepted cash from large corporations after settling antitrust cases out of court. "GOP's Counterpunching in ITT Hearings May Sour the Public on Antitrust Policies." March 16, 1972. 10.

the technology. The members of the committee agreed with him, murmuring their collective incredulity that Americans could sell technological know-how to the communists. Yet, a thriving business continued between the "opposing blocs," transcending that era of heightened ideological rhetoric, including that of Bucy's Texas Instruments.²⁷ But technology transfer included formula products, American grains and other food commodities.

Manufactured baby food and formula paraphernalia like bottles and nipples were also a form of technology transfer monitored by governments. Activist Doug Johnson placed the beginning of INFACT's concern for technology transfer with an economist working on "taste transfer." Where Church's subcommittee on MNCs explored technology transfer among almost every aspect of corporate "global reach," political economist Steven Langdon supplied the "taste" framework, especially through marketing and promotion. Nestlé's Lactogen, which filmmaker Peter Krieg added to a panoply of serious global health concerns in his film, commanded large swaths on Swahili radio - "the media of the Kenyan poor and illiterate." According to Johnson, "Lactogen was the most advertised product in the country."²⁸ Langdon's own professional research on advertising claimed that "a three week survey of Swahili radio advertising in Kenya, conducted in 1973, showed that 80.2 percent of all advertisements (by time) were sponsored by multinational firms - with Brooke Bond, Nestlé, Colgate-Palmolive, Coca-

²⁷ Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations and Foreign Policy, Part 10, Investments By Multinational Companies in the Communist Bloc Countries, June-July, 1974, 274.

²⁸ Johnson to Guerrant, 629. See also Steven Langdon, Multinational Corporations in the Political Economy of Kenya, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981); "Multinational Corporations, Taste Transfer and Under-Development: A Case Study from Kenya," Review of African Political Economy no. 2 (January 1, 1975): 12-35; "The State and Capitalism in Kenya," Review of African Political Economy no. 8 (January 1, 1977): 90-98.

Cola, Unilever, Glaxo and Sterling-Winthrop," leading these "examples of consumer-sector MNCs."²⁹ Landon quoted early New Internationalist articles on the baby food supplements and MNCs, noting that "the costs of this 'taste transfer' can include malnutrition and death.

Langdon mirrored exactly what INFAC and others hoped to achieve in the 1970s. MNCs as a neo-imperialist presence in the Third World affected local tastes and contributed to greater inequality. Thus, "taste transfer" had to be regulated and discouraged. "This requires strict demand management by government, for instance the banning of certain sorts of products in the same way as Tanzania has virtually banned the import of private motor cars. And to succeed, it would also require a redistribution of income." This broadside included moving away from foreign products to "simpler, local commodities."³⁰ In similar fashion, emerging governments needed to focus on strengthening their own markets and productive capacities, which "would include nationalizing many brand-name, consumer goods subsidiaries," everything from soaps, minerals and petroleum, "and redirecting their production." That Johnson referred to Langdon, and Leah Margulies was an unabashed socialist critical of corporate capitalism who had worked for Marxist political economist Hymer, it should surprise no one that industry believed even the churches were inimical to the free world as a whole. Langdon's critique of a kind of corporate imperialism, with his focus on social and economic inequalities, represented a critical strain that flourished during the strange multinational moment.

²⁹ Langdon, "Multinational Corporations, Taste Transfer and Under-Development: A Case Study from Kenya," Review in African Political Economy, 1975, 33.

³⁰ Langdon, 32.

This strangeness required constant analysis and immediate investigation from many segments of society, including the critique of corporate activities offered by the authors of Global Reach.³¹ On May 17, 1975, Senator Church welcomed Global Reach authors Richard Barnet and Ronald Muller to the hearings on political contributions to foreign governments.³² He introduced the two scholars with evident admiration, especially their critical stance relating to the multinational phenomenon. Barnet was the founder and co-director of the IPS, Washington's only "respectable" think tank formed from the ashes of the New Left. Barnet opened with a statement that revealed the political and cultural atmosphere at the time. Americans possessed, he asserted, an "insufficiently

³¹ The first two hearings, noted above, covered ITT and Chile. A list of the other fifteen hearings is helpful in order to appreciate the scope of the investigations: Part 3, "Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), July/August 1973; Parts 4-7, "Multinational Petroleum Companies and Foreign Policy," Jan. 1974, Feb. 1974, March, 1974, August 1974; Part 8, Appendix: "Multinational Petroleum Companies and Foreign Policy, Material Relating to Hearing"; Part 9: "Multinational Petroleum Companies and Foreign Policy," July, August 1974; Part 10: "Investments By Multinational Companies in the Communist Bloc Countries," June, July 1974; Part 11: "Political and Financial Consequences of the OPEC Price Increases," Jan., Feb., March 1975; Part 12, "Political Contributions to Foreign Governments," May, June, July, Sept., 1975; Part 13: "First Session on Multinational Corporations in the Dollar De-Regulation Crisis and the Impact of Direct Investment Abroad in the U.S. Economy," July, Dec., 1975; Part 14: "Second Session on Lockheed Aircraft Corporation," Feb., May, 1976; Part 15: "First Session on Multinational Banks and U.S. Foreign Policy," July, Sept., Oct, 1975; Part 16: "International Grain Companies," June 18, 1976; Part 17: "Grumman Sale of F-14s to Iran," Aug., Sept., 1976.

³² The role of MNCs in the developing world aroused special interesting during this "multinational moment." See Susan George and Institute for Policy Studies, Feeding the Few: Corporate Control of Food (Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1978). George also published other influential books for the Left: Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire (Westview Press, 1994); Food for Beginners. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative Society (Distributed in the USA by W.W. Norton), 1982; How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger (Montclair, N.J: Allanheld, Osmun, 1977), Ill Fares the Land: Essays on Food, Hunger, and Power, (Washington, D.C: Institute for Policy Studies, 1984), The Lugano Report: On Preserving Capitalism in the Twenty-First Century (London ; Sterling, VA: Pluto Press, 1999). See also Lawrence Litvak, Robert DeGrasse and Kathleen McTigue, and IPS, South Africa: Foreign Investment and Apartheid (IPS Publications, 1978). The authors of this IPS publication were members of the South Africa Catalyst Project, founded in June 1977 by activists at the Stanford Committee for a Responsible Investment Policy (SCRIP). College activists united US foreign policy, MNC and university investments in South Africa in their understanding of human rights and economic justice.

underdeveloped" understanding of "the rise of multinational corporations," which explained in part the success of their book as energetically they attempted to redress some of those insufficiencies.³³

Barnet's testimony moved away from detailing the crimes of multinationals, something the subcommittee had been doing for a few years. Overtly illegal activities should not be the focus of an investigation of MNC activity in the world. The issues "raised by the global corporation transcend the question of criminal behavior," and crimes themselves should not be the center of attraction, as much as they might excite the public. Rather, the authors maintained that the real issues were "the effects of ordinary business practice of multinational corporations, because these practices in our view are bringing about a revolution in the world economy which is having profound implications for all the Americans." The two went on to suggest that MNCs far outpaced theory and "the lag of our political institutions," and controlled everything from capital, new technologies and natural resources, and acted directly upon the continuing division of labor. Furthermore, principally as social institutions, corporations impacted social relations on every level, from worker relations to consumer choices, and they forcefully integrated entire nations into a world market economy whether they wanted to be or not.

The Senate Finance Committee, another congressional arm investigating MNCs and the pressures of the new paradigm, substantiated this interpretation.³⁴ The Senate

³³ Testimony of Richard Barnet and Ronald Muller, Senate Subcommittee on Multinationals, Part 12, Political Contributions to Foreign Governments, May 16-19, June 9, 1975, 59.

³⁴ When Hymer argued that capital moved across borders to directly compete against other firms, to seek expanding markets and cheaper sources of labor, and not to seek positive investments related to exchange or interest rates, he stated that this could be understood as the result of oligopoly pressures in context of a new world market economy. His chief expression of this position can be found in his MIT dissertation, The International Operations of Nations Firms: A Study of Direct Foreign Investment, Cambridge, 1960 (published MIT Press, 1976); see also

Finance Committee concluded that, "in general, U.S.-based multinationals went offshore when it was necessary to protect an existing foreign market which it could no longer serve economically with exports from the United States." By seeking to protect market position, some corporations viewed the world as a borderless expanse in which to seek profits and grow ever larger. Thus, the concerns of American workers about unemployment and jobs stealing away overseas were no longer significant issues for the corporation.³⁵

Yet it was not clear what policymakers would do about these particular transformations, and the cultural, political and social consequences. Church often claimed that the momentum was already so great, and international cooperation close to impossible, that there was nothing that could be done to corral the multinationals. These global giants had already constructed the world and the rest had to adjust. Journalist Dan Morgan uncovered the dire fact that nation-states "have only begun to examine the impact of the giant supranational structures on their own policies and the outlook for extensive new controls seems bleak. The global thinking of the multinational executives is running far ahead of the narrower outlook of the men who govern the world's

"The Multinational Corporation: An Analysis of Some Motives for International Business Integration," Revue Economique, 19, No. 6 (Nov. 1968): 949-73; Multinational Corporations and International Oligopoly: The Non-American Challenge," in C. P. Kindleberger, ed., The International Corporation, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1970), 57-91; Testimony in The Multinational Corporation and International Investment, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, 91st Congress, 2d Session, July 30, 1970; and "The Internationalization of Capital," Journal of Economic Issues, 6, No.1, (March 1972): 91-111.

³⁵ Senate Finance Committee, "Multinational Corporations: A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate," Russell B. Long, Chairman, U.S. Government Printing Office, February 21, 1973, 50.

countries."³⁶ Business, as evidenced in the subcommittee hearings on the communist bloc, far outpaced national politics, foreign policy, and their respective rhetorical and regulatory regimes. Hymer was the first to admit that the MNCs raised "more questions than economic theory can answer."³⁷ He was adamant that activists, workers, and scholars had to challenge the fact that "markets come out of the barrel of a gun" by organizing the global, grassroots, socially-conscious imperatives of collective political power.³⁸

In 1973, Senator Abraham Rubicoff set up his subcommittee's work on international trade with concerns about the corporations gone global. "The operations of multinational corporations are truly international and this isn't just an American problem. The OECD, for example, has a special study being made on multinational. You can go to almost any country in the world and find concern over the operators of the multinationals."³⁹ But for our purposes, he asked a question that others would pose after him. "Do you believe there should be some kind of international code of conduct as to how all nations will treat the multinational corporations?" Figuring out how to regulate global corporate capitalism became the question of the 1970s and beyond.

³⁶ Dan Morgan, "Controlling the Multinationals," The Washington Post-Times Herald, (Nov. 17, 1973), A15.

³⁷ Hymer, "The Efficiency (Contradictions) of Multinational Corporations," American Economic Review LX, No. 2, (May 1970): 441-8.

³⁸ Hymer, "The Internationalization of Capital," The Journal of Economic Issues 6, No. 1, (March 1972): 91-111.

³⁹ See Abraham Rubicoff, "Multinational Corporations": Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 93rd Congress, First Session, February 26, 27, 28; and March 1 and 6, 1973." Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 221. On the OECD and its attempts at an early code of conduct for MNCs, see Sol Picciotto, Regulating Global Corporate Capitalism, International Corporate Law and Financial Market Regulation, (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

When it came to regulation, the world food crisis and survival requirements, private transport of agricultural commodities around the world framed questions about food corporations during the multinational moment. Most ordinary citizens going about their daily lives do not think about or understand the aspects of security, feeding, energy, survival issues that politicians and bureaucrats consider during the course of their careers. The MNC documents revealed rich and complicated concerns about food, energy, and security. Richard Gilmore, a staff researcher, went to Russia on behalf of the subcommittee to investigate commercial relations between the USSR and USA especially focused on grain.⁴⁰

In the 1970s, during the height of the "world food crisis," how American grain traveled the globe became a question of tremendous import. Gilmore wrote that the Soviet Union's relationships with western grain companies were "handled with the utmost

⁴⁰ Senator Clark opened the grain hearings with profound declarations that expressed the multinational moment's anxieties, and its realities within a global food crisis, foreign policy and national security. I must quote his opening statement: "Whether our exports go to developing states, socialist states, or rich developed regions, they are essential not only to the sustenance and prosperity of other nations, but to the health of our own economy as well. Trade statistics indicate that in 1975 roughly one-fifth of our total exports consisted of agricultural products. Grain accounted for \$12.5 billion, or 85 percent of U.S. agricultural exports; and grain exports alone more than offset our nonagricultural trade deficit; it is our largest export commodity. This importance has become magnified in the aftermath of the sharp rise in oil prices mandated by the OPEC cartel. Thus, agricultural exports and the purpose for which they are made are increasingly at the center of U.S. foreign policy. But our knowledge of the export system that we rely on so heavily is sorely deficient. Our exports are controlled by a very few multinational firms which, with one exception, are privately, not publicly, owned. Six multinational companies ship extremely high percentages of our domestic grain exports. From 1970 to 1975, six multinationals have accounted for as much as 96 percent of U.S. wheat exports, 95 percent of U.S. corn exports, 90 percent of U.S. oat exports, and 80 percent of U.S. sorghum exports. These six companies – Bunge, Cargill, Continental, Dreyfus, Cook, and Garnac – almost totally dominate our markets and the world's markets." Senator Clark, Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, International Grain, 1.

secrecy."⁴¹ American grain giant, Cargill, from the American breadbasket's great grain city, Minneapolis, and other companies were the purveyors, shippers and distributors of such grains, happy to negotiate with various governments on their own. Negotiations under the radar between governments immediately complicated the phrase "open market," which included national security concerns, foreign policy issues, bureaucratic imperatives, and anxieties about one's own feeding regime for any given year.

Biopolitics converged geopolitics as people investigated infant health and national health. Studying the multiple congressional investigations into food, nutrition and energy during the 1970s sheds light on the real-world state-corporate terrain around survival necessities, and this within what we might call bio-capitalism. American MNCs were content to work the many layers of global trade during the era of East-West dichotomy. It was one thing to contemplate American companies importing grain into the USSR and America's foreign policy and regulatory concerns; but quite another to contemplate the same companies exporting grain from the Soviet Union. Given their concepts of a global social order and a system they negotiated, one can see why these companies moved food grown in one geographical region to consumers in another.⁴² And because of this growing

⁴¹ Richard Gilmore, Staff Report, U.S.S.R. and Grain, Ninety-Fourth Congress, Second Session, Prepared for the Use of the Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, with Foreword by Senator Frank Church," April 1976, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. p. 1. The US-USSR Grain Agreement was signed on October 20, 1975.

⁴² Illustrating world food concerns within which the Nestlé boycott existed, given the various global food summits of the 1970s, Gilmore wrote "The US Government has consistently handled these two issues on parallel tracks. When negotiations began for a bilateral grain agreement, the White House was already preparing finishing touches on a proposal to establish an international grain reserve system. The proposal was a follow-up to the President's UN address in the Fall of 1974, the Secretary of State's address before the 1974 World Food Conference in Rome, and an ad hoc meeting of grain trading countries at the Wheat Council, February 10, 1975. The proposal

power, one can also see why developing countries tried to assert themselves against the Global North and its representative capitalists.

Postcolonial Pushback: The New International Economic Order

Independence from colonial domination in much of the Third World framed thinking and action, both within and outside the UN system. Organized international resistance to the power of multinationals existed within the non-aligned movement. From the Third World Arbeitsgruppe (TWAG) in Switzerland, War on Want in Britain and the American boycotters, all actors admitted their deep concerns for Third World exploitation and nationalist movements to fend off new forms of postcolonial power imbalances. Within the United Nations, the Group of 77 combined their efforts to block the power of the developed countries in the 1970s.⁴³ The UN, which thought of itself as a "universal organization," fostered multiple resolutions, sub-organizations and actions aimed to corral the seemingly rampant power of corporations and developed states. Importantly, these energetic responses to the rise of MNCs existed under the rubric of species-thinking and world-saving impulses. Resistance to inequality coming out of the independence movements, and those for economic and social justice, might best be symbolized by the

was finally introduced formally at a preparatory meeting of the International Wheat Council in London, on September 29, 1975," 19.

⁴³ The Group of 77 was a consortium of African, Asian and Latin American nations determined to correct the global imbalance of power between the North and South, especially without the realm of economic justice. See Karl Sauvant, *The Collected Documents of The Group of 77, Vol. 1, The Third World Without Superpowers*, (New York: Oceana Publications, 1981). In keeping with a dominant theme during the multinational moment, Sauvant worked as the Transnational Corporations Affairs Officer for the Center on Transnational Corporations (UNCTC) at the United Nations, and at the Multinational Enterprise Unit, the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. The origins of the Group of 77 began at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1963, for UNCTAD.

Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO), adopted in May 1974.⁴⁴

The New International Economic Order illustrated the historical context for concerns over MNC activities, especially evinced by Frank Church's investigations and the Nestlé boycott. Not only were "boycotts in the air," as Doug Johnson said. Development, growth and health remained imperatives for the common goal of improved living conditions and human survival. Resources should be shared, corporations brought under reasonable regulatory control, and growth obtained as a universal objective, no matter a given state's chosen political economic system or its cultural differences. The resolution called for "an end to the waste of natural resources, including food products."⁴⁵ Additionally, the resolution evinced a desperate tone, demanding "the need for developing countries to concentrate all their resources for the cause of development," claiming that that powers that be, in the form of "producers' associations," should assist "in the promotion of sustained growth of the world economy and accelerating the development of developing countries." The reality of development was "imperative," and resolutions such as the NIEO and the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade remained the impulses upon which the new order of growth and health would prevail.⁴⁶

The Nestlé boycott and baby food struggles had raised deep questions about progress, food technologies, and healthy bodies. In Nestlé's view, science could help

⁴⁴ United Nations, General Assembly, "Declaration of the Establishment of a New Economic Order," A/RES/S-6/3201, May 1, 1974.

⁴⁵ UN NEIO item "q." Other appearing in this analysis are "r," "t," and "p."

⁴⁶ UN NEIO, item 5, and the International Development Strategy, Resolution 2626 (XXV).

people solve the world's problems and maintain the survival of the species. Science could also feed babies who could not breastfeed, or satisfy mothers who could not or would not breastfeed their infants. According to the formula companies and mass-food distributors, science and capitalism together benefited both the bottom line and humankind through new inventions, medicines, and wealth creation. But Nestlé and the other formula companies assumed that scientific knowledge and technological expertise would rightly be distributed through existing market mechanisms. The NIEO declaration, on the other hand, claimed that developing countries should possess "access to the achievements of modern science and technology," and that the international community must promote "the transfer of technology and the creation of indigenous technology" for the improvement and vitality of nations and people everywhere.⁴⁷ The implicit assumption was that global capitalist markets would not automatically benefit all nations and all humans, especially those in the Global South. This creation of local skills and technologies, and support thereof by the international community, necessarily would exist within the global economy.

Peace, prosperity, and justice would exist for "present and future generations" if the world's nations followed the new economic order. The "greatest and most significant achievement during the last decades" had been independence movements and the end of colonialism proper.⁴⁸ "The developing countries, which constitute 70 percent of the world's population, account for only 30 percent of the world's income." Therefore,

⁴⁷ UN NIEO, point "p." Recall in the multinational moment section, that Senator Frank Church's Senate subcommittee explored technology transfer vis-a-vis national security and the imperatives of multinational corporations and their profit motives. One couldn't, according to foreign policy and national security, export all technologies for the benefit of LDCs, or poor eastern bloc countries for that matter.

⁴⁸ NIEO Declaration, 2.

according to the General Assembly, a "balanced development of the international community under the existing international economic order" cannot exist. In addition to the postcolonial landscape and new forms of oppression and exploitation, the 1970s witnessed "grave crises." Because of intensified interrelationships between nations and the rising influence of LDCs, the new nations possessed a right to influence world affairs. Global economic integration, especially in food distribution, finance and raw materials, demanded a new focus on "the reality of interdependence of all the members of the world community."

The NIEO used the language of a "world community," imagined as a single ecosystem in which nations, like flora and fauna, were mutually interdependent. "The interests of developed countries," the Declaration continued, "and those of developing countries can no longer be isolated from each other" noting the perception that "there is a close interrelationship between the prosperity of the developed countries and the growth and development of the developing countries, and that the prosperity of the international community as a whole depends upon the prosperity of its constituent parts."⁴⁹ This kind of thinking reflected an image of social and political order on a grand scale - a humanity properly administered. Worldwide development remained "the shared goal and common duty of all countries." Economic health, national health, and bodily health became a duty for nations and for ordinary people. Growth existed as the dominant paradigm.

Much of the NIEO Declaration embraced radicalisms not seen anywhere since. The UN General Assembly demanded the "right of every country to adopt the economic and social system" best suited to it, its resources, its people and culture, even its power

⁴⁹ NIEO Declaration, 2.

structures.⁵⁰ This perspective of sovereignty included control for every state "over its natural resources," and, if necessary to advance its own position and power, to "exercise effective control over them and their exploitation with means suitable to its own situation, including the right to nationalization or transfer of ownership to its nationals." Western MNCs and their home governments balked at such language, and the issue commanded the attention of Congress and the UN.

As the next chapter explores in detail, when it came time to battle over the wording and intent of regulatory codes, we see why the formula companies fought as they did. One key indicator of the historical moment was the seriousness with which formula and pharmaceutical companies responded to the boycott, state and international pressure, and the burgeoning consumer advocacy networks. For them, this era demonstrated very real danger to their prerogatives, if not a threat to the free enterprise system. Looking from their vantage, companies saw activist networks and international organizations such as WHO, UNICEF, and the impulses behind United Nations Center on Transnational Corporations (UNCTC) as a phalanx arranged against their market share, their profits, and their survival.⁵¹ Company growth depended on babies growing and developing while using their products.

⁵⁰ NIEO Declaration, 3.

⁵¹ Leah Margulies eventually worked for the UNCTC, following her professional trajectory from Stephen Hymer's Yale Economic Growth Center through ICCR and then the UN organization formed to study the TNC phenomenon. The UNCTC, formed in 1975 to deal with the issues of national sovereignty and corporate responsibility, mirroring the Church Hearings, Kennedy Hearings, and many more congressional investigations, was disbanded under pressure by the Clinton Administration in 1992. One might view the 1990s as the era of neoliberal consolidation, and the fulfillment of the "biggest business in the world." See Khalil Hamdani and Lorraine Ruffing, United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations: Corporate Conduct and the Public Interest, (Routledge: London, 2015). See also, Tagi Sagafi-nejad, The UN and Transnational Corporations: From Code of Conduct to Global Compact, United Nations Intellectual History

The NIEO claimed that nation-states, regions, communities and all people on the planet possessed a right to their own cultural and resource properties. Under the framework of individual rights and duties in a private property universe, if individuals lived "under foreign occupation, alien and colonial domination or apartheid" they would be entitled to "restitution and full compensation for the exploitation and depletion of, and damages to, the natural resources and all other resources of those States, territories and peoples." Effectively, this perspective reflected market tendencies, and the right to the resources existing within state boundaries. Coercion and exploitation under colonialism, especially for people recently freed from the colonial paradigm, continued with TNCs and their growing power in home and host countries.

The NIEO, OECD codes, and the UN's attempt at a general code of conduct illuminated a new "regime," as political scientist Kathryn Sikkink called the rising interdependency networks. The new order called for assistance to LDCs that remained under "colonial and alien domination, foreign occupation, racial discrimination or apartheid or are subjected to economic, political or any other type of coercive measures" to help them control their own economies and resources and to end "neocolonialism in all its forms." Under this purview, the Declaration demanded the sensible control of transnational corporations, especially their resource extractions from poor countries. The UN noted that sovereign states should have the power to organize, limit and regulate the

Project, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008); Larry Backer, Multinational Corporations, Transnational Law: The United Nation's Norms on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations as Harbinger of Corporate Responsibility in International Law, (SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, April 5, 2005), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Transnational Corporations and World Development, (New York: Published by Routledge on behalf of the UNCTAD, Division on Transnational Corporations and Investment, 1995); United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Companies without Borders: Transnational Corporations In the 1990s. 1st ed., (London ; Boston: International Thomson Business Press, 1996).

sovereignty of huge companies operating within their borders.⁵² Commodities, food, and raw materials should be equitably exported from LDCs on fair terms and these countries should benefit and share in the "expansion of the world economy." The Declaration assumed that all nations, their economies and people remained interconnected at the primary commodity or survival level and that all engaged in total expansion. This positionality illustrated the development thinking of the era even though growth critique and ecological contingencies also existed. The NIEO, the Bucharest Population (1974) megaconference and the Rome Food Summit (1974), and even the booklet The Limits to Growth dominated the policy, activist and survival scene in the early 1970s.

Historian and rhetorician Matthew Brigham analyzed the overpopulation problem from a rhetorical and linguistic angle, studying the UN population megaconferences from Bucharest 1974 to Cairo 2004. The World Population Plan of Action (1974) offered a starting point for Brigham's analysis. He noted that ". . . the 1974 conference was neither the first international conference on population nor even the first United Nations-sponsored conference on population." Contests within the UN system exhibited the frictions between First and Third worlds, between developed and developing. As Michael Schechter, Ronald Greene and Karl Sauvant wrote in their various studies on UN global conferences, the Group of 77 redirected drafting of population documents to reflect their interpretations of the world and their own experiences vis-a-vis the dominant powers.⁵³ According to Brigham, and often obscured from view from final drafts, "the vision of Bucharest was substantially contested along developed-developing country lines. As

⁵² NIEO, point "G."

⁵³ Michael G. Schechter, United Nations Global Conferences, Global Institutions Series, (London, 2005); cite Greene Malthusian Worlds and Karl Sauvant, *The Group of 77*, 1981.

Greene explains, the 'Group of 77 played a significant and decisive role challenging the United States in conceptualizing the work of the Bucharest conference.'⁵⁴ Further, the Group of 77 insisted on a particular reading of the infant formula controversy and attitudes not only about powerful nations, but about MNCs working within their own borders.

From Greene's interpretation of the population apparatus, his thinking about the megaconferences and the Group of 77, the postcolonial impulse manifested huge cultural and political momentum in the 1970s. Neocolonialism, and most edifices of Western power, existed as frameworks of domination that were to be opposed. Resistance to all forms of invasive power, including those of multinationals, remained at the heart of postcolonial, anti-corporate politics. Hints of a new colonialism, even through international organizations such as the UN or WHO, encouraged skepticism and resistance from most of the non-allied movement, and the activists in the infant formula controversy. Whether countries wanted socialism, communism, or capitalism, what they most desired was some model that mirrored the growth paradigm, and they raised bureaucracies to administer healthy bodies, healthy economies, and a healthy state. Mass

⁵⁴ Greene noted that "'The 'Group of 77,' a coalition of African, Asian, and Latin American countries who . . . began to demand a new set of economic relationships between the First and Third Worlds . . . the Group of 77 did not conceptualize their development problems as essentially population problems but instead as the residual hangover of colonialism . . . in preparation for the Bucharest Conference a set of preliminary meetings were held on a regional basis in an effort to formulate a draft of the World Population Plan of Action. At these meetings there was little opposition to the basic reasoning of the U.S. wing of the population apparatus that the growth in population was the primary reason for the failure of development programs and family planning should be institutionalized in an effort to directly reduce the rate of population growth . . . However, as the Conference unfolded it became clear that the Group of 77 would block the preferences of the United States . . . the dominant organization of the elements within the population apparatus was ambushed at the Bucharest Conference. A new articulation of the population apparatus was in the making,'" in Michael Brigham, 112. Recall Matthew Connelly's Fatal Misconception, noted in the Introduction, on attempts to control the entire human population.

administration of growth reflected the global hegemonic order no matter the loose network of interconnected political economies.

The United Nations and the Global Baby

The United Nations involvement in infant and child feeding, and the TWAG lawsuit against Nestlé in Switzerland, set in motion a convergence that ultimately led to the international boycott and the Kennedy Hearings. This convergence helped set the structural standard for public-private dealings in health and growth that became dominated by neoliberal thinking. As seen in the PAG process and the WHA proclamations, the UN focused on infant foods and private enterprise, and was prepared for the 1981 WHO Code process by the sequence of historical events. Often not mentioned in this history, however, was the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO/WHO) Codex Alimentarius Commission. The global food code covered most issues of protecting "the health of consumers," overseeing "fair practices in the food trade," and promoting the "coordination of all food standards" that NGOs, IO's and national governments hoped to derive through separate and collective processes. The Codex expressed nothing less than the total food safety and biological health of the species - an ideal that came out of the UN Declaration of Human Rights and the mandate to monitor humanity issues on a vast scale.

In addition to establishing ingredient formulations for artificial baby foods and labeling guidelines, the Food Policy and Nutrition Division of FAO published a defense of breastfeeding in 1975. Within the context of the "world food crisis" discussed at the UN food megaconference in Rome the year earlier, baby food politics rose to the political, economic and cultural surface of many international agendas. Declining

breastfeeding rates in developing countries contributed to infant malnutrition and mortality, mostly because of early weaning techniques often under three months. The FAO declared that, "early severe malnutrition of the type associated with early weaning may lead to permanent physical and mental damage and the developing countries may thus have to carry the added economic burden of many permanently disabled persons."⁵⁵ Child feeding decisions thus became issues of national health and security, with breastmilk losses calculated economically.

The Codex worked with national governments, NGOs and companies in order to coordinate food standards around the world. The FAO published Codex standards after member governments accepted the recommendations on everything from local to global standards. Since its inception, the Codex held eleven sessions, and in the eleventh convened in early spring 1976, members considered "three world-wide standards" for infant formula, canned baby foods, and cereal-based foods for infants and children.⁵⁶ "The product shall be nutritionally adequate to promote normal growth and development when used in accordance with its directions for use," the statement declared. The Commission's focus on formula and baby food contents demonstrated extraordinary precision, and reflected most organizations' emphasis on ingredients and labeling requirements, not regulating corporate marketing or promotional campaigns. In this way the Codex standards for infant formula and baby foods reflected the U.S. Infant Formula

⁵⁵ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, "Summary of FAO's position on Breast feeding and a Tentative Strategy for Action," quoted in Jane Cottingham, 6.

⁵⁶ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and the World Health Organization, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Recommended International Standards for Foods for Infants and Children," (March-April, 1976), in Kennedy Hearings, 179-188.

Act, passed in 1980.⁵⁷ The "essential composition" of formula, based on the "milk of cows or other animals" must incorporate proper levels of vitamins, minerals, choline, protein, fat and linoleum (or linoleic acid, necessary for healthy skin, hair, and healing wounds). These ingredients included explicit measurements of vitamins such as thiamine, ascorbic acid, riboflavin, folic acid, per 100 available calories.

Formula companies, regulatory agencies, and national governments producing their own formula (such as Chile) were expected to abide by these standards. The Codex also formulated mineral contents, such as sodium, potassium, chloride, phosphorus, zinc, copper and more; and specific measurements of protein - no more than 4 grams per available 100 calories. This kind of detail should not be ignored, as formula recalls because of missing chloride in the United States showed – with children born with developmental problems and billion-dollar lawsuits.⁵⁸ The statement also regulated thickening agents and other additives (such as starches, emulsifiers, antioxidants and phosphates) that pharmaceutical and food companies found necessary for product stability, shelf life, and consumer mixing before consumption. Contaminants, "pathogenic microorganisms" and "pesticide residues" should be removed or "reduced to the maximum extent possible."

The UN food safety, health and consumer protection agencies also outlined packaging and labeling procedures. These exacting standards, set in 1976, in many ways provided some of the ideas, language, and mechanisms for the WHO Code on corporate marketing that followed. Safe packaging and the kinds of containers used grabbed the

⁵⁷ FAO/WHO Standards for Foods for Infants and Children, 181, and for the Infant Formula Act.

⁵⁸ Ibid, 183.

commission's attention. As for labeling - an extremely important aspect of the boycott struggles - the name of the product, protein sources, and ingredients should be on manufactured commodity labels. Additionally, the Codex Commission and baby food politics demonstrated the quantification, medicalization, and hyper chemical calibration of food in the modern age. Experts outlined and regulated the "amount of energy expressed in calories," and this energy also reflected the amount of consumer demand and need in different markets around the world. Significantly, food companies built knowledge and shared information on these energy requirements and hoped to make money off both abject needs, and manufactured needs.

The rhetoric of growth and improvement resisted challenges, even outside corporate culture. In the next section, Chile offers an example of a nation concerned about modernizing its infant feeding. The country explicitly imagined growing national babies as part of its development planning. Chile visualized total health and nutrition coverage for all of its children, whether rural or urban. In doing so, whether under socialist leadership and military dictatorship, Chile's health professionals negotiated state prerogatives and multinational manufacturing, marketing and regulation, sickness and health. The case of Chile in the 1970s marked a perfect confluence of development, health, and corporate growth.

Chile and Making National Milks

Chile, under Salvador Allende's government, aimed to provide milk for all its children, of any age, no matter the ruling political party.⁵⁹ Chile's governing class apprehended a

⁵⁹ Hakim and Solimano, "Supplemental Feeding," 185-195. Incidentally, once Salvador Allende moved from Minister of Health to the presidency, USAID, which had provided 18 million kilograms of ready-to-feed baby foods and powdered milks, "stopped its donations," leaving only school lunch programs with voluntary organizations distributing the milk products. During

national body and all its citizen bodies as one healthy, functioning social unit. Infant health policy included powdered milk, formula, medical attention and vaccinations. Director of the Institute of Nutrition and Food Technology, Dr. Fernando Monckeberg, conceived of mass health administration, concerned with healthy bodies so that the nation experienced productivity in the world.⁶⁰ Often criticized by activists for his pro-industry stance, he, like policymakers around the world, specifically believed that child health equated to national health, necessary for proper development and growth. Which helps explain why, by the 1990s, development economists would become central contributors to matters of global health, where “investing in health for economic development” became the dominant strategy for most nations on the planet, for WHO and the World Bank.⁶¹ For one observer these historical shifts led to a “cost-effective new universalism.” But Chile learned about the difficulties of marketing food products when the country attempted to modernize its impoverished urban and rural citizens.⁶² For example, health

Allende's artificially shortened presidency, "every Chilean under 15 and pregnant and nursing mothers" were to receive about half a liter of milk a day. Hakim and Solimano, in Kennedy Hearings, 335-346.

⁶⁰ Fernando Monckeberg, "Nutrition Intervention Programs in Chile: 1951-1978," in Kennedy Hearings, 286-332. See also Peter Hakim and Giorgio Solimano, "Supplemental Feeding as a Nutritional Intervention: The Chilean Experience in the Distribution of Milk," Journal of Tropical Pediatrics," 46 (Aug. 1, 1976), 185-202. This monograph resulted from work at the International Nutrition Planning Program, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in 1975.

⁶¹ See Nitsan Chorev, The World Health Organization Between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 168-175 in her chapter “Health in Economic Terms.” Chorev wrote, “The setting up of the Commission on Macroeconomics and Health marked a watershed in the involvement of economists in health. It also marked their co-optation into the World Health Organization,” which became what she called a “cost-effective new universalism.” In 1993, the World Bank published its World Development Report: Investing in Health, a culmination of Alan Berg’s work on nutrition at the World Bank in the 1970s, noted in Chapter One.

⁶² Chile possessed an admirable health care system. The country had "socialized medicine for the last 20 years. Ninety-seven percent of the medical doctors are employees of the government. The

experts, passing out free milk, realized that people would not use free food if it "didn't have prestige," if it looked "like it's poor food." Demand for free milk powder increased after "improving both the product and the marketing system." In a way, Chile sold nutrition products and gave it away for free, while concerned with improving national health and GNP. Chile possessed a National Program of Supplementary Feeding, including comprehensive mapping of its young infants, toddlers, preschool children, and women's consumption of supplementary foods. Parents grew children; but so did the state.

The quantification of children and the creation of knowledge about nutrition and healthy were instrumental to Chile's national effort of social improvement. "Because we cover almost 100% of the children," Monckeberg claimed, "we also can solve other nutritional problems" such as iron deficiency. Health experts worked under scientific conditions with the latest global knowledge and aimed to improve bodies, lower costs, increase efficiency, and thus enhance national productivity. "We have weaning food for children between 2 and 6 years of age. The composition is protein 23%, lipid 6%, and 445 calories for each 100 gram, plus vitamins. We cover 85% of the children between 2 to 6 years of age." Comprehensive nutrition coverage continued inside the framework of development, life and death.

In addition to infant formula, Chile produced weaning food and contracted four private firms to manufacture it for them. Each company created a line of foods used to propel children into their lives, their education, and their working, productive years.

health service covers almost 85% of the total population." And, as the country tried to improve infant and child health, it spent "5% of the gross national product in health," a huge percentage. Chile counted a mostly urban population of 80% of citizens of European descent, and 20% indigenous living in rural areas.

Firms from Nestlé to Bristol-Myers created weaning products as food for children beyond infancy and into toddlerhood, harnessing their growing energy. The companies in Chile "invested more than 16 million dollars to build these factories," Monckeberg claimed, "and they do business both with the government and on the open market." The product produced by state and private collaboration, Fortesan, showed a smiling, healthy white child on its label. Monckeberg argued, "the child on the box should never be a poor child . . . always a nice healthy boy or girl - blond and blue eyes." Starving children ruined marketing initiatives for states and private companies, but not for consumer groups. For War on Want, INFACT, and IBFAN, starving, malnourished children made for a successful boycott drive, convincing mostly middle-class Americans and Europeans to boycott Nestlé products. "In Chile, the mother has to be European. The child has to look healthy." The product's name, Fortesan, meant "strong-of-health." The label did not say a word about malnutrition. "The label asks the mother what she wants for her child . . . such as vitamins and protein." Companies arrived in South America to manufacture formula locally in an integrated food and feeding network that became inseparable over time.

Monckeberg reveled in the genius of Chile's marketing and distribution program. He noted that the products were advertised on TV each day, explaining that, "one of the products has a chocolate flavor." The government named one product "Super-child," depicting a healthy comic-book-like super baby and blast of power, and "have nothing about nutrition on them." Chile distributed the state-and-commercial products "free through the health centers where the child is weighed, examined from the medical point of view or vaccinated. Then the mother received 3 boxes per child." Thus, the state

contributed to diminishing breastfeeding, and convinced its citizen-mothers to use supplemental foods for its growing children.

Chile aspired to monitor who actually used the food products it provided through the health services. The problem for the state and its resource distribution arose because mothers only consumed 30% of the free milk for themselves. Most Chilean mothers took the state's milk and circulated it throughout her community: as conceived by the state, the Chilean Mom used "her milk for the whole, sharing the rest with the whole family." But Monckeberg hoped that infant mortality would decline and overall life expectancies rise, while citizens used state foods properly. Thus, the health service monitored bodies, and bodily fluids. "The technique that we use to trace consumption is by adding xylose to this product." A kind of sugar, xylose is not metabolized, thus, "by obtaining a urine sample from family members, we know exactly who is drinking the product that we've distributed." These survival scientists working with concepts of order analyzed "food habits during pregnancy" and marketed their public-private commodities to various members of the household.⁶³ No investigative body - not Congress, not consumer groups and not the UN - could keep up with these fast-moving complexities within global food systems.

In seeking total health, Chile created a pathological other, a sick child, an image of a sick economy, and the illnesses that resulted from the opposite of growth. Chilean health professionals and economists monitored and quantified within the "econometrics of suffering" unhealthy children and infants.⁶⁴ The nutrition experts concerned with the

⁶³ Monckeberg, Kennedy Hearing, 303.

⁶⁴ For detailed studies of and within the "econometrics of suffering," see Alan Berg, The Nutrition Factor: Its Role in National Development, Washington: Brookings Institution, 1973; Alan Berg

nation's children - its prized national resource - located malnourished infants, took them out of expensive pediatric hospitals and placed them in "centers" that provided treatment for severe illness due to malnutrition. The state numbered weight deficits and height shortfalls and "psychomotor development quotient," and developed a state-private program for saving these children.⁶⁵ Creating healthy children and rehabilitating families contributed to national growth. Chile also addressed the context beyond malnutrition, the "whole environment of misery and poverty which produces the damage."⁶⁶ Chile proved to be an important illustration of the political economy of bodily and national health, and showed the kinds of conversations nations were having about nutrition, growth and national health. But boycott activists in the U.S. and some health experts dismissed Monckeberg as a pro-business bureaucrat who answered local health problems with

and World Bank, Malnourished People: a Policy View, Poverty and Basic Needs Series, Washington, DC (1818 H. St., N.W., Washington 20433): World Bank, 1981; Alok Bhargava, Food, Economics, and Health (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Bhargava and Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy (World Health Organization), Modeling the Effects of Health on Economic Growth (World Health Organization, 2000). Note the WHO's involvement, within the UN System, for studying and trying to produce knowledge about health and bodily growth for bodies, and health and bodily growth for economies, and all of this for national growth. Of course, with the critics of "growth" in the 1970s and 1980s, some learned that growth was never a halcyon for the species or the planet. Further, simply ask: Why the constant emphasis on economic and national growth, on corporate growth, and how do these, in the cumulative, contribute to an idea -- at the very least an idea -- of species growth and the impulses of an organism working far beyond any ineffectual or theoretical realm. See Devi Sridhar, Devi, "Economic Ideology and Politics in the World Bank: Defining Hunger," New Political Economy 12, no. 4 (2007): 499–516. While on this subject, note John Searle, Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010, and his The Construction of Social Reality, (New York: Free Press, 1995), which outline the vital role of language in our construction of institutions and thus our societies. See too his critique of a "universal" human rights, which complicates much of the thinking and movements coming out of the 1970s, even though their language, rhetoric and writing -- their activisms and their practices, constituted the shifting, contingent global social world.

⁶⁵ Monckeberg testimony, Kennedy Hearing, 307.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 317.

market solutions, thereby perpetuating the problems of corporate marketing and malnutrition.

Critics of Chile's feeding schemes arose out of the Kennedy Hearing and included nutrition authorities who supported a socialist distribution of wealth and resources. According to the Journal of Tropical Pediatrics, one expert argued that food distribution did not answer poverty and economic inequality. A researcher of "the political economy of malnutrition" condemned such food distribution schemes, noting that they "generally assist only a small proportion of the malnourished" and "divert attention from basic problems of insufficient income and food." The political economy of malnutrition, of water resources, of the entire "world food crisis" more generally, took place within the context of a mostly unquestioned neoliberalism. The answers to most problems came with a market and private enterprise understanding of politics and economics, of the health of nations.

Even with state-assisted food programs, poor malnourished human beings often lacked access to essential nutrients for growth and development. Surveys with medical and health professionals showed that the continued programs "did not readily translate into an improvement in the situation of the country's most nutritionally vulnerable groups. The primary beneficiaries of expanded health services and nutrition programs, like other social welfare measures, were public and other white-collar employees and organized sectors of the working class, who comprised the principal constituencies of Chile's political parties."⁶⁷ According to international nutrition experts at MIT, mostly the "urban and rural poor who lacked political representation" bore the costs of nutritional

⁶⁷ Hakim and Solimano, Kennedy Hearing, 384-85.

intervention and received little of its benefits. Corporations often argued that state intervention never worked, and claimed that their penetration of regions and bodies offered a more efficient solution to growth. Even Allende could not manage effective wealth redistribution. "Sharp disparities of income and wealth among social classes," and thus health inequalities, "with a large segment of the population living at or near subsistence levels," presented the reality on the ground in Chile and most of the Third World.

For most of the world, then, wealth equaled health.⁶⁸ "The milk program may have contributed to some improvement of nutritional standards in Chile and certainly led to heightened attention of nutrition in the practice of health care. Malnutrition, however, has remained a feature of Chile's social order reflecting the persistence of certain pattern of distribution, consumption, and production - patterns which have been reinforced, with few exceptions, by the country's strategies of economic development." Arguments persisted about the politics of wealth and health with little consensus about how to solve these problems. Political struggle increasingly took place beyond the local, and into transnational arenas. The capitalists who contributed to health and wealth contained most of the activist impulses, and created the technologies of globalization.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ In addition to this portrait of Chile's understanding of growing healthy national babies and tensions between health and wealth, please digest Meredith Fort et al., Sickness and Wealth: The Corporate Assault on Global Health, (Cambridge, Mass: South End Press, 2004).

⁶⁹ In addition to Alan Berg's The Nutrition Factor, noted elsewhere, see similar contemporaneous sources within the realms of growth from bodies to whole economies: UN Economic and Social Council, "General Progress Report of the Executive Director; Part II: Programme Progress and Trends," E/ICEF/616 (Part II) (March 1, 1972); Nevin S. Scrimshaw, "Myths and Realities in International Growth and Planning," American Journal of Public Health, August 1974; UNICEF, "Supplementary Feeding Programmes for Mothers and Young Children," E/ICEF/CRP/72-11 (March 14, 1972); John W. Mellor, "Nutrition and economic Growth," In Alan Berg, Nevin

Regulating Global Corporate Capitalism: To the World Health Organization

The Kennedy subcommittee hearings on the marketing and promotion of infant formula in the developing nations, convened by Senator Edward Kennedy in May 1978, encompassed most of the major players, ideas, problems, and potential solutions to the infant formula issue. Those assembled to testify favored the activist position, or as scholar Lisa Newton termed the "Jelliffe Scenario." Companies presented their ideas about infant foods, free market capitalism, food distribution, saving lives, and tempering scarcity. Industry testimonies painted a capitalist vision of a one world, governed by the logic of constant growth. Developing babies linked to developing countries and to growing economies across the globe. And when one studies corporate and activists rhetorical and affective positions, they explicitly demonstrate competing views about how to save the planet.

Different constituencies brought their agendas to the hearings. The companies wanted to be left alone, to 1) continue with their business and their own health and survival, and 2) police themselves. Kennedy began with the "human tragedy": "The Bengali poet Tagore wrote that 'every child comes with the message that God is not yet discouraged of man.' Yet in one nation in Latin America, 80 percent of all deaths are accounted for by children under 5 years of age."⁷⁰ Kennedy spoke of the care of bodies,

Scrimshaw, and David Call, eds., Nutrition, National Development and Planning (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1973) among a host of others.

⁷⁰ United States. Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations, 1978: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, Ninety-fifth Congress, second Session ... May 23, 1978. Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off, 1978, Kennedy opening statement. The hearings and published reports, expert evidence and corporate defense, collected into 1500 pages. They

with a conception of huge numbers and a big problem across a major unit of analysis: hundreds of millions of people, and "the world." "It is astonishing," Kennedy continued, "that one-fourth of the people on this earth - 1 billion men, women and children - have no access to any health care whatsoever." He framed global health as a major American concern.

Kennedy established the governing liberal thesis: formula was dangerous and could kill babies. "Can a product which requires clean water, good sanitation, adequate family income, and a literate parent to follow printed instructions be properly and safely used in areas where water is contaminated, sewage runs in the streets, poverty is severe and illiteracy is high?" And importantly, "whose responsibility is it to see that the products are properly used - the manufacturer, the health professionals, or the government involved? Whose responsibility is it to control the advertising, marketing and promotional activities which, in and of themselves, may create a market in spite of public health considerations? ... When economic incentive are in conflict with public health requirements, how shall that conflict be resolved?"⁷¹ The problem stated was massive, and the fault lay not with any one side.

Kennedy's first expert testimonials came from anti-formula health professionals from Jamaica and the Philippines. Babies in "modern" hospital settings, with the rise of male doctors and decline in women's choices, the increased medicalization of birth and early feeding, were taken from their mothers right after birth. Fundamentally, removal

included infant mortality rates from every region on the planet, divided by prominent countries, from the 1920s through 1976. Without a doubt, and challenged by no one, mortality rates declined during the century. Many supporters of capitalism attributed this success to free movement of ideas and goods, and to wealth creation. Growth and improvement won the day, the century, and humanity for many observers and theorists.

⁷¹ Kennedy opening statement, 1978, 2.

contributed to declining breastfeeding rates. Dr. Navidad Clavano, "an eminent pediatrician and head of pediatric development" in the Philippines, substantiated the main points of Jelliffe's central critique. He noted "the havoc that bottle feeding creates" in the clinics, and in a working paper covering 10,000 infants from 1970 to 1976, pointed out the sharp declines in breastfeeding in his country. He tried to overcome baby separation by bringing "babies back to their mothers."⁷²

But Dr. Clavano explained the difficulties of bringing babies back to mom, and testified about the condition on the ground in the Philippines. He noted that "it is the sort of system wherein we health workers know the economic problems, and yet we cannot seem to cover all the ground in implementing . . . breast feeding. So, from the very start, babies are separated from their mothers at the hospital and are mostly started on bottle feeding." Added to real poverty and hunger, high infant mortality, unsanitary conditions, actual illiteracy, and the lure of modern advertising, the Jelliffe Scenario made sense for many experts, observers, mothers and consumer groups.

The fight to save individual babies encompassed the social, political and economic struggle of healing the sick and feeding the hungry. Churches led the way, both paternalistically and benevolently, civilizing, according to their practice, the entire world, while creating norms of action and health. Church groups labored front and center, on the ground in Third World settings, in disaster relief, in the dirt and grit of helping the poor in barrios, favelas, and slums. Missions engaged the work of salvation -- saving bodies, and souls. Mission nurses and parish priests testified before the Kennedy subcommittee

⁷² United States. Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations, 1978: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, Ninety-fifth Congress, second Session ... May 23, 1978. Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off, 1978, 8-10.

about their work in the field: in Jamaica, Venezuela, Malaysia and the Philippines; in South Africa, Kenya, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Egypt, Ethiopia; in Los Angeles and Detroit; in Chile, Guatemala, in Cuba, Haiti; in Yemen, Mexico City, Bangladesh, and India; in transnational refugee settings and disaster relief.

Churches and missions worked on the ideological, intellectual, and practical sides of the struggle. One priest, who operated for more than a decade in Caracas, testified that direct media advertising did in fact affect people in his community. He stated, "if you go anywhere in my parish, if you go into a pharmacy or into a grocery store, you see these infant formula products, particularly the products of Nestlé and Wyeth, who are the biggest sellers there, which are right up front and center on the shelf." Most missionary workers were concerned for the lives of real babies, and not schooled in the terms of leftist consumer propaganda, and his statement represented the actual interpretation of real people on the ground in the Third World. Church people argued strenuously, engaged politically, and acted on the politics of breastfeeding, of saving babies, of healing the sick.

Images of dead babies, coupled with the initial inadequacy of company responses, drove much of the activism against corporations such as Nestlé. In Hospital de Ninos, the Caracas children's hospital, a priest noted "one of the saddest scenes I have ever seen," providing a visual that must have affected the senators, including Orin Hatch, Republican Senator from Utah, demonstrably concerned about family values and a supporter of the free market system.⁷³ Inside the maternity ward, the priest observed, "there were 58 babies, 53 of whom had diarrhea. Of the 53 babies who were there, all were bottle fed,

⁷³ Kennedy Hearing, Venezuela priest, 15 .

although the hospital does not know which formula they are taking. The doctor checked the records, and all had been bottle fed."⁷⁴ In "Bottle Babies," Peter Krieg showed a baby receiving an intravenous injection with a needle slowly driven into the baby's head. The priest from Caracas described a similar scene: "Three of the babies are receiving intravenous feeding which . . . in babies, they receive through the head." The formula companies countered that such images relied on the politics of emotionalism and lack of proper information.

Not simply photographs of malnourished African babies drove consumer ire against the companies: real people, acting out their social roles as doctor, nurse or priest, regularly witnessed famine, morbidity and mortality. In one dramatic moment during the hearing, Reverend Daniel Driscoll of Kentucky observed what he termed the well-meaning but misinformed actions of an indigenous nurse working in a maternity ward. He told her that he was there to observe babies and formula, and she replied, "last week [the company] came and gave me a whole box full [of formula], 24 cans." The Reverend said that "she was not a greedy person, but . . . she was a poor person." And poor people, by this interpretation, were vulnerable to modern influence and the commodity fetishism of bottles, teats and scientifically formulated food engineered in laboratories, proven to be effective. In these settings, with free canisters, baby beds, and other necessary materials provided by private corporations, notions of "modernity" influenced ordinary people working under severe conditions.

Ready-to-Feed Democracy: Congress and the Infant Formula Act

⁷⁴ Navidad Clavano testimony, Kennedy Hearing, 15.

Politicians in the United States directed significant cultural and political attention to the infant formula problem in 1979 and 1980, providing important confirmation for the boycotters. In the autumn of 1979, contamination in Syntex formula contributed to infant sickness, including "symptoms of hypochloremic and metabolic alkalosis," a pH imbalance that can cause vomiting, lethargy and decreased growth. This corporate production of pathology led some congressmen to draft bills that focused on quality control, and not marketing and promotion, or price fixing within the industry.⁷⁵ In November 1979, Representative Albert Gore, Jr. (D-TN) introduced the Infant Formula Act (H.R. 5836) to create "guidelines for the manufacture of infant formulas."⁷⁶ Gore and his wife, Tipper, active professional parents, fed Neo-Mull-Soy to their own baby.⁷⁷ The Infant Formula Act was approved in 1980 and signed by President Jimmy Carter, claiming that the "Federal Government and the private sector [would] meet their

⁷⁵ See "Infant Formula Bill Introduced in the U.S. Congress," INFACT Update, January 1980, p. 2, Tamiment Collection, INFACT Folder. See H.R. 5836, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to "amend the Federal food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require infant formulas to provide certain nutrient levels and to require seizure actions to be instituted against an adulterated infant formula if the manufacturer has not initiated a satisfactory recall." This bill gave federal officials power to recall products on its own initiative. This bill, like the Harkin Bill noted below, utilized the precautionary principle, where the onus rested on companies rather than affected consumers to prove safety, danger, or compliance.

⁷⁶ In 1982, Wyeth Laboratories recalled over two million cans of formula because it lacked enough vitamin B6, which is a vital nutrient for growing infants, according to the Food and Drug Administration and the New York Times. Absence of vitamin B6 can lead to nausea, convulsions and in serious cases, cerebral palsy and retardation. See "Wyeth Expands Recall of Defective Baby Formula," New York Times, March 13, 1982, 8, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Many infants became sick with the deficient Syntex formula in 1979, and the National Institutes of Health, along with the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), monitored their health for at least five years. See Randal D. Shields, "Food and Drug Law: The Infant Formula Act of 1980," Akron Law Review 15, No.4, (Spring, 1982): 752-770; see also Infant Formula Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 96th Congress, 1st Session, (1979).

⁷⁷ Susan Okie, "How Two Angry Mothers Beat Uncle Same at His Own Game," The Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1980, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, A3.

responsibilities" in feeding the nation's children, the country's "most important resource for the future."⁷⁸ The law mandated that the formula industry monitor and test its products, both during manufacture and after delivery, to ensure that required nutrients remained during the product's shelf life. Each manufacturer had to identify packaging location and date, and notify the government before new products were prepared for market.

Implementation of the law faced delays for several years. Many criticized the FDA for the lag; some blamed the Reagan Administration. According to the television show 20/20 in March 1980, and the Washington Post that December, Syntex, a Panamanian company with plants in the U.S., had to contend with lawsuits totaling more than three billion dollars. By 1982, Syntex no longer made infant formula.⁷⁹ Carol Laskin and Lynne Pilot, mothers of babies whose consumption of formula resulted in serious nutritional deficits that impacted their development, fought for amendments to strengthen

⁷⁸ See Jimmy Carter: "Infant Formula Act of 1980 Statement on Signing H.R. 6940 Into Law.," September 26, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=45151>, (accessed March 14, 2014).

⁷⁹ "Baby-Formula Rules Issued," New York Times, April 6, 1982, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, C8. There were amendments to the Act passed in 1986. The FDA mentioned the need for proper nutrition for the "growth and development of infants," and stated that "in passing the 1980 Infant Formula Act and its 1986 amendments, Congress recognized infant formulas as a special category of foods that, because there is no margin for error in ensuring the healthy growth and development of infants, requires more regulation than other types of foods." Al Gore and other congressmen reiterated this interpretation. See "Briefing Materials: Food Advisory Committee Meeting on Infant Formula," Food and Drug Administration, at http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/02/briefing/3852b1_01.htm (accessed March 10, 2014). The offending Syntex Corporation produced pharmaceuticals and chemicals throughout the world and only entered the formula business when it bought the Borden Company formula line in 1971. Randal D. Shields, "Food and Drug Law: The Infant Formula Act of 1980," Akron Law Review 15, No.4, (Spring, 1982), 753.

inadequacies in the law.⁸⁰ Al and Tipper Gore saw a television program about the deficient formula, which "inflamed" Gore.⁸¹ Soon after, Wyeth was forced to recall three million canisters of formula for vitamin deficiencies. After public outcries resulting from the television program, Laskin's and Pilot's political organizing, and the backing of senators Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio) and Gore, amendments in 1986 managed to give the FDA more powers to intervene in manufacturers' activities.⁸²

The Syntex case showed many critics just what they could expect from the Reagan Administration on matters of corporate culpability. Reagan's deregulation agenda within the U.S. was also a global one, as we will see in Chapter 5 on the WHO Code voting process; the infant formula controversy was an early indication of growing neoliberal trends. Senators Gore and Metzenbaum, among many other Democrats, criticized the government for not utilizing the regulatory teeth in the Infant Formula Act. Additionally, the FDA "strongly recommended criminal prosecution" of Syntex.⁸³ As it

⁸⁰ See Gore Hearings, Infant Formula Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 96th Congress, 1st Session, (1979); and Susan Okie "Baby-Formula Rules Foster Long Struggle: Consumer Group Takes on FDA, Industry," Washington Post, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, Feb. 20, 1986, A17; Randal D. Shields, "Food and Drug Law: The Infant Formula Act of 1980," Akron Law Review 15, No.4, (Spring, 1982): 752-770.

⁸¹ Susan Okie, "How Two Angry Mothers Beat Uncle Same at His Own Game," The Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1980, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, A3.

⁸² Journalist Susan Okie, writing in The Washington Post, lauded Lynne Pilot and Carol Laskin and how "the ordinary citizen, without funding or clout, could manipulate Washington to achieve something worthwhile." The same might be said for the ordinary mothers fighting established power during the entire baby food controversy. But Okie also noted how Laskin and Pilot, middle class women with access to centers of power in Washington, were not so ordinary. Susan Okie, "How Two Angry Mothers Beat Uncle Same at His Own Game," The Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1980, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, A3.

⁸³ Philip Shenon, "Agencies Split in Baby-Formula Case," New York Times, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, Sept. 24, 1985, A28. For an excellent discussion of the legal implications and litigious possibilities in the Syntex case and the Infant Formula Act, see Randal Shields, "Food and Drug Law," (1982).

was, the company settled close to 200 individual lawsuits against it. Proving that formula canisters lacked specific nutrients was easy. Establishing causation in baby sickness, especially when that infirmity might not manifest until later, was extremely difficult. Ordinary people and families had to establish that their illnesses arose from company negligence. Because of this difficulty, the Justice Department did not follow the FDA's recommendations. Democrats in both houses joined a chorus of criticisms against the Reagan Administration's "handling of corporate crime." The Senate Judiciary Committee also looked into Reagan's inaction in other cases of "corporate misconduct." Syntex announced that the company cared about the health of infants who consumed its formulas, but that it planned to "vigorously" defend itself against unwarranted attack.

The Kennedy hearings on infant formula had focused on formula companies' activities in the Third World, but similar problems existed in impoverished areas of the United States.⁸⁴ Congressman Ron Dellums (D-CA) initiated research showing that poor people in Detroit, Cleveland, and Los Angeles experienced the same problems that doctors and activists saw in the Third World.⁸⁵ Dr. Derrick Jelliffe testified on American

⁸⁴ Interested institutions included the Department of Agriculture, the Surgeon General (and a his workshop on maternal and infant health), the Department of Health and Human Services, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Food and Consumer Services, Human Nutrition Center, U.S. Nutrition Center, the National Academy of Sciences, Food and Consumer Services of the FDA, Congress, states, and municipalities.

⁸⁵ See U.S. Congress, "Infant Feeding Practices: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition Committee of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 97th Congress, First Session, June 22 1981. The healthy state of humankind converged with the creation of the Third World within concerns about war refugees hoping to enter the U.S., and the poor living in American cities. As the U.S. constructed a racialized state (see Mae Ngai) and a straight state (Margot Canaday), not to mention reified gender categories through various institutions, including the law, the American state conceived of a healthy individual entering a healthy society, one growing and productive. These refugee bodies from Vietnam after the war, and poor migrant workers in Los Angeles, and African Americans living in Detroit or Cleveland, required expert advice and government education in order to properly feed their babies, conceive of survival strategies, and exist at all in a free market society.

poverty and infant mortality.⁸⁶ Dellums' team "visited six inner city areas, two farmworker communities and two Indian reservations."⁸⁷ On one reservation, "not all families on the reservation are hooked up to piped-in water" - the principal problem in slums and impoverished regions around the world. The researchers found that "about 90% of the children who were seen at the clinics had problems with diarrhea, colds, pneumonia and intestinal blockages. About 95% of the mothers were bottle feeding." The formula, food and pharmaceutical companies argued that unsanitary conditions, polluted water, and illiteracy were not their responsibility.

Aiming to restrain corporate invasions of individual bodies and the planetary body, congressional Democrats continued to offer regulatory roadblocks. The Dellums bill, (H.R. 4093), created to "regulate the sale, distribution, and export of infant formula in and to developing countries, and for other purposes," was referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the 96th Congress. The bill called on the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to publish a list of the developing countries to which the Act would apply. More, it called on the Secretary of State to help make the list, based on countries that participated in foreign aid with the U.S. In this way, the Act would regulate formula companies doing business in developing countries that

But participants, health professionals and policymakers visualized health norms for poor mothers in urban ghettos and war refugees streaming into the U.S. during the Vietnam War moment.

⁸⁶ One Dr. George Lythcott argued that proper investments in maternal and infant health would "return more to the Nation than their cost." In "Infant Feeding Practices," U.S. Congress, p. 2. Government programs, especially through Women, Infants and Children (WIC), distributed "commercially prepared materials" to cities and regions throughout the United States, 21.

⁸⁷ Andrew Chetley, The Baby Killer Scandal: A War on Want investigation into the promotion and sale of powdered baby milks in the Third World, (London, 1979), 152-53. See his later popularly-published book on the subject, Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods: Successful Challenges to an International Marketing Strategy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986).

accepted U.S. Foreign aid.⁸⁸ The bill sought to forbid any person or company from selling formula in developing countries unless licensed by the United States. The U.S. government, through the FTC, would control entrance to foreign markets, and determine "specified income groups" that companies could access. Food and pharmaceutical firms needed to complete an "application for eligibility" for ingress to impoverished regions. Applicants were to be denied market access by the FTC if: one, they did not specify the incomes groups to be targeted; two, failed "to specify the literacy levels of such groups"; three, failed to provide assurances that the formula sold actually went to those consumer and not to third or fourth party sellers and consumers (which happened all the time in places like Bogota); four, if companies failed to prove that formula products would not or did not contribute to infant morbidity or mortality.⁸⁹

As powerful as multinationals became, this document may seem silly at first glance. But in fact, members of Congress took the issues seriously at the time. Hoping to assuage American formula companies, Dellums asserted that regulation would benefit them in the global marketplace. In his newsletter prepared by staff members, Dellums associated formula marketing with worldwide declines of breastfeeding.⁹⁰ These types of associations, and this kind of regulatory action, alarmed industry and incited the companies to emergency action. However, companies that "voluntarily modified their practices" remained at a "competitive disadvantage," so long as other companies ignored

⁸⁸ Section Three, Dellums Bill (H.R. 4093), "the Infant Formula Act of 1979."

⁸⁹ Dellums Bill, Section 5(b)(1)(A)(i)(ii).

⁹⁰ See Ron Dellums, "News & Views from Ron Dellums of California," May 15, 1979. Action for Corporate Accountability Collection (ACA), United States Government Files, 1976-1994, Legislation Files, Box 3, MHS.

voluntary self-regulation. "Uniform regulation" for the entire industry would solve this problem.⁹¹

The U.S. companies did not agree. INFACT circulated a press release announcing the bill.⁹² The group identified the bill's co-sponsors, and immediately began conversations on strategy to help get it passed. Mead Johnson responded to the bill, too, and wrote Dellums with their concerns. Mead Johnson had tried to meet with congressional leaders before the introduction of the bill.⁹³ The company viewed the proposed legislation with "great concern," and noted that Third World feeding issues were far more complicated than bills coming out of Congress could address. The company worked to "formulate policies and programs" which understood and responsibly engaged "conditions in developing countries." Their products, especially after the fifth and sixth month, were an improvement on "inferior alternatives" traditionally employed by locals, such as "flour paps" and "rice water." Republican congressmen supported this position, and began telling letter-writers and petitioners that the UN would deal with the issue, and congress would wait for an official word.

In 1981, Tom Harken (D-Iowa) introduced a bill (H.R. 4535) to stop marketing abuses. His efforts aimed at the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, hoping to "deny any deduction or credit" to companies that refused to abide by the WHO Code, which

⁹¹ Ron Dellums, "News & Views," 1.

⁹² Tim Atwater, Washington INFACT, "To People Interested in the Infant Formula Malnutrition Problem," May 16, 1979. ACA Collection, Box 3. MHS.

⁹³ Mead Johnson, Office of the Vice President, "Letter to the Honorable Ronald V. Dellums," July 3, 1979, ACA Collection, Box 3, MHS.

included the American companies.⁹⁴ This infringement on free enterprise included foreign tax credits that American subsidiaries garnered. One selling point for the bill rested on increased revenue for the government during stark economic times, especially as multinationals appeared to be increasing their wealth at the expense of Third World infants. There should be no more "massive corporate tax cuts" and no more "tax write-offs for deceptive infant formula marketing policies" condemned by the "world's highest health authorities."

Senator Kennedy continued his involvement in the formula issue after his hearings. In June 1981, he added an amendment to the foreign assistance bill (S. 1196) that itself contributed money to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act, raising funds for "development and security assistance programs" the Peace Corps, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, appropriated \$5,000,000 for any developing country that hoped to implement the WHO Code.⁹⁵ The money was an attempt to alleviate the fallout from the U.S. "No Vote" on the WHO Code, detailed in the next chapter.

Just as USAID explored infant feeding in the Third World, the Americans probed their own national feeding practices. Dr. Edward Brandt, Assistant Secretary for Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, testified to Congress's Infant Feeding Practices in the Committee on Agriculture. The state, in this instance, surveyed its population and monitored its babies, with a keen national eye on health and breastfeeding. Brandt declared, "breast-feeding information has recently been added to

⁹⁴ Tom Harkin, Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 97th Congress, First Session 127, No. 124 (Sept. 24, 1981).

⁹⁵ Senator Edward Kennedy, Senate Memo, July 8, 1981. ACA Collection, Box 3, MHS.

the Centers for Disease Control National Nutrition Surveillance System of Youths. The system currently receives information from State health agencies on approximately 850,000 children annually, primarily from high-risk individuals seen in public supported health care facilities. Breast-feeding data from these programs will rapidly increase over the next few years."⁹⁶

If capitalism began at the mother's breast, it also started at the point of conception, and the growing and developing fetus. The administrated society probed the unborn, learned about its abnormalities, and utilized technologies to save the normal baby, the normal family, and the normal, growing economy. On research and development within the state, on which the organization spent \$23 million, Brandt emphasized the vital nature of inquiries on infant health and national health. "The importance of such research can be appreciated even more if we begin to consider that information on the composition of human milk will enable us to formulate products to meet the unique requirements of infants with inborn errors of metabolism and various genetic defects, malformations, handicaps, or conditions that preclude them from breast feeding."⁹⁷ Determining the constitution of human milk drove state and private research and development while the politics of artificial feeding flourished.

The healthy state of America and its surveillance society reached into the pre-born realms of life. Norms, scientific probing, and corporate marketing extended through the mother to the fetus, toward improving the unborn, and providing the information and

⁹⁶ Brandt Testimony, *Infant Feeding Practices*, 35.

⁹⁷ Brandt Testimony, *Infant Feeding Practices*, 33. Commodifying actual breast milk eventually became a reality, with companies encouraging female human mammals to produce milk for sale, with fears of poor women arranged in buildings like so many dairy farms. See Andre Pollack, "New Breast Milk Products Are on the Rise, but Commercialization Troubles Many," *New York Times*, March 20, 2015, <http://nyti.ms/1H9uD9L> (accessed March 20, 2015).

funds necessary for death control. The state explored a fetus for abnormalities, deformations and problems that existed at the site of the potentially healthy newborn, this new object for improvement, and ultimately for its contribution to The Economy. The global economy and the fetus united at the place of information gathering and expert analysis, for improved health, and for submitting to the whole.

The state, like sending out survey teams into a continent, explored its national boundaries and mapped its citizens in utero. Brandt's official testimony in front of the probing body of politicians stated that in "recent years, attempts to determine specific needs relating to the role of nutrition before and immediately after birth led to exploring the environment of the neonate. In order to understand growth and development throughout the life cycle, research studies are underway to more fully explain not only the interactive role of nutrients but also the relationship between parents, particularly the mother, and the newborn."⁹⁸ Perinatal explorations reflected public and private desires to catalogue and define the healthy citizen.

Senator Tom Harkin claimed that the language about breastfeeding in Department handbooks discouraged breastfeeding, that the print and language itself rendered making educated decisions about what sort of feeding method to employ very difficult. He questioned Brandt about a publication called "Breast Feeding," a pamphlet provided to health professionals and mothers. Harkin read that, "most hospitals bring your baby to you 4 to 12 hours after birth. Some hospitals may let you nurse your baby sooner." Harkin countered this normal image of a hospital birth. "Why don't you put in there that

⁹⁸ Brandt Testimony, 33-35.

you, as a mother, have a right to demand that they bring your baby to you immediately after birth to start breast feeding?"⁹⁹

Dr. Vincent Hutchins, a director in the Office of Maternal and Child Health of the Bureau of Community Health Services, answered this query. He explained that a female health professional at the University of Iowa compiled it and La Leche League signed off on it. Harkin was not impressed. "I find it thoroughly unacceptable and I don't care who wrote it. Through it you are saying to the new mothers the hospital can decide for you when you get to see your baby." Not only experts from the corporations, steeped in scientific knowledge and marketing practices, but health bureaucrats from government agencies, the hospitals themselves, and male experts decided how and when women met and fed their babies. Harken, a Democrat, drove home a familiar point, claiming that the agency did not need to spend 23 million dollars to determine that breastfeeding is best.

Senator Harken claimed that he knew why breastfeeding declines occurred all over the world. Mothers chose alternate methods because of the "unconscionable purveying" of such foods and the "insidious invasion of their privacy in hospitals" by formula company invisible hands. He wondered how much a year's worth of formula would cost, "especially for a poor mother, utilizing a public hospital. . . they don't know. They get the free stuff in the hospitals. Then they get a free discharge package when they go home. Then they have to go out and start buying."¹⁰⁰ Ready-to-feed commodities in the market held the system of growth and improvement together, especially as companies controlled the means of reproduction.

⁹⁹ Infant Feeding Practices, 43.

¹⁰⁰ Infant Feeding Practices, 46.

Brandt answered that the nation recognized the problem and labored to address it. Publications such as Promoting Health/Preventing Disease: Objectives for the Nation included statistical targets for the mass population "consistent with national goals set down by the Surgeon General in Healthy People." The Department of Agriculture and the CDC had a strategy to achieve those numbers, especially in poor public hospitals in places like Los Angeles and within the Indian Health Service. The reports included data on Mexican-American populations along the border, for Vietnamese refugees and how health professionals monitored their arrival into the country.¹⁰¹ The healthy state regulated the health of poor mothers and children, and demonstrated the normal control of these bodies. The aftermath of the Vietnam War showed the arc from biopolitics to geopolitics, body movements across borders, and the vision of health within the political economy of national survival.

The biggest business in the world was also national business. Johanna Dwyer of Tufts University outlined the state's interest in maternal and child bodies. Her report, "Unfinished Business: Nutrition Education, Infant Nutrition, and Infant Health Tasks for the Next Decade," employed the dominant discourse of a business society. Business

¹⁰¹ "From the barrio of East Los Angeles to the Native American Reservation, from migrant labor camps to the resettlement sites of Indo-Chinese refugees, health workers are consistently reporting that poor people, particularly those not literate in English, frequently overdilute or underdilute infant formula." The report continued, "This profile of use and misuse translates directly into human suffering and wasted federal dollars." Spending extra money on formula, especially when it was not required, and the health costs of such use led to a calculation of breastfeeding savings. Quantifying illness for the American state included categories such as hospitalization, emergency room visits, outpatient services, and the expense of formula that totaled an estimated \$378,592,000. This accounting reflected an "unnecessary tragedy" and "economic waste." See Angela Glover Blackwell, an attorney with Public Advocates of San Francisco, "Testimony in Behalf of 14 National Organizations, Before the House Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition," pp. 174-180. Some of the fourteen included National Council of Negro Women National Women's Health Network, Women of All Red Nations (WARN), Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the National Council for Jewish Women.

should always play a vital role, and Dwyer believed that "private, public and voluntary sectors can work together to promote the health of America's infants and children."¹⁰² The report utilized similar language for improving infant bodies that capitalists used for improving land, and improving agriculture in order to feed larger populations. Practices of rational improvement included creating precise information in order to solve resource distribution problems. The solution to malnutrition, illness and the global recession was to solve scarcity through growth, provide jobs, and continue expanding the economy. This rhetoric, combined with policy initiatives, economic discourse and health education expressed the trends of total growth and health for all communities and nations.

This language mirrored the expectations of development and modernity itself.¹⁰³

Health professionals, politicians and many capitalists wanted to aid development of bodies and regions within the United States. Many elites saw bringing LDCs into line with modern economies, and the "special needs" children who resided in poverty. Being poor meant being diseased, requiring help from rich experts, and needing to be taught

¹⁰² Johanna Dwyer, testimony and report, "Unfinished Business: Nutrition Education, Infant Nutrition, and Infant Health Tasks for the Next Decade," Frances Stern Nutrition Center, Department of Medicine, Tufts Medical School, in *Infant Feeding Practices*, Hearing Before Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition," 211.

¹⁰³ Please see James Ferguson, Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). Africanists probably do development, development theory and capitalism/neocolonialism the best. For excellent books on modernizing the globe, read Michael Latham, Modernizing as Ideology: American Social Science and 'Nation-Building' and the Third World since 1945 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); David C. Engerman, et al, Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War (University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); David C. Engerman, Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); Fritz Fischer, Making Them Like US: Peace Corp Volunteers in the 1960s (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian, 1998); Elizabeth Borgwardt, A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights (Harvard, 2007); Greg Grandin, Fordlandia: The Rise and Fall of Henry Ford's Forgotten Jungle City (Metropolitan Books, 2009); Matthew Connelly, Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population (Harvard, 2009).

how to breastfeed, use modern survival mechanisms, and exist within the proper conditions outlined by the state. The history of "normal" and statistical categories was not idle wordplay. Scholars have studied these phenomena of mass administration that developed out of the Enlightenment, when statistical organizing of society and the "quantum of health" drove state policies governing their populations, and their ideas of order.¹⁰⁴

The quantum of health and wealth prevailed in the country's highest policy echelons, as the U.S. pushed what historian David Ekbladh called "modernization and the construction of an American world order."¹⁰⁵ Within modernization contexts, the Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) possessed its own science of proper infant feeding and infant survival. Drs. Lewis Barness and Robert Winters noted that the American Academy was founded in the 1930s when doctors supported the Sheppard-Towner Act, which provided "maternal and infant health care in rural areas."¹⁰⁶ Pediatricians at the time recommended nursing, and rooming-in, the opposite of removal practiced by most modern hospitals around the world. And it was a practice that experienced sharp declines after World War II, as the medicalization of childbirth became the norm.

Improved refrigeration and new technologies led to radical declines in infant mortality. This drop in mortality around the world coincided with decisions to forgo breastfeeding. The doctors testified that between 1915 and 1978 infant mortality dropped

¹⁰⁴ See the best example of this scholarship, which also cites important work within the entire conversation, Ian Hacking, The Taming of Chance, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

¹⁰⁵. In addition to the books listed above, you might investigate David Ekbladh, The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

¹⁰⁶. Lewis Barness and Robert Winters, Prepared Statement, Infant Feeding Practices, 150-155.

from 100 deaths per a thousand births to just above ten per a thousand births. At the Children's Nutrition Research Center, Baylor College of Medicine (run by the United States Department of Agriculture), they worked to "define and quantitate" nutritional health in women and infants in the early stages of feeding. The center's mission aimed to "encompasses the nutrient needs of . . . half the population of the United States" and its international impact. "The quantitation of nutrient intake" functioned to investigate growth and development, and the "biochemical standards for nutritional surveillance."¹⁰⁷ Carbon dioxide molecules from an infant's breath, measured by a mass spectrometer, calculated glucose levels and energy use by the infant.¹⁰⁸ Using radioactive isotopes, The Weaning Laboratory worked with the Lactation and Stable Isotopes Laboratories, including the Applied Mathematics Division at Argonne National Laboratory, to study the molecular differences between breastmilk and alternative foods.

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the Department of Agriculture also ran the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) Program and appropriated millions of dollars annually to women's and infant health. This included support for breastfeeding, bottle-feeding and supplements for pregnant women. INFAC¹⁰⁹ monitored the contents of "food packages" for these women.¹⁰⁹ Many groups applied for FNS grants for improving

107. Statement of Dr. Cutberto Garza, Infant Feeding Practices, 63-67.

108. The quantum of health included "the total body water in children. Measuring this body compartment allows us to determine the composition of weight gain. If a child is given a few drops of 'heavy' water to swallow, water in which the heavy form of hydrogen or deuterium makes up 99.9 percent of all hydrogen, the heavy water will be absorbed quickly and carried by the blood to all the tissues in the body. Within minutes, the heavy hydrogen will have penetrated every cell and become distributed uniformly in the body fluids." Body fluids like blood and urine were collected and analyzed.

¹⁰⁹ NGOs monitored the WIC program. But so did formula and grain companies that supplied governments with thousands of pounds of formula. One observer noted that changing sugar

nutrition distribution among women who required assistance.¹¹⁰ These programs came out of the 1966 Child Nutrition Act and amendments in 1978. FNS desired projects to study the feasibility of a Native American Indian State Agency program and ways that WIC might use USDA commodities in their products.

The federal agency USAID shipped tons of infant formula to developing nations, war zones and refugee camps. Industry used the existence of such programs as a defense against what they saw as a one-sided, uninformed boycott of Nestlé products, including coffee and chocolate. Doctors, governments and agencies such as WHO and UNICEF asked companies for formula products and powdered milk, therefore industry felt that attacks against manufacturers were misplaced. David Cox of Abbott/Ross complained, "It seems inappropriate that private industry should be singled out as having the unique responsibility for denying these products to members of low socioeconomic groups." While industry had a point, critics charged that companies marketed their products and created need in places where need did not exist.

WIC was a partial provider, offering supplemental feeding to women in need. A front cover of one WIC brochure depicted a cartoon drawing of smiling mother, infant and child. There was no father in this image, or in the entire booklet. The state became the paternal figure, and counseled gently "WIC is a kind of preventive medicine, like a

amounts in cereals or iron fortification "could dilute General Mills' WIC sales, since half of all the current high-iron" cereals came from that Minneapolis food giant. Food companies remained especially interested in the government's Recommended Daily Allowances (RDA). Community Nutrition Institute, CNI Weekly Report, 9 No. 48 (December, 6 1979).

110. INFACF Memo, "Forthcoming proposed regulations for the WIC food package," and Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Federal Register Notice, "Demonstration and Evaluation Projects for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), ACA Collection, U.S. Government Files, Box 4, MHS.

shot to protect you from getting measles or mumps."¹¹¹ On a page detailing nutrients and outlining the importance of iron in early childhood feeding, the WIC booklet noted, "feeding your baby an iron-fortified formula, such as Similac With Iron . . . will help make your baby strong and healthy." To the ire of many activists and nutritionists, the federal program continued: "if your baby can't drink a formula that contains cow milk, a special feeding like Isomil soy protein formula" exists, and it "has extra iron too and you can get it through WIC."¹¹² American pharmaceutical company Abbott Laboratories manufactured Similac and Isomil.

The healthy state, for all the investigations and concerns evinced during the era, remained a huge purchaser and promoter of artificial baby food supplements. Historian Linda Blum highlighted the "unequal access to breastfeeding" in the U.S. within America's intimate politics; state policies in a free enterprise era offered "inadequate healthcare and maternal-child support," lack of day care or options for working mothers who desired to breastfeed at work.¹¹³ But the government was "a major promoter of artificial breast milk." According to Blum, the WIC purchased around \$500 million annually of artificial baby foods, aiming to supplement family nutritional requirements. The WIC distributed "free formula for a child's first year" and gave food vouchers to women who chose to breastfeed, although only 34% of WIC mothers chose natural feeding. In Washington D.C., 26% of WIC mothers breastfed their infants, and in Detroit the rate was "as low as 4 percent." Contradictions persisted between large institutional desires to understand growing national babies inside the complicated, shifting vortex

¹¹¹ Women, Infants and Children, "What Is WIC?,"

¹¹² WIC "What Is WIC?" 5.

¹¹³ Linda Blum, 299.

between mother and infant, private bodies and private enterprises, while attempting to contrive a system of global regulation for multinational corporations.

Many scholars, policymakers, and lawyers expressed interest in the transnational nature of corporations and their potential regulation during the era. Law journals regularly queried the legal implications of formula and regulating potentially harmful products across national boundaries. Exploring the literature of the multinational moment demonstrated the flood of interest and resulting print matter, within and beyond the United States. The law, according to political scientist Sol Picciotto, expressed the current hegemony best, and reflected how the international system worked.¹¹⁴ Young lawyers and legal scholars wrote many hundreds of articles about MNCs during the era, following their social science and humanities counterparts.¹¹⁵ Governments in developing

¹¹⁴ Sol Picciotto used the phrase "regulating global corporate capitalism" in the title of his recent book. See Picciotto, Regulating Global Corporate Capitalism. International Corporate Law and Financial Market Regulation, (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), especially Chapter 4, "Transnational Corporations, Groups and Networks," 133-141 and Chapter 5, "Hyper-Liberalization and Globalized Regulation," especially the section on social responsibility campaigns and codes, 193-199. Picciotto noted that "the sudden emergence of corporate codes in the mid-1990s took many by surprise and raised new questions for both critics and defenders of big business," which included the benefits contained within "the mantra of liberalization," in which profit and expanding markets would lead to "economic growth and social development." This proliferation of codes amounted to 246 codes in a 2000 OECD study. Picciotto documents IBFAN and Nestlé, and also more recent actions against Royal Dutch Shell when the company sunk a tapped-out oil platform in the North Sea. He also mentioned the debate about the "global citizenship" for TNCs that surfaced in the 1970s, and included the International Labour Organization (ILO) Tripartite Declaration in 1977, the 1976 Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises that came out of the OECD, and the "aborted" UN Code of Conduct for TNCs, that led to the UN Commission on TNCs.

¹¹⁵ See Influencing Multinational Corporations: The Infant Formula Marketing Controversy, 10 NYU Journal of International Law and Politics, 125, (1977); Spilled Milk: A Rebuttal to the United States Vote Against the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes, 2 B.U. International Law Journal 103 (1983); Innocents Abroad: Infant Food Technology at the Law's Frontier, 20 Va Journal of International Law 617 (1980); The Implementation Process of the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes, 11 Syracuse Journal of International Law and Com. (communication?), 161 (1984); also Nancy Ellen Zelman, "The Nestlé Infant

nations, along with the rapidly expanding panoply of activist networks, felt the need for regulation, responsibility, and legal accountability - especially after disasters from World War II to Bhopal.¹¹⁶ Environmentalism, broad ideas of health and survival, and even personal dignity, demanded a renewed focus on the roles of corporations within a growing awareness of global capitalism.¹¹⁷

The Church and Kennedy senate hearings produced fascinating information on the working of global business enterprises and national security. But the hearings did not lead to any regulations, merely suggestions. Kennedy, after meeting with business leaders from the formula industry, realized that the global aspect of the controversy had to shift to the WHO, while Congress would deal with domestic formula issues, including price collusion by the American companies. The story shifted to Geneva and the formation of the WHO International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes, which is the subject of the next chapter.

Formula Controversy: Restricting the Marketing Practices of Multinational Corporations in the Third World," *The Transnational Lawyer* 3 (1990): 697-758.

¹¹⁶ See Elizabeth Borgwardt, "Bernath Lecture: Commerce and Complicity: Corporate Responsibility for Human Rights Abuses as a Legacy of Nuremberg," *Diplomatic History* 34, No. 4 (September 2010): 637-640.

¹¹⁷ Of the many hundreds of codes, declarations and guidelines for MNC conduct around the world, see the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) "Declaration on International Investment and Multinational Enterprises," adopted on June 21, 1976, and successive updates. These guidelines, according to their intent, were supposed to "provide a robust set of recommendations for responsible corporate behavior worldwide consistent with existing legislation," at Investment Instruments Online, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), IIA Compendium, <http://unctad.org/sections/dite/ia/docs/Compendium/en/145%20volume%206.pdf> (accessed January 28, 2014) These guidelines were voluntary and non-binding. For a complete list and access to the documents of codes and guidelines, refer to UNCTAD, International Investments, <http://www.unctadxi.org/templates/DocSearch.aspx?id=780> (accessed January 22, 2014).

CHAPTER FIVE

What is World Health? The WHO International Code

*"In the long run, no code of good behavior by corporations, no prohibition of advertising or any other cosmetic measures will prevent the shedding of blood in the dealings of the profit maximizers."*¹

The creation of the WHO International Code in Geneva in 1980-81 included intense conflict and compromise over specific language. The argument occurred between a global class of experts – educated activists, health professionals, international organizations, and capitalists – without the presence of ordinary mothers and children. The political site of a mother's body and her feeding baby existed at the center of a global political economic effort to craft nutrition and marketing guidelines for feeding children everywhere.

These regulatory efforts were top-down, and included efforts to regulate marketing, health and infant feeding. In the process, ideas of world health became reified in practice, and a universal vision of health and growth was offered within the World Health Organization, where the phrase "the biggest business in the world" originated in the 1950s. This moment co-existed with the beginning of the Reagan Administration, and the shift from the NIEO's anticolonial worldview of cooperation, to what we now know

¹Peter Krieg, Bottle Babies, "In Defence of Intolerance," Epilogue, in Jane Cottingham Bottle Babies: A Guide to the Baby Foods Issue, (Rome: ISIS- Women's International Information and Communication Service, 1976), 35.

as neoliberalism: an emphasis on market answers to global questions, support for free enterprise, and a shift to industry presence in the making of global health policy.

The chapter begins with the immediate process of drafting the Code, moves to feminist and industry critiques of these efforts, explains the American vote against the Code, and ends with conclusions about the entire controversy. Most important, the chapter uncovers how food and pharmaceutical companies insinuated themselves within the UN system: acting as NGOs themselves in the formation of policies, and working to avoid regulations by pushing for mere recommendations. The Code established the legitimacy of corporate presence within official proceedings in places like Geneva; but also, and most important, industry's legitimate role in two vital places: in Third World markets, and the negotiated, contentious space between mothers and infants.

For many critics of industry, the Code existed as a pivot between community ideas over health and private ones, between anti-colonialism and neocolonialism. In many ways, the Code was the end of a long story. But it was also the beginning of another one – of world health and growth representing a corporate paradigm, with the commodification of life itself a distinctive reality rather than a fanciful idea. Explorations of what multinational capitalism might be, and what it became, arose from these global baby food politics in the 1970s and 1980s.

Exploring this issue through a longue duree framing, we begin to see that the ascendance of capitalism historically, the vital material reality of an expanding population, and the need for mass administration encompassed most of these unique and divergent approaches. In other words, "scientific motherhood" was a product of incorporation writ large – the desire for proper health, productivity, and technological

advancement. These moves toward socialization and proper health, of course, were challenged and still are. As the Nestlé boycott showed in the end, most challenges, including radical ones, have become subsumed by the larger impulses of administration – whether communist, capitalist or anything in between.

Global to Local: Inside Geneva and the Path to the International Code

Edward Baer, an infant feeding activist and co-director of the Infant Formula Program at ICCR, claimed, "the debate over the code at the May 1981 World Health Assembly was one of the most dramatic moments in the history of international health policy."² The breastfeeding versus artificial-feeding debate heated up in the 1970s, as biopolitics and geopolitics became more complicated, explicitly interwoven, and possessing much larger scales. In 1970 the Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO) and UNICEF focused on "questionable marketing practices" in the Caribbean and Latin America. In 1974, the WHA passed resolution WHA27.43, which denounced promotional techniques that encouraged the use of breastmilk substitutes, and the decline of breastfeeding "related to socio-cultural and environmental factors." Additionally, the resolution addressed "the mistaken ideas caused by misleading sales promotion that breast-feeding is inferior to feeding with manufactured breast-milk substitutes," and asked member states to look at the problem in their own countries and pass regulations on advertising. In 1978, the organization passed WHA31.47, which urged member states to promote breast-feeding, discourage and "regulate 'inappropriate sales promotion of infant foods that can be used to replace breast

² Edward Baer, "An Update on the Infant Formula Controversy," Studies in Family Planning 14, No. 4 (April, 1983): 119-122.

milk."³ Nations themselves should pass codes, limit advertising and pass legislation to curb marketing excesses.

WHO passed mostly guidelines and was never politically forceful. One activist inside the Joint WHO/UNICEF Meeting on Infant and Young Child Feeding of 1979, Andy Chetley, approached the 1974 and 1978 WHA resolutions from the perspective of the WHO's relatively weak position as a player in "the realm of global politics."⁴ The resolutions supporting breastfeeding had contained strong language, and demonstrated the need for increased breastfeeding in developing and developed countries, but contained zero enforcement mechanisms. The "bitter negotiations" during the marketing and promotion of infant formula still arose from the WHO leadership, which "chose cooperation over conflict" but also "strategic resistance."⁵ The massive international agency, with a mandate and vision for saving human lives, passed these several resolutions in the World Health Assembly (WHA) prior to the 1979 Joint Meeting, which set the stage for the 1980-81 Code negotiations. Companies played a role in every step of this process.

³ Resolution WHA27.43 and Resolution WHA31.47 in Handbook of Resolutions and Decisions of the World Health Assembly and Executive Board, 2, No. 4, Geneva, WHO, 1981. See also, Chorev, The World Health Organization Between North and South, 104-5. For the 1974 resolution, see http://www.healthinternetwork.com/nutrition/topics/WHA27.43_iycn_en.pdf (accessed March 14, 2014). For an example of such resolutions to see how they build on one another, see WHA39.28, passed after the WHO Code, http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/WHA39.28_iycn_en.pdf (Accessed March 14, 2014).

⁴ Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods: Successful Challenges to an International Marketing Strategy (New York: St. Martin's Press), 1986, 64-5.

⁵ Nitsan Chorev, The World Health Organization between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 104-110. Not only did WHO have to deal with the power and pressure of MNCs, it also engages with intransigencies and disapprovals from the rich industrial countries, and "chose to avoid a direct confrontation," 103.

Industry attempted to "depoliticize" the boycott and social noise by moving away from cites of public relations disasters and contentious public debate. This escape emphasized moving away from Congress and the boycott's epicenter, the United States, where, for one thing, Nestlé did not even manufacture formula. Instead, however, the political situation spread globally and activists, health professionals and critics of capitalism created international networks that ultimately entrenched the issue within international organizations and nation-states, and helped establish NGOs as important voices within the UN system. Industry lobbied Kennedy to move the problem to Geneva, and Kennedy subsequently wrote Director-General Halfdan Mahler and requested that hearings be held on the exploding formula problem. Mahler agreed, as this seemed a natural culmination from previous WHA resolutions on the topic.

The Code went through four drafts between February and December 1980, with industry pressuring to change specific language with each consultation. Industry did not want NGOs present. In meetings with WHO and UNICEF staff members, companies emphasized that NGO's should not attend and, when they lost on that count, "threatened to walk out if the NGOs became confrontational."⁶ WHO, like a teacher trying to control an unruly classroom, reminded both the NGOs and industry that the consultations for the fourth draft were "not a negotiating forum." ICIFI, as it lobbied for NGO status within WHO, added to its team Dr. Stanislas Flache, who had the day before been assistant directory-general of WHO. Business International noted that the "choice was obviously not haphazard." ICIFI added inside actors with their own agenda to counterbalance what they saw as the unfair influence of activists within WHO. WHO sent draft 4 of the Code

⁶ Chetley, The Politics of Baby Food, 81.

out to all the governments involved on December 10, 1980. This draft would eventually become the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes.

The Nestlé Company, Incorporated - the American subsidiary - became a principal source for combating the boycott and the activists specifically on behalf of its parent in Switzerland. Nestlé hoped to solve "total infant nutrition" on a "global basis" for the improvement of babies in the Third World, which would mean a "global resolution" through the UN process.⁷ While possessing a vision from healthy baby to healthy globe, the company also dismissed the "activist groups" that "focused narrowly on the promotion practices" of industry "as an oversimplified means to attract attention to their cause." Nestlé publicly declared its desire to solve infant malnutrition, and believed that responsibility lay with industry, governments (especially those in the West), medical experts and international organizations. In many such declarations the company did not mention consumer groups or churches.⁸

The company also lauded Senator Kennedy for meeting with industry and agreeing that WHO should gather all interested parties, and with Dr. Halfdan Mahler, Director-General of WHO, throwing his and the World Health Assembly's weight behind the idea. Nestlé seemed to breathe an institutional sigh of relief, arguing that the chance to solve infant malnutrition was "now at hand." The Nestlé Company also declared that the activists did not desire the WHO meeting, calling WHO "ineffective," and believing that the issue was slipping from their dogmatic "mandated solution." Nestlé concluded

⁷ The Nestlé Company, Inc., "The Infant Formula Controversy: A Nestlé View," (White Plains, New York: The Nestlé Company, Inc.) n.d.. INFAC folder, WAG 51, Box 30. Tamiment Library, NYU.

⁸ Ibid., 2.

that, because of the WHO meeting and industry's eager compliance, the boycott proved to be "an inappropriate measure whose symbolic significance has disappeared."⁹ Industry worked vigorously to marginalize the consumer groups. But companies were only partially successful.

Lawyers for WHO wrote the U.S. Department of Justice in order to clearly understand the antitrust implications of both the final legal standing of the code, and the fact that American companies collectively organized their negotiating efforts. In January 1980, Claude-Henri Vignes, legal director at WHO, asked four questions about the American producers. First, were there any laws that would inhibit an American company from participating in the WHO negotiations. Richard Favretto, Assistant Attorney General, noted that "antitrust laws do not prohibit a producer from making known its individual views to an international organization concerning proposed restriction on advertising and marketing."¹⁰ But that answered the question for only a single company. For more than one company attended such negotiations, "joint efforts" that included "the sharing of competitively-sensitive information which could lead to a diminution of competition" could violate antitrust laws. WHO also wanted to know if talking with industry lobby groups such as ICIFI were legal. The Justice Department wrote that this depended "on what was done among the producers," and also that a final draft of the code may or may not involve a restraint in trade. INFAC used this exchange to show that the Justice Department signed off on the Code process, and to declare the Reagan administration's callused insanity for voting no. Favretto ended by saying that the

⁹ Ibid., 29.

¹⁰ Richard Favretto, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, "Letter to Claude-Henri Vignes, Legal Division, WHO," May 23, 1980. ACA Collection, Government Files, MHS, Box 4.

antitrust division possessed a Business Review Procedure for companies could query about potential antitrust implications of corporate behavior.

Because industry was involved in every step of the Code-making process, and ensured through several methods - such as lobbying national delegates, wining and dining some delegates, persuading the WHO Secretariat, and pressuring health professionals - that their prerogatives remained dominant, the process resulted in a watered-down version.¹¹ Of course, this impression of a softer version came out of the NGO side. Participants in the process argued with the West that if the Code became a fight between First and Third Worlds, then organizers would push for a more restrictive code. Doug Johnson emphasized that WHO was also culpable in the defanging process, because of its presence as a "world" body that had to deal with all countries and governments. Besides, Johnson reminded, the Code was merely a set of "recommendations" that effectively acted as a starting place. It worked to shame multinational corporations, but was not binding on their actions.¹²

Ideals for infant health and food rights met stark reality on the ground within the WHO negotiations. Corporations and developed nations wielded huge amounts of power within the global health organization, and its influence rested on money. For many observers then and now, WHO had to listen to those who kept the organization alive, in

¹¹ Edward Baer and Leah Margulies, "Infant and Young Child Feeding: An Analysis of the WHO/UNICEF Meeting," Studies in Family Planning 1, No. 2 (Feb., 1980): 72-75.

¹² Doug Johnson, "The Interview," 1997; and Edward Baer, "An Update on the Infant Formula Controversy." Studies in Family Planning 14, No. 4 (April, 1983), 119-122; See "Joint Prepared Statement of Leah Margulies and Douglas Johnson," in House of Representatives, Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in Developing Countries, Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ninety-Sixth Congress, January 30 and February 11, 1980, 49-59.

the strictest most realistic terms. IBFAN could take no part in this aspect of the game. IBFAN mostly worked with WHO staff members "who were the strongest advocates of the code." For their side of the story, this collaboration worked well. For practical politics, however, their union was "in some ways unfortunate," because this group was not "the people who made the political decisions within WHO - decisions which were based not so much on questions of infant health, but on the healthy survival of WHO."¹³ This perspective was the USA's all along.

America and the major industrialized countries provided seventy percent of WHO's operating budget. The Reagan administration and multinational corporations involved in health - especially pharmaceutical and food companies - emphasized this reality at every turn, and cringed when subalterns tried to influence their prerogatives. The U.S. contributed 25% to WHO, and twelve more developed countries brought that total to 70%. At many points during the negotiations, WHO staff asked the U.S. for its influence and opinion. Companies had no trouble exploiting "this type of economic dependence." Robert Dee, of pharmaceutical Smith Kline, recommended that industry "put intense pressure on the UN - and on its health agencies - to give realistic instead of unrealistic advice to developing countries."¹⁴ As thirteen developed countries out of 156 nations overall propped up WHO, then "certainly this entitles the industrialized world to stand up to WHO. We must have the will to do so." The companies found and funded the will to do so.

¹³ Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Food, 84.

¹⁴ Robert Dee, quoted in Chetley, 84.

In February 1980, WHO staff prepared the first draft of the Code, modeled on the set of recommendations established at the 1979 Joint Meeting. Many on the NGO side, and those within WHO, imagined that the draft would be accepted at the May 1981 WHA meetings. However, the big three American companies, Abbott/Ross, Bristol-Myers and Wyeth, expressed deep reservations, and organized themselves against the draft. ICIFI claimed that the Code was "wholly irresponsible" and would "kill hundreds and hundreds of babies."¹⁵ Industry objected to what it saw as "a long series of unwarranted and absolute prohibitions and restrictions of legitimate commercial activity." Statements of this kind, of course, naturalized what legitimate enterprise could be in a transnational society. Many Member States submitted responses to the draft, mostly favoring its intent. The "major milk-exporting countries" rejected the first draft.¹⁶ American companies pressured the U.S. government, which resulted in a letter to WHO that called for a voluntary code. The Americans called for "intergovernmental organizations" to negotiate any such code, suggesting that WHO and UNICEF had over-reached.¹⁷ The American companies objected to the second and third drafts of the Code, as well. Already-developed countries, standing as the growth and health norm for the world, agreed to the intent of the Code, but argued against its attempt to regulate enterprise with a universal standard.

¹⁵ ICIFI quoted in Chetley, 77.

¹⁶ These leading milk nations were Denmark, France, West Germany, Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland, and the U.S. See Chetley, 77.

¹⁷ See "Letter to Dr. Halfdan Mahler from Dr. John H. Bryan, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Health, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare," (March 29, 1980), in Chetley, 77-86.

Industrialized countries responded to the first draft in ways that surprised many at WHO, as well as the NGOs involved. Most developed nations replied that they supported the Code, but needed to address the document based on their local conditions. Canada, for example, noted that, "infant feeding practices vary from country to country," and so the code must be flexible enough "to allow for universal application."¹⁸ Moreover, the Code should be a "set of nonbonding recommendations to members states," especially because of the "broad-ranging subject matter involved and the extensive commercial practices which the draft code purports to regulate." Germany, too, expressed reservations and proposed its own amendments. The Code failed to "take into account the prevailing conditions of the Federal Republic of Germany." Perhaps patronizing, perhaps not, Germany added that revisions must "make adequate allowance for the situation in industrialized countries and for the fact that manufactured baby food is used properly and under perfectly hygienic conditions in these countries."¹⁹ The UK felt that Member States should only address "breastmilk substitutes" and not "breastmilk supplements" during the early drafting stages. In July, Julius Richmond, Assistant Secretary for Health and Surgeon General, wrote Secretary-General Mahler and underscored that the Code should only be basic agreement and set of guidelines for national legislation.²⁰ A "statement of principles" would help guide all those involved in infant feeding around the world.

¹⁸ "Canadian Comments on Draft International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes," ACA Collection, World Health Organization and World Health Assembly Files, Box 37, MHS.

¹⁹ "Comment of the Federal Republic of Germany on the Draft Code for the Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes of WHO/UNICEF," ACA Collection, WHO and WHA Files, Box 37, MHS.

²⁰ Julius Richmond, "Letter to Dr. Mahler," ACA Collection, Box 37, MHS.

Political scientist Nitsan Chorev, an expert on the World Health Organization, global health and the rise of neoliberalism, detailed the U.S. government's influence on developing and underdeveloping the Code. American companies and the new administration did not believe that the UN had a role to play in regulating global corporate capitalism. Chorev found that a member of the American delegation suggested "that the code would be developed by an intergovernmental group of member states instead of a secretariat task force was dismissed by the secretariat. Hence, it was the WHO staff that prepared the draft declarations, which were then circulated among the interested parties."²¹ National health delegations, company executives, and groups such as INFANT and IBFAN received the drafts and concocted their own amendments to them.

The World Health Organization's constitution stipulated three ways to enforce a code of conduct. First, the convention method, a difficult process that required a two-thirds majority within the WHA and then ratification by each member state. Second, a regulation, requiring a simple majority of WHA member states, which would "have a binding effect without the need for ratification at the national level."²² And third: a recommendation, also requiring a simple majority or consensus with each state determining adoption.²³ Member states debated the drafts with the secretariat listening to all points of view. Chorev revealed that member states "debated whether the code should be adopted as a regulation . . . or whether it should take the form of nonbinding recommendation for governments to follow on a voluntary basis. The U.S. government

²¹ Nitsan Chorev, The World Health Organization between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 106-110.

²² Chorev, 106-110.

²³ See Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Food, 80.

insisted on a nonbonding resolution and threatened that a binding resolution would not pass Congress."²⁴ As Chorev's title declared, the issue in the formula controversy and the code process demonstrated "an explicit divide between North and South," and also that WHO, considering that much of its funding came from the U.S. while it defended many developing countries and their interests, decided to "take no position," to "remain as neutral as possible."

IBFAN kept tabs on industry lobbying during the World Health Assembly meetings. In 1981 the group disseminated a press release called "Dirty Tricks during the WHA." The activists group accused ICIFI of claiming anti-WHO Code (and pro-formula) support from the United Kingdom's Health and Social Security; from India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, the International Pediatrics Association, and others, which required repudiation from various national delegations.²⁵ Cables from the United States mission to the State Department also noted that "ICIFI 'hawks'" attempted to "thoroughly discredit" the WHO Code by seeking a No Vote from the Americans. The list included ICIFI's hospitality suite at the Hotel Intercontinental and industry junkets for national delegations. Newspapers and other reports substantiated these claims. But more importantly for us, they illustrated the contentious, bitter nature of the Code negotiations, and industry's attempts to water down the final document and combat its effects through back room pressure and negotiations.

²⁴ Nitsan Chorev, The World Health Organization between North and South (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 106-10.

²⁵ IBFAN, "Dirty Tricks During the WHA," (Geneva: European Clearinghouse, IBFAN, 1981), ACA Collection, MHS, Box 24.

In December 1980, IBFAN prepared line-by-line commentary on the proposed code, demonstrating the ideals and hopes from the activist side. In many cases, the group reinserted specific language from the October Joint Meeting recommendations. And in each instance, added language emphasized the importance of breastfeeding and the seriousness of the global problem. In the Preamble, for example, IBFAN removed what it saw as soft language, that infant malnutrition is "part of the wider problems of lack of education, poverty and social injustice," which made it to the final draft, and reattached "taking a heavy toll in deaths and in long-term mental and physical disability."²⁶ In italicized margin commentary, the organization wrote that the difference in language was to "emphasize the seriousness of the problem and help lead towards an understanding of why the Code is essential." Other phrases affirmed that "every society" should ensure the right to health, which is how the final draft left it. IBFAN added children should be encouraged to "develop to their full potential" and that women must be able to "fulfill their roles as mothers and partners in social and economic development." IBFAN also suggested changing the phrase "infant formula" to "products within the scope of this Code," which made it into the final draft.

IBFAN continued to fight for its version of the Code throughout the year. In August, the group prepared a statement on the summary of discussions for the Consultation on the Third Draft of the Code. Among other things, IBFAN expressed its concern about "the danger of a conflict of interest in allowing the infant food industry to

²⁶ IBFAN, "Line by Line Commentary on the WHO/UNICEF International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes," (Dec, 10, 1980), ACA Collection, WHO-WHA Files, Box 37, MHS.

initiate work in this field, and called for a specific prohibition."²⁷ Even though they agreed that, when necessary, industry had a role to play, there should be specific proscriptions placed on industry's involvement in world health policy. In September, IBFAN expressed its desires that the Preamble be specific and clear, and that it set the "overall philosophical and political context in which the specific article are considered." The third draft did not state the purpose, which, according to IBFAN, was to "control the marketing and promotion of infant formulas and other infant feeding products because such practices contribute to the denigration and decline of breast feeding."²⁸ IBFAN also prepared commentary for the fourth draft, but by then the WHA had already prepared it for a final vote.

Political scientists and sociologists covered the boycott, its structures from many angles, its meanings, and its legacies for international political organization. They offered many useful methodological and analytical tools for understanding the boycott and its context. Available technologies and institutional structures, plus inherited cultural and historical norms, influenced the way the boycott played out, and the way corporations responded. Political scientists Kathryn Sikkink (who happened to be married to Doug Johnson) wrote that scholars should "think of all current code efforts for transnational corporations as specific instrumentalities or agreements within a normative framework of the emerging regime for investment and TNCs."²⁹ Paradigms, discourses and actual

²⁷ IBFAN, "Commentary on the Summary of Discussion for the Consultation on Third Draft of the Code," ACA Collection, Box 37, MHS.

²⁸ IBFAN, "Areas of Concern: The Third Draft of the International Code of Marketing, (September 1980), ACA Collection, Box 37, MHS.

²⁹ Kathryn Sikkink, "Codes of Conduct for Transnational Corporations: The Case of the WHO/UNICEF Code," International Organization 40, no. 4 (October 1, 1986): 815–40. For

material structures determined what could and could not be accomplished. Sikkink used the phrase "current normative consensus" the way other scholars understand paradigm or discourse. Importantly, noting the "convergence of conditions favorable" to the boycott movement, the consolidation of its international networks, and its accomplishments, is important for understanding its cultural meanings and its place within contemporaneous visions of human survival.

Breeders and Feeders, or The Mothers of Global Capitalism

Attempts to identify historical actors in this controversy as speaking for either elites or the grassroots, for the powerful or the ordinary, encounter complications. To determine whether the WHO code was an elite document or one that gave voice to subaltern subjects is not a transparently simple process.

Dana Raphael, an anthropologist at the Human Lactation Center in Westport, Connecticut, provided an alternate view of the code and its world health norms and assumptions.³⁰ For her, a feminist activist and breastfeeding expert, the documents

Sikkink's vital contributions in this area, see Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1998); Ellen Lutz and Kathryn Sikkink, "Nongovernmental Organizations and Transnational Issue Networks in International Politics," *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law)* 89 (April 5, 1995): 413–15; *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks, and Norms*. Social Movements, Protest, and Contention, v. 14, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002); Sikkink, "A Typology of Relations Between Social Movements and International Institutions," *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law)* 97 (April 2, 2003): 301–5, *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions Are Changing World Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 2011); "Transnational Politics, International Relations Theory, and Human Rights," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31, no. 3 (September 1, 1998): 517–23.

³⁰ Dana Raphael Testimony, U.S. Congress, Infant Feeding Practices, 202-207. Her testimony created much excitement from activist, especially as the formula industry used her work to support their market and bio-capitalist presence, and, Nestlé helped fund the Human Lactation Center. And yet through it all, her critique demonstrated a particular postcolonial framing of

ignored regular women on the ground. The code was a "unilateral" call on elite institutions such as national governments to "limit the use, promotion and marketing of breastmilk substitutes" that gave poor women "no instrumental role in determining" their own feeding methods. The code hoped to protect ordinary women from malfeasant infant formula companies marketing their product in the Third World like neo-imperialists. But, according to Raphael, the Code served as a paternalistic, evangelical, invasive tool for coercive actions directed from above.

Raphael listed her criticisms for Congress. She claimed that the "attempt by an international agency to intervene in culture-specific child rearing practices" and organize a "global time table for weaning" had "no precedent in history." Reproductive choice, feeding methods, and survival strategies encoded global norms for proper social, cultural and reproductive behavior. Poor women and men in all cultures already made choices with "a delicate equilibrium that serve[d] to keep some babies alive." The bio-economics of this history necessarily included infant survival and social reproduction within the norms of the globally administered society. Raphael called the code an "intimidating" document that arrived "at a time when women's customary maternal responsibilities, including breastfeeding, have been altered immeasurably by contemporary social movements and rapid economic development."³¹ Much as women faced choices within the U.S. about motherhood and the market, as conservatives and progressives argued

Global North v. Global South and cannot be ignored. Many feminists in the United States argued that women should have a right to choose, especially in a nation that did not support their childrearing and caring needs. In the Global South, too, more women entered urban workforces, and, said Raphael, "these are women who reject the role of only breeders and feeders."

³¹ Raphael Testimony, *Infant Feeding Practices*, 202-207.

about the "proper" roles for women throughout the 1970s, infant feeding exposed these tensions on an international stage.

For Raphael and many others, poor women who migrated to cities and worked outside the home faced difficult choices about child feeding, and out of necessity they created new strategies for survival. Women increasingly had to "manage child rearing alone" and this "forced them to adopt new cultural responses, including innovative feeding practices, in order to maximize their chances of survival." Hoping to improve their quality of life, women often worked in conditions that at times placed their survival choices at odds with the idealism of the Code and the world health dreams of its planners. According to Raphael, women seeking market work and surviving on the margins of society, "especially those living within the urban web," required "more, not less, options" for feeding their babies.³²

Furthermore, contravening planners, and at times sounding like the corporate officers when defending their products and their marketing strategies, "the anthropological evidence," and here supporting the entire historiographical body of subaltern studies and de-centering capitalism and other large structural totalities – "confirms that women in poverty already act sensibly and rationally in their decisions about breastfeeding." The WHO Code, for activists such as Raphael, ignored "these realities" on the ground, and the way women rewrote marketing strategies and WHO planners. The Code was "self-righteous in tone," and "its sanctions serve[d] mainly to thwart the re-definition of female roles now sweeping through the developing countries, abetted by international development and such by-products of technological change as

³² Raphael, *Infant Feeding Practices*, 202-07.

the feeding bottle." Here, then, vividly demonstrated within the dialectics of growth and zero-growth, of health and stagnation, of scarcity and expansion, these struggles illuminated issues with the family, the state, and the story of capitalism beginning at the mother's breast. The narrative highlighted, too, how images of women breastfeeding assumed a non-working mother – the mother of global capitalism - and how these discourses united conservatives, evangelicals, food activists, and anti-corporate agitators.

The WHO Code was problematic in other ways as well. First, it was a voluntary code, and as a set of recommendations. These voluntary ideas reflected global health and growth ideologies, and they would "set limits on the freedom of women to make informed choices about feeding, deny the aspirations of this new class of urban women" who, within an expanding market economy, simply searched for "an optimum balance between their personal reproductive obligations and their new public or work roles." Moreover, the WHO code "expresse[d] little trust in these women," and reasonableness had been "replaced by a license to intimidate any woman who" sought "more convenient feeding methods, including bottles." For Raphael, these institutional moves, hoping to enshrine initiatives of global health and survival, furthering social reproduction, coerced women and could lead to regulations that would require prescriptions for bottles, an instance that did occur in New Guinea.

Raphael argued that women possessed the ability to make educated decisions about infant feeding. She denigrated the INFACT and IBFAN monitoring techniques, but ignored pediatric evidence presented by Derrick Jelliffe and others. Her arguments, while defining female empowerment, ignored the central matter of corporate marketing, which the WHO Code attempted to address. The Code's "proponents justify their stand based on

questionnaire surveys and narrow clinical data, all of which are used by them to suggest that women, in the face of an onslaught of marketing techniques, do not act responsibly in the decisions they make about feeding." She mirrored the corporate use of the WHO Collaborative Study to show how infant feeding around the world was more complex than the activists claimed. The WHO Collaborative Study studied breastfeeding practices among 24,000 "mother/child pairs" spread throughout nine countries.³³ Raphael testified that, "Remarkably, this code chooses to ignore" its own findings in "Chile, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Nigeria, The Philippines, Sweden and Zaire," which showed that "mothers have always known how best to maximize their feeding choices, within cultural constraints to assure the survival of their infants." Perhaps unfortunate for Raphael's critique of the activists, the WHO Study "was conducted on the basis of a questionnaire interview."³⁴ And though the study illustrated complex feeding patterns and a variety of reasons for breastfeeding declines, it also hinted that the "easy availability of breast milk substitutes" might have impacted a mother's confidence in her own ability to produce sufficient milk.

INFACT struggled to combat Dana Raphael's influence. According to Doug Johnson, as he catalogued gift giving and bribes to governments, Nestlé USA funded the Lactation Review, in which Dana Raphael featured prominently. The company employed "its public relations budget to mislead consumers through distribution of confused

³³ David Cox of Abbott/Ross referred to the WHO Collaborative study, as did many other formula companies. The WHO hoped to investigate declines in breastfeeding "with the ultimate aim of formulating programs of intervention." The study covered Global North and South, and mothers from "three socio-economic groups -- urban elite, urban poor and traditional rural." See Y. Hofvander and A. Petros-Barvazian, "WHO Collaborative Study on Breast Feeding, Acta Paediatric Scand 67 (1978, Geneva: WHO), 556-560.

³⁴ WHO Collaborative Study, 557.

materials," particulars such as the Bwibo letter and the above review.³⁵ The International Council of Infant Food Industries (ICIFI) found many expert sources to support its position. For example, Norge Winifred Jerome, a professor of community health at the University of Kansas School of Medicine and not an industry propagandist, responded to the "Draft Code for the Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes" in a clear-headed way that delighted industry. Jerome criticized the proposed Code, noting that breastfeeding in the Third World still continued, local people exhibited "creative innovation" regarding food choices, and that the WHO Code threatened to be its own form of neocolonial venture, a "new controlling system" in Jerome's words.³⁶ As a "bi-cultural scholar," Jerome emphasized that "a new brand of colonialism" expanded throughout the Third World, and "more sophisticated thinkers view the proposed Code . . . as a step in that direction." She also reminded that "the mother-child as a focus point is artificial at best," as a dyad concept within extended family units and their feeding choices. Thinking only of mother-and-child," in fact, was "particular destructive to the family system and community structure."³⁷ In the proposed world health system, according to this account, women would once again be reduced to "chattel." Sounding more like a Marxist critique of multinational corporations, ICIFI saw the pamphlet as a way to complicate the activist narrative. ICIFI printed and disseminated Jerome's interpretation. Furthermore, because

³⁵ Doug Johnson, Testimony, Kennedy Hearings, 632.

³⁶ Norge Winifred Jerome, "Comments on 'Draft Code for the Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes': A Nutrition-Anthropological Perspective," (March 8, 1980), Action for Corporate Accountability Collection, MHS.

³⁷ Jerome, 8.

of the activists' moral high ground, any scientific or medical testimony that supported the corporate position in any way automatically entered the propaganda category.

Even experts who sympathized with the activist position, and who materially helped them along the way, expressed qualifications within which women like Raphael offered counter-narratives. Penny Van Esterik, the anthropologist who worked for USAID and who debated the formula industry, discussed the "problem of over-romanticizing breastfeeding" while mostly ignoring, for pragmatic simplification in their consciousness-raising cause, the real problems that women in already-developed-and-arrived countries faced "in western medical setting" and "may have cost INFACT real feminist support."³⁸ Given the ambiguity that suffused the entire controversy, "industry apologists" found room to maneuver in "medical, nutritional and anthropological literature," and the formula industry happily distributed their work.

According to some scholars, Raphael's central criticism presented "an American feminist position" that nevertheless stridently critiqued the boycott impulse and specific activists, while siding within the corporations. Women and men concerned about infant feeding and nutrition found themselves on opposite sides in the controversy. Raphael, writing in the Lactation Review and the Journal of Nurse-Midwifery, argued that the activist community merely attempted to "restrict women's right to choose."³⁹ The WHO Code existed as a male-centered document, a universalizing text that elided women's voices, and aimed to demand that women in the Third World had "an obligation to breastfeed." Raphael saw Doug Johnson as a male controller of poor women. These

³⁸ Penny Van Esterik, Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy, (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 105-06.

³⁹ Penny Van Esterik, 105.

arguments helped explain why "Bristol-Myers and Nestlé purchased and circulated so many copies" of the Lactation Review. Moreover, an analysis of tax statements revealed that the Human Lactation Center received "94 percent of its income in 1979 and 1980 . . . from the infant formula industry." Multinational formula companies positioned themselves as feminist in their unified embrace of a woman's right to choose.

No matter a given woman's perspective, whether conservative or feminist, breeder or not, feeder or not, many women no longer knew how to talk about these issues, and the word "lactation" slipped away from common discourse. Thus, women around the world lost the "words, models, or metaphors for expressing this intimate power" within them "without appearing to defend biological determinism." Given these discursive difficulties, especially in the United States, woman became "easily muted by the forces of medical hegemony and corporate interests." INFACT's ability to get everybody talking about breastfeeding, and increasing actual breastfeeding numbers at the height of the multinational moment, remained one of its legacies.⁴⁰

Reading the International Code

Even though Raphael offered a feminist counter-narrative, many more feminists saw the Code as a success. Breastfeeding advocates and boycotters who struggled for the Code saw its very title as a triumph. The wording within the Code itself bore evidence of the battles of language, within a patriarchal, capitalist, growth-paradigm social organization. But the language in the title too reflected concerns women's health activists possessed regarding their roles in this controversy. Women's feeding decisions, and the central

⁴⁰ Penny Van Esterik, 106-07.

place their bodies had in these conversations reflected real-world political and cultural struggle. The wording here was important. For one, "breast-milk substitutes" in the title included the human female breast and its mammalian capabilities, historically the central feeding place and practice for human survival. To re-include the breast and its milk in the conversation, rather than simply write "infant formula" or "bottle feeding" or even "baby food" - recentered a woman and her body, as well as her choices.

The World Health Organization's International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes opened with a declaration of a right: "Affirming the right of every child and every pregnant and lactating woman to be adequately nourished as a means of attaining and maintaining health."⁴¹ What kind of "right" was this, and how did the United Nations imagine it might be guaranteed? To state definitively that there existed a right to nutrition, to proper energy, and thus a right to health—as human rights—was the take the first step in a long journey. The construction of health, with proper vitamins, nutrients, proteins, would be identified over time, quantified, and outlined as guidelines for individual bodily growth by the U.N. itself. To quantify and measure a right is to take an additional step; it is to say we know how citizens are supposed to grow.

But the Code was not all idealism and social justice, at least as many in the boycott movement would have seen it. In the sixth paragraph of the Code, there was clear language establishing a legitimate role for the infant formula industry in global motherhood. Executives for Nestlé and Abbott/Ross noted that after the Code passed they felt they had established their sanctioned presence in the world of infant feeding and growth, and could market their products pretty much as before. The relevant clause

⁴¹ Preamble, WHO/UNICEF Code, line one. See Appendix. In this discussion of the Code, quotes from the International Code.

explained that there was "a legitimate market for infant formula and for suitable ingredients from which to prepare it" for mothers who do not breastfeed. Moreover, these commodities should "be made accessible to those who need them through commercial or non-commercial distribution systems." The Code recognized a reason and a need for formula products. The following paragraph though, reflecting the back and forth negotiations of the Code process itself, reaffirmed that "inappropriate feeding practices lead to infant malnutrition, morbidity and mortality in all countries," developed, developing or those non-national communities in between.

The preamble also supported the role of civil society in the "protection" of breastfeeding, declaring that nongovernmental groups belonged in the process alongside IO's, state health agencies and companies. In other words, real people, women and families, had a rightful place in the process, not simply the global health experts. "Families, communities, women's organizations and other nongovernmental organizations have a special role to play" in "promoting" breastfeeding, and supporting it, protecting it and even marketing it. The preamble ended with "marketing of breast-milk substitutes requires special treatment, which makes usual marketing practices unsuitable for these products." Regular selling did not work for infant formula products. If this alone was the marker of success or failure, the activists failed on a global basis. No one could see this at the time. The Code would be a basic statement of intent for companies and states, a starting place. The word "recommendation" came out of intense battles within the Geneva negotiations.

But the companies agreed with every word in the first article.⁴² Industry executives claimed that they, too, desired "safe and adequate nutrition" for babies, that they always maintained that breastmilk was best, that their products forever stated this fact. Formula companies illustrated that they desired the "proper use of their products," absolutely, and when these are necessary, formula companies existed to provide demand. Marketing and promotion, by highly trained agents, was ethical, legal and honest to the needs of mothers, infants and health professionals. Within the initial article, agreement prevailed for all the actors in this experiment of world health and corporate regulation. Companies believed that because they agreed to these terms, and behaved reasonably, they possessed the credibility necessary to continue their operations.

Formula firms fought for a voluntary recommendation principally because this particular international organization ominously reached into their own private, sovereign operations. On the issue of labeling, the Code made it clear that companies were not free to do as they pleased. Outside of the Code, however, they could ignore it, as formula companies did around the world, in developing and developed countries. Labels should not have images of happy babies that might "idealize the use of infant formula." The words "humanized" or "maternalized" should not appear, indicating some kind of equivalency. The label was to be a warning, indicating the "superiority of breast-feeding" and that the product, purchased in grocery markets, rural shops or mailed to a pregnant woman's doorstep, should "be used only on the advice of a health worker" (Article 9.2).

⁴² Arthur Furer, Nestlé SA president, noted "the longer these codes are discussed, the more moderate and practical they seem to become." Quoted in Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods, 75. At the end of the 1979 Joint Meeting, Furer declared "we do not feel restricted in any way in the field of commercial activity by the WHO recommendations." Nestlé and ICIFI had made company changes and adhered to their own internal codes.

Companies argued that this clause assumed women lacked the intelligence necessary for making their own feeding and preparation decisions.

The eleventh article also set the terms for future monitoring of marketing practices and adherence to the code. From earlier chapters we saw how important monitoring the code became for IBFAN and other activist groups. Surveilling compliance became enshrined in the principles and aims of the code, and outlined that governments should work with companies, NGOs, consumer groups, health professional and other experts (Article 11.2). Collaboration for groups such as IBFAN provided the entrance to permanent work within the UN system, monitoring and pressuring companies, and publishing its findings. But the Code also yielded permanent residence within WHO for industry lobby groups such as ICIFI.

The food and pharmaceutical companies involved in this global issue were charged with policing themselves and engaging in social responsibility. But companies claimed that they already monitored themselves, by enacting their own internal codes, and by adhering to national and local laws. Corporate conduct must conform to the aim of the Code; companies must "regard themselves as responsible for monitoring their marketing practices" (Article 11.3). Governing sales agents in the colonial field in places like Africa and Asia remained difficult from the metropole, especially as incentives that rewarded sales agents and applied tremendous pressure on their activities remained. Nestlé and the American formula companies published their internal directives to marketing personnel, noting conformity to the Code.⁴³

⁴³ See "A Comparison of The Nestlé Infant Formula Marketing Instructions with the WHO/UNICEF Notes on the WHO Recommended Code," (Washington, D.C.: Nestlé Coordination Center for Nutrition, December 1982). Edmund Muskie and the Nestlé Infant

The individual formula companies published reports explaining how they would adhere to the Code when it passed. Wyeth issued a line-by-line response to the Preamble and each article in a document titled "Policy of Wyeth Laboratories and its Worldwide Affiliates with Regard to WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes."⁴⁴ The company's introduction declared that all Wyeth companies and affiliates that make baby foods shall abide by its policies. The new policies replaced "existing Wyeth policies," while the company also shall adhere to local laws. The company promised to monitor its sales agents around the world, and investigate "reports of possible departure" from company compliance. With respect to specific articles, Article 5, on "the general public and mothers," the Code stipulated that, "manufacturers and distributors should not provide, directly or indirectly, to pregnant women, mothers or members of their families, samples of products within the scope of this Code" (5.2). Wyeth's official guidelines, which mirrored every other company's approach to this problem, declared that samples would go to and "be under the control of health workers who are independent of Wyeth," while donations, regulated under Article 6.6, would be provided only "to institutions and organizations" within the health fields that requested them. Article 5.3 of the Code noted that point-of-sale marketing and free samples should

Formula Audit Commission requested this report, which showed corporate compliance. Henry Anderson Papers, Presbyterian Historical Society, Box 25.

⁴⁴ Wyeth Laboratories, "Policy of Wyeth Laboratories and its Worldwide Affiliates With Regard to WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes," (n.d.), WHO/WHA Files, ACA Collection, Box 37, MHS.

be prohibited, and the company agreed not to "provide incentives or other means of supporting such activities."⁴⁵

Wyeth could not hide its dislike for an international body trying to tell it how to run its business. Article 8, on "persons employed by manufacturers and distributors," meant to control bonuses for sales personnel, and stated that incentives should not exist for "the volume of sales of products . . . nor should quotas be set" for formula, baby food or bottles (Article 8.1). Promotion and marketing for the pharmaceutical and food companies meant providing "information" to health professionals, not a marketing scheme. Sales staff were not allowed to recommend formula feeding over breast-feeding, and they did not contact mothers directly. Because of this, WHO had no mandate to constrain Wyeth's compensation programs, as "they do not interfere with breast feeding or promote inappropriate use" of Wyeth baby foods. Wyeth did not violate these aspects of the Code, and therefore WHO could not proscribe its incentives programs for trained sales professionals in the world of business.

The Articles of the code governing company representatives became especially watered down over time. American pharmaceutical companies had problems with proscriptions against their workers banned from health clinics and hospitals. David Cox of Abbott/Ross had emphasized in multiple hearings that his company was a science-based company staffed by doctors and other medical professionals, that they were different from the food companies. Articles 6 (Health care systems), 7 (Health workers), and 8 (Persons employed by manufacturers and distributors) covered the convergence between the health care system and company personnel. Originally, in the Joint Meeting

⁴⁵ Wyeth Laboratories, "Professional Service Representative Guidelines," WHO/WHA Files, ACA Collection, Box 37, MHS.

of 1979 where the first recommendations were drafted, the interdiction read "no personnel paid by companies producing or selling breast milk substitutes should be allowed to work in the health care system."⁴⁶ For Gary Mize, vice president of Mead Johnson Nutritionals, a subsidiary of Bristol-Myers, "it should be noted that in the United States, the three major manufacturers of infant formulas are also widely diversified health care companies." The final draft suggested that health facilities should not be used to promote company products, and sales personnel should not dress up as nurses.⁴⁷ "If taken literally," he said, "this sentence could be read to mean that none of these companies pay for medical personnel to conduct clinical studies of new pharmaceutical products, even though such studies are required for marketing approval in many countries." It would also deny actual MDs working for the company to donate their professional time to clinics and hospitals. Ideals and reality classed within the sphere of code language.

Both Edward Baer, an infant feeding activist and co-director of the Infant Formula Program at ICCR with Leah Margulies, and Andy Chetley of War on Want, insiders during the WHO Code drafting process, summarized the issues that separated the various parties.⁴⁸ "The draft code that emerged in the spring of 1981 was inevitably the

⁴⁶ WHO, "Statement and recommendations of the joint WHO/UNICEF meeting on infant and young child feeding," (Geneva, 1979), <http://archive.unu.edu/unupress/food/8F023e/8F023E04.htm> (accessed March 28, 2010).

⁴⁷ See WHO Code, Appendix, Articles 6, 7 and 8; and see Gary Mize Testimony, Marketing and Promotion, Hearings, 1980, 29.

⁴⁸ Baer noted that "Not surprisingly, there were bitter disagreements among governments, the industry, health experts, legal experts and citizens groups over key issues of the code, including its aim, the scope of the products to be included, the differences between educational advertising and promotional advertising, distinctions between free samples and free supplies, and distinguishing between legitimate support for health services and inappropriate inducements to win brand loyalty." Baer, 119.

imperfect result of hard bargaining and compromise in a highly charged political environment." The questions about the success of the Nestlé boycott and the Code of conduct existed at the heart of this entire history, with implications about neoliberal globalization and privatized survival options. Baer asked similar questions, and was pragmatic and hopeful. "The code thus reflects a compromise between the weak, voluntary general principles favored by industry and industrialized countries, and the strong, specific, and binding restrictions favored by many health professionals with front-line experience and by most government officials in developing countries."⁴⁹ The compromise, though, remained within the heart of the dominant neoliberal paradigm.

Baer noted some of the successes of the boycott and the code moment. One of them detailed what Ken Cmiel saw about social justice networks, being "a new form of international organizing and cooperation among nongovernmental organizations."⁵⁰ Plus, the idea of "demarketing" infant formula existed as one goal of the activists, perhaps monumentally impractical considering the dominant paradigm. ICCR and the other groups, for example, imagined that corporations would voluntarily or through direct action pressure engage "downward changes in corporate sales and profit goals" because of the agreed-upon "dangers of normal product use." Corporate accountability and social responsibility merged in ideas of demarketing, as "industry's intimate involvement in the process imposes grave responsibilities on it to follow the provisions of the Code voluntarily, as required by Article 11.3."⁵¹ However, history has few examples of

⁴⁹ Baer, 120.

⁵⁰ Baer, 120.

⁵¹ Ibid., 120.

corporations willingly lowering profit targets and market access, especially in the face of intense competition from companies who refuse to follow guidelines and happily take over a competitor's market share. Baer noted that 'regrettably,' voluntarily profit-loss had "not yet been translated into practice by any of the major infant food manufacturers."⁵² Nor would there be such voluntary loss.

The No Vote: Global Deregulation As Universal Freedom and World Health

Whether the Code was an instrument of corporate control or a weapon of the weak mattered little to the Reagan Administration and to an influential cadre of American politicians. To them, regardless of the Code's strengths or weaknesses, it represented a violation of U.S. sovereignty and had to be denounced. When the Code came before the U.S. General Assembly for a vote, the United States, despite the crucial role played by many of its own citizens in authoring the Code, voted against it. Standing alone in a 118-1 vote, the U.S. stood fast and became an international outlier.

"In Geneva it was the U.S. against the world." So journalist Kurt Andersen opened his 1981 article in Time shortly after the vote on the WHO international Code of conduct.⁵³ He commented on the vote outcome in ironic language, noting that the United States was the lone dissenter in a global referendum on infant health, 118-1. In this particular case, social justice tangled with economic justice as expert delegates and activists argued about poverty and wealth within an organization that conceived of proper realms of health and survival. Time echoed what activists and doctors had argued for so

⁵² Ibid., 120.

⁵³ Kurt Andersen, "The Battle of the Bottle," Time, June 1, 1981, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,954789,00.html>, 1-3 (viewed 11/03/2008).

long, that "formula can lead to infant malnutrition and death when used improperly," and therefore "the WHO Code had the support of doctors and government health officials all over the planet." Locally, women had much to say about this issue as well, they were concerned about their babies, made informed feeding choices and also supported the Code.

The United States, which often ignored health care for women and policies for breastfeeding in the workplace, struggled to maintain a male breadwinner ideology. The U.S. voted along free market lines and vigorously maintained the mythology of family and market and its own role in the world. The vote "was 118 to 1, a near miracle of consensus in any international forum." The Americans, though they argued in Congress in favor of breastfeeding and the health of women, infants and children, and though they appeared to care about regulating the false advertising of biologically-necessary commodities, appeared "to align itself in opposition to good health for babies."⁵⁴

Reagan, the White House, and the formula corporations fought against the Code's original aims. The corporations worked to water down the Code from a regulatory apparatus to a voluntary one, and they successfully maintained corporate prerogatives. These particular actors desired to ward off international agencies and activists because they believed that the "code would restrict free speech and free trade."⁵⁵ Activists protested, of course, as did Dr. Stephen Joseph, the top health official" at the U.S. Agency for International Development and Eugene Babb, USAID's nutrition expert, both of whom resigned. According to Time, Dr. Joseph "called the vote 'contrary to the best

⁵⁴ Kurt Anderson, "The Battle of the Bottle," Time 1981.

⁵⁵ Anderson, Time, 1981.

interest of my country, inexplicable to my professional colleagues . . . and damaging to the health and growth of the world's children.'" Senator Edward Kennedy, who had convened hearings on infant formula and corporate marketing before, and who had encouraged activists to take the issue to the United Nations, vowed to investigate America's contrary position. The conservative, pro-business, Financial Times of London stated that "it is special pleading of the worst kind to invoke the right to free expression and free competition if a potential danger to life and health has been identified." Most already-arrived nations and multinational companies felt it was bad business to vote against the Code.

Former Democratic senator from North Carolina, Sam Ervin, engaged a one-man mission against the Code on behalf of the Grocery Manufacturers of America (GMA). He provided constitutional expertise on the formula matter for Congress, and he wrote editorials that pointed out potentially draconian interventions by world institutions into markets and people operating in total freedom. The Code, and WHO's hubris, amounted to "a totalitarian grab for baby's bottle."⁵⁶ Ervin envisioned a global baby and her interrupted reach for excellent technologies of progress. Any regulation that aimed to limit the spread of educational information (read advertising) was unconstitutional. WHO's overreach aimed to "undermine the basic American values of free speech." In fact, Secretary of Health and Human Services, Richard Schweiker, insisted that the Code

⁵⁶ Sam Ervin, "A Totalitarian Grab For Baby's Bottle," n.d., United States Government Files, ACA Collection, Box 3, MHS.

violated the First Amendment. He also claimed that the Code would transgress U.S. antitrust laws.⁵⁷

The Code, as it attempted to regulate "evil multinational corporations," could only "establish a danger precedent of worldwide control over the advertising, labeling, and marketing of infant products." The Code even covered cookies and juice. Ernest Lefever of the "Nestlegate" issue explored in Chapter Three explained that adopting the Code would be a victory for "international regulation" of multinationals that activists hoped to achieve.⁵⁸ The "anti-industry coalition" Lefever identified included the World Council of Churches (WCC, along with the NCC and U.K. version, BCC), Clergy and Laity Concerned (CALC), "whose leaders are eager to work with others 'who are angry and hate corporate power,'" and the radical-left Institute for Policy Studies. Controlling multinationals and free market imperatives remained the goals of activists and "international bureaucrats." Negotiations within the WHA promised to be "charged with Third World demands wrapped in moralistic slogans." Developing countries and "their Soviet bloc friends" might pass this Code without critical analysis from the watchful friends of global enterprise. For Lefever, the coming "more realistic" Reagan administration would do the right thing against "self-appointed custodians of rectitude." Even though the Code passed almost unanimously, the "inimical" effect on global trade

⁵⁷ Spencer Rich, "Rules on Infant Formula Called Unconstitutional," Washington Post, May 13, 1981; clipping in INFAC collection of No Vote imbroglio, ACA Collection, Box 21, MHS. Schweiker said in an interview that he believed in breastfeeding.

⁵⁸ Ernest Lefever, "Politics and Baby Formula in the Third World," Wall Street Journal, January 14, 1981.

that Ervin feared never materialized. Not even close. And that is a lesson for those who study social and economic justice in the age of capital.⁵⁹

Ervin could not believe that free-loving nations planned to vote for the Code, as doing so prefigured global regulation of national, and corporate, prerogatives. The Code would never be "a seemingly innocuous document," rather would exist as a "precedent-setting attempt at the international regulation of all aspects of the advertising, marketing, and labeling practices of U.S. industry."⁶⁰ The problems of infant malnutrition required multiple approaches, especially private, efficient ones. Any code that removed "infant foods from the marketplace . . . Would be blatantly unconstitutional in the United States." In hearings before Congress after the No Vote explosion, Ervin defended the wisdom and courage of the American position, and this from a Democrat. "I believe that the United States showed great courage in standing up against the Code, and in so doing did not relinquish even a shade of our national sovereignty. There is sometimes great wisdom in standing alone." Standing along in defense of free markets and against wonton intrusion into national, and multinational, sovereignty defended infant health and economic health. Overcoming hysterical and emotional arguments within the politics of living and dying babies took bravery and intelligence. America had to stand for freedom and "reject an

⁵⁹ Dogmatic autocrats were notoriously precise, and should be feared. Ervin wrote at that Code "regulates with complete, drastic, and totalitarian precision every aspect of the marketing, distributing and using of infant products in foreign nations" and it "defines with equal precision every permissible activity of every person involved in any way in such transactions," including the way global babies consumed their growth products.

⁶⁰ Sam J. Ervin, Jr., GMA Testimony, Implementation, 39. Ervin, representing the Grocery Manufacturers of American, Inc. (GMA), was a former Senator from North Carolina and called himself a "simple country lawyer" from North Carolina. He defended the American Way of Life with vigor in the face dangerous attempts at international regulation by the United Nations.

estimate of totalitarian tyranny which would rob the people of the free world of the rights which are reserved for the people of America by our Constitution."⁶¹

Charles D. May, an editor at Pediatrics for seven years in the 1950s and early 1960s, and Emeritus Professor at the University of Colorado, attacked the "intemperate" activists and the core issues of the entire baby food controversy. No data existed to prove formula marketing's effects on breastfeeding rates, and neither WHO or the activist produced "no substantial, sound, scientific" studies to substantiate their emotional claims. Critics engaged nothing but "outbursts." WHO was incapable of keeping the Code proceedings to a civil, scientific, objective meeting of like minds. The political and ideological stridency displayed by activists led only to a "notorious threat to reason in matters of health."⁶² When it came to time vote on the "severely restrictive" WHO Code within the U.S., however, "reason prevails" and the U.S. voted no, which rather than worthy of derision exemplified only courage. WHO's reputation after the disastrous, one-sided Code process would be damaged, especially since the Code encroached "on our free-enterprise system and the sovereignty of all nations." The formula industry supported and encouraged such third-party, disinterested, reasoned analysis from experts in the field.

Formula producers actively monitored threats against it, and engaged every available channel to ward off perceived danger and consolidate power. For formula executives, the Code, the Dellums bill, and the consumer groups represented targets

⁶¹ Sam J. Ervin, Jr., GMA Testimony, Implementation, p. 39. Ervin, representing the Grocery Manufacturers of American, Inc. (GMA), was a former Senator from North Carolina and called himself a "simple country lawyer" from North Carolina. He defended the American Way of Life with vigor in the face dangerous attempts at international regulation by the United Nations.

⁶² Charles D. May, "The 'Infant Formula Controversy': A Notorious Threat to Reason in Matters of Health," Pediatrics, 68 No. 3, (September, 1981).

worthy of corporate manpower, energy and money. Companies fought incursion against their perceived sovereignty, and most often received satisfaction. No matter how the activists perceived the Code's results, industry applauded itself and saw victory. Nestlé's own interpretation viewed the Code as establishing company legitimacy in world health, and providing the company with global approval to continue accessing markets and bodies in the Third World. "The final version of the Code recognized that the industry did indeed have a role to play in Third World infant feeding" and therefore, "at last, industry had the endorsement it needed to justify the continued marketing of infant formula in developing countries."⁶³ Activists desired that the WHO Code would be adopted within the U.S. According to Leah Margulies, the American infant formula companies never abided by the Code within the U.S., whereas Nestlé did, effectively ceding the market to its competitors.⁶⁴

American Home Product's (AHP) criticisms of the Code represented industry, but also the U.S. government position at a moment of deregulation and privatization. Big Business and the "biggest business in the world," reflected the multinational moment. Chorev's study noted this particular transition from the NIEO era of non-allied movements and G-77 impulses, to the consolidation of neoliberal organization. AHP derided "the activist groups" and their "latest version of alleged violations of WHO Code drafts, when they counted as 365 violations," involving posters, labeling and other such

⁶³ Maggie McComas, Geoffrey Fookes and George Taucher, The Dilemma of Third World Nutrition: Nestlé and the Role of Infant Formula (Vevey: Nestlé 1983), in ACA Collection, Company Files, Box 25, MHS. See other company documents during the code moment in 1980-81; Nestlé, Marketing Infant Formula to the Third World: How Nestlé Has Followed the WHO/UNICEF October 1979 Recommendations (April 1981); Henry Ciocca, The Nestlé Boycott as a Corporate Learning Experience (White Plains, N.Y.: Nestlé Company, Inc., March 18, 1980).

⁶⁴ Leah Margulies, Interview with the Author, January 2013.

"violations." Wyeth explained what it saw as ridiculous accusations that need not bother the international community. All sides, during these rhetorical forays, defended breastfeeding and the need to solve poverty, malnutrition and infant mortality, always claiming that these issues existed at the core of the problem and therefore everyone should be able to agree. In reality, though, the Nestlé boycott and the broader bottle-breast struggle reflected the direction of global management in a corporate age. The controversy was not a battle for infant nutrition and health. it was a political struggle, fought globally, over the direction of the free enterprise system during the hyper-rise of MNCs and neoliberal international organizations. The controversy remained so intense because of this perspective. A corporate age, and a corporate management of all people in the world.⁶⁵

The U.S. under Reagan pushed free enterprise ideology locally and internationally. No matter the difficulties and challenges to Reagan's agenda, an era of privatization and deregulation dawned. The U.S. voted against the WHO Code, demonstrating a clear transition from an earlier period in the 60s and 70s marked by environmentalism, anti-corporate agitation, and attempts by developing countries to control their own destinies within the world system. Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, defended the American position and its impending "No" vote at the WHO. The government continued to encourage breastfeeding, he noted, spending "millions of dollars each year promoting" natural infant feeding.⁶⁶ The government's argument rested on an emerging neoliberal ideology. But

⁶⁵ Wyeth/AHP testimony, Implementation Hearings 1982, the No vote, 56.

⁶⁶ Elliott Abrams, "Infant Formula Code: Why the U.S. May Stand Alone," Washington Post, May 21, 1981 A27, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

also claimed that the U.S. would not under any circumstances support or implement the code domestically, therefore it should not internationally.

The Code was stricter than some developed countries believed. Many nations planned to vote "yes" for the code to avoid controversy, even though many possessed "grave doubts" about parts of the code. The Code would create a world that relied on the state to make decisions for individual mothers, and in place of health professionals.

Ordinary people could make their own choices, and advertising provided necessary "information" required to make difficult choices within poverty environments.

Advertising was education in this new age. The United States never liked to stand alone, according to Abrams. But the nation was "prepared to do so -- on questions ranging from economic freedom to support of Israel - if necessary to defend our principles and friends." Passing the Code would restrict proper information about maternal and child health, about feeding regimens, and about infant formula. Artificial infant foods remained vital for those women who could not breastfeed, and therefore "the health of children may actually suffer." The U.S. Government, going against the grain, could never "support a detailed and inflexible code, global in scope and rigid in structure." America's "laws and traditions" mandated a no vote, and standing alone it came to that.

Elinor Constable of the State Department defended the infamous No Vote. As the Code became the first such regulatory code within the UN system, many within the United States deemed it vital to squash its international momentum, and especially its critical intent. According to Constable, the entire controversy was blown out of proportion and based on ill-conceived ideas of reality. Too many excitable people commented on the American vote. In reality, the Code was a threat to freedom and

democracy. Instead of criticisms, the world should thank the U.S. for its "honesty" to vote how it believed. "The United States stands to gain respect for having the courage - on a well-publicized and controversial issue -- to stand alone and say what it believes. Further, in relation to the development of new codes in the United Nations system, we think that our vote will have specific foreign relations value. Up until the adoption of the WHO infant formula code, there had never been an international code dealing with the marketing of a specific product. It is a troubling development."⁶⁷ Infant formula feeding issues should be addressed on a case-by-case basis by national governments, not the global body.

Some members of Congress grilled Reagan administration officials on the shocking No Vote. Congressman Howard Wolpe focused his attention on Dr. Brandt's conservative credentials and wondered why the administration could regulate abortion but not infant formula.⁶⁸ "Isn't it a bit of a contradiction," Wolpe said, for the government in power, "which is in favor of strong legal measures to control abortion to be opposing this effort by the World Health Organization to save the lives of newly born infants?"⁶⁹ And, for that matter, "doesn't the repeated citation of the first amendment freedom of commercial speech ring a little hollow?" Dr. Brandt avoided the abortion probe and stuck

⁶⁷ Elinor Constable, Testimony: Basis for U.S. Vote on WHO Code," in Implementation of the World Health Organization (WHO) Code on Infant Formula Marketing Practices, Hearings Before the Subcommittees on International Economic Policy and Trade and on Human Rights and International Organizations, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session, June 16 and 17, 1981, U.S. Government Printing Office, (Washington: 1982), 6.

⁶⁸ Howard Wolpe specialized in African development and politics, and dealt with many issues of Africa in the world. Significantly, he led efforts against Apartheid South Africa, which included restrictions on business. He helped override Reagan's veto of sanctions against the country. Within African development, he was concerned about famine, food, and aid distribution.

⁶⁹ Dr. Brandt Testimony, Implementation of the WHO Code, Hearings, (1982), 20-1.

to the line of a health professional, that the government studied declines in breastfeeding and that infant lives mattered. When Wolpe ridiculed the U.S. No Vote given that all other countries supported it, even the nation's "Nordic" allies, Brandt merely articulated that the Code did not address the actual nutrition needs of mothers and infants.

Jack Anderson, muckraking journalist and thorn in the side of the political and business establishment, and famous for obtaining classified documents for his expose stories in the Washington Post, pieced together the reason behind the No Vote. At base, the decision exemplified politics over health or foreign relations concerns. The administration overruled many medical and health experts in USAID, Health and Human Services (HHS), and the government's own delegates at the Geneva WHA meetings. Furthermore, Reagan's policy advisors discounted seasoned diplomats who had spent years in the field dealing with LDC governments and the United Nations. All members of the administration who testified before conference maintained the party position, namely that the Code was unconstitutional within the U.S., that it violated First Amendment freedom of commercial speech (the freedom to market and advertise), and that the Code set a dangerous regulatory precedent. The Congressional hearings on implementing the Code, and Anderson's investigation among many other sources and testimonies, including Dr. Stephen Joseph's resignation, revealed that four advisors within the White House decided to vote against the Code.

This negative vote came even though the U.S. delegates had promised at least an abstention if the WHA made two significant changes to the document. The first was that the U.S. Demanded the Code be voluntary - a recommendation - though many of the nations involved, especially those experiencing the most detrimental effects of marketing

in their countries, desired a regulator Code. The WHO Director General agreed to the changes. Anderson wrote in June 1981, "like handgun control and abortion, the marketing of infant formula has become an emotional issue characterized by rhetorical excesses on both sides," creating a complex, "obscured" controversial narrative about mothers, babies and multinational corporations. However, "confidential memos and State Department cables" helped illuminate the politics involved from a free market and foreign relations perspective.⁷⁰

Afterwards, the companies used these concessions in their operations and defense of their actions in the Third World. "The infant formula code would be defined as strictly voluntary and it would be made clear that it applied only to formula not other baby food."⁷¹ Doug Johnson of INFANT, INBC, IBFAN and other activists perpetually found themselves demanding that the Code applied everywhere, not simply developing countries, and pertained to all baby foods, not merely formula. Industry successfully fought strict language and supplied softer, more ambiguous terms. Mahler agreed to the concessions, and the WHA passed the version of the Code. Deputy Secretary of State William Clark told Abrams that if the concessions were granted the U.S. would abstain.

However, the White House never agreed to these maneuverings within the WHO, and in any case had dedicated itself to implementing a well-defined, deregulatory ideology on a global scale. Presidential counselor Ed Meese, Richard Allen, the president's national security adviser, and two other advisers, Lyn Nofziger and Martin Anderson, ensured that the U.S. voted against the Code. The State Department heard of

⁷⁰ Jack Anderson, "Formula Flap: Story Behind the Lone 'No,'" The Washington Post, June 2, 1981, B18, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁷¹ Anderson, "Formula Flap," June 2, 1981.

their meeting from the National Security Council (NSC). Leah Margulies often noted how vigorously the American formula makers fought the boycott and all attempted regulations. As it happened, Bristol-Myers, Abbott Laboratories and American Home Products (AHP) "lobbied the administration against the code," along with the Grocery Manufacturers of America (GMA). The GMA worried that the Code would affect "other baby food," though the U.S. had demanded that the Code only include formula. Congressional investigations substantiated these formula industry lobbying efforts.⁷² Industry believed, probably correctly, that: "the Code's adoption would give ammunition to critics of Big Business." But even Republicans thought the No Vote "discredited our country, our diplomatic and health professionals, as well as the political party I represent."⁷³ Worse than that, the ideological argument that justified the No Vote provided international critics, especially from the Global South, a clear target for their anger and their ammunition.

In a letter to congressmen Jonathan Bingham and Don Bonker, chairmen of the two subcommittees, AHP executive Charles Hagan vigorously defended the company and lambasted the activists, especially Leah Margulies and Doug Johnson. Instead of dealing with the "substantive provisions" of the Code, activist testimony "once again"

⁷² Anderson, "Formula Flap," and "Implementation" hearings. See for example Dr. Stephen Joseph's conclusions at the end of the hearings, "The short answer is the article by Jack Anderson in the Washington Post some 2 weeks ago to the best of my knowledge is entirely accrete. I believe that the pressures of the lobby, the GMA and the industry, were heard in the White House and the decision was made in the White House," and "perhaps it was a 'Nordic conspiracy' or something," 166.

⁷³ Leach Testimony, Implementation of the WHO Code, Hearings, 163.

merely reflected "an all-out attack on industry."⁷⁴ The NGO panel invited to Congress "made no effort to identify which companies allegedly participated in the various activities which they criticized, thus creating the impression that all of the infant formula industry," including AHP, engaged in lobbying WHO and the U.S. government. Margulies possessed a list of "accusations," claiming that "industry" - the unified monster - circulated lies, phony letters, funded fake organizations such as "Voices of the World's Children"; that industry representatives pretended to be from national delegations in order to attend certain meetings; that "industry representatives" offered "travel around Europe on condition that they not be present to vote on the Code." Some companies had engaged in such insider battles to control the WHA proceedings, but not AHP, according to Hagan.

Congress after the No Vote investigated rhetorical battles and multifaceted paranoia. Regarding lobbying efforts at the White House, Margulies and Doug Johnson testified that ICIFI "hawks" at the WHA meeting pushed "the United States to vote 'no' so that WHA would pass the Code as a 'regulation' which allegedly would have split the third world countries from the industrialized countries. Hagan responded, "our company had no such strategy and the statement, as to us, is untrue." Johnson testified that AHP "pressured the United States to vote 'no' on the code 'in hopes of setting off a chain reaction that would structurally damage WHO itself." Johnson had claimed that these industry efforts demonstrated the "depths to which some companies were willing to sink in order to protect their own narrow self-interest."

⁷⁴ Charles Hagan, "Letter to Jonathan B. Bingham and Don Bonker," Appendix 2, Implementation of the World Health Organization Code, Hearings, 170.

The controversy was not simply a battle for infant nutrition and health. It was a political struggle, fought globally, over the direction of the free enterprise system during the hyper-rise of MNCs and neoliberal international organizations. The controversy remained intense because of this perspective. A corporate age, and a corporate management of all people in the world. Dr. John Bryant, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Health, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, speaking in Geneva during the WHO voting process, noted that "my government does not want this decision to be considered as a precedent for the drafting of codes in other UN agencies." WHO should not be involved in even trying to regulate multinational capitalism, and such agreements should only take place between governments.⁷⁵ For the Reagan administration, infant health mattered. But the issue with the WHO Code always expressed fear about purported international regulation of free enterprise.

Jeane Kirkpatrick, Reagan's foreign policy adviser during the 1980 presidential campaign and the first woman to represent the U.S. at the United Nations would have preferred to abandon the entire internationalist project. Kirkpatrick offered the conservative, imperial critique of the UN: "countries that have the votes don't pay the bills, and the countries that pay the bills don't have the votes." Congressman John Mica complained, "We pay \$350 million a year, plus, to be there. It appears . . . that it is kind of an elite anti-U.S. debating society and we are paying for it. Now, why should we stay

⁷⁵ See Andy Chetley, The Politics of Baby Foods, 79-80.

in the United Nations?"⁷⁶ Global deregulation and free enterprise resided at the heart of a new kind of internationalist agenda.⁷⁷

According to Chorev and David Harvey, "neoliberalism was a global project," a new kind of imperialism, with governing elites across a broad spectrum, "and neoliberal economic policies eventually diffused from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Chile to other Latin American countries, Western European countries, South Africa, New Zealand, almost the entire Soviet bloc after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Sweden, India, and China."⁷⁸ In the story of capitalist globalization, Ronald Reagan played a major role. In his agenda and his rhetoric, Reagan brought 'the magic of the marketplace' to developing countries. According to his personal view, the Berlin Wall fell because of his economic policies. Everybody wanted to be a capitalist.⁷⁹

A leaked telegram from the U.S. mission to the State Department outlined the American position on the negotiation." To all OECD capitals priority," it claimed, and

⁷⁶ Jeane Kirkpatrick and John Mica, in hearings on "U.S. Policy in the United Nations," before the House of Representatives, quoted in Chorev's Chapter 5, "The Neoliberal Turn at the International Level," 127.

⁷⁷ A writer in the Wall Street Journal demonstrated ideological frustration over the "\$500 million-a-year United Nations agency" that employed "distorted science" in its global aim of a "world-wide code restricting" company marketing. Regulation and codes of conduct led to sickness and did not solve famine or hunger, argued neoclassical economists from Adam Smith to Milton Friedman. To feed properly, to distribute resources, to improve living standards, the entire world required open markets and free enterprise unhindered by state or institutional meddling. See Carol Adelman, "Closing the Book on Infant Formula Fears," Wall Street Journal, June 19, 1986, 30. And for an excellent essay on Adam Smith, please read Fredrik Albritton Jonsson, "Rival Ecologies of Global Commerce: Adam Smith and the Natural Historians," The American Historical Review 115, no. 5 (December 2010): 1342–63.

⁷⁸ Chorev, WHO Between North and South, 128. See also David Harvey, A Brief History of Neoliberalism (New York: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2007), and his The New Imperialism (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

⁷⁹ See Michael Lind, "Conservative Elites and the Counterrevolution against the New Deal," in Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, Ruling America: A History of Wealth and Power in a Democracy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 251–285.

included USAID, the Department of Justice and the Department of Agriculture among other ministries within the U.S. The government naturally supported breast-feeding, but underscored that the "USG could not accept a legally binding code," as this international regulatory method "would not be in keeping with other codes developed in the international system, all of which are voluntary."⁸⁰ Whether a document that contained regulations or mere recommendations, the Code was a problem. Most importantly, the Code, if adopted might "stimulate WHO interest in further codes, relating to weaning foods, pharmaceuticals, or other products." The Code also attempted to interrupt the private inside operations of companies, and influence point-of-sale transactions in the market.

The telegram also noted that the U.S. would absolutely vote No on regulations and, and might still on a voluntary document. The issue "has provoked considerable controversy both within WHO circles and within the U.S. USG is currently giving full review to the position it should take on the Code at WHA. Embassies requested to consult all relevant ministries in most government - MFA, Foreign Assistance, Trade, Economic Affairs, Justice, Health, etc. - To advise on positions governments plan to take and in particular whether USG could expect support if it pursued various options at the WHA." INFACT's press release about the cable claimed that it ignored infant health and instead highlighted the potential injuries to the industry position. This interoperation rang true, as the "USG" position remained synonymous with industry's position in the language.⁸¹

⁸⁰ United States Mission Geneva, "Outgoing Telegram to Department of State on the WHO Infant Formula Code," May 1981, ACA Collection, United States Government Files, MHS, Box 4.

⁸¹ INFACT, "Statement to the Press," Douglas Johnson, May 15, 1981, ACA Collection, US Government Files, MHS, Box 4.

Douglas emphasized that a "vote for the code is a vote for life." This confidential telegram the activists used to reveal a deep conspiracy within the government on matters of business rights over infant health. However, Jack Mongoven, formerly of NCCN, explained that the Reagan Administration would vote against the Code no matter the resultant political noise.

Members of Congress urged support for the Code before the vote, and expressed their dismay after the Reagan administration decided to ignore an abstention. Ron Dellums and the congressional black caucus sent a 50-page telegram to the director-general of WHO, Dr. Mahler, explaining that they opposed "the action taken by the United States delegation at Geneva in their vote not to accept the recommended monitoring code."⁸² Dellums assured Mahler that the vote did not reflect the "majority of the American people," and claimed that Congress would introduce bills to "support and implement" the code in the U.S. Congress demonstrated bipartisan unity on this score. Dellums noted that the black caucus was "appalled that the Reagan administration place a higher priority on the preservation of profits than on the preservation of human life," and thus the administration could only stand as an "outcast." Reagan did not care for human lives. But this members of congress who did, revered "children as the true resources of human society." Children existed as combined national resources, as investments on the future, and as a global commons.

Mahler also heard from universities and public health officials from the U.S. Faculty at the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health recorded their "dismay and disapproval" of the No Vote. The U.S. experts underscored that the code,

⁸² Ron Dellums, Walter Fauntroy, William Gray, et al, Congressional Black Caucus, May 1981, ACA Collection, MHS, Box 4.

developed over "two years of intensive negotiations" was meant to demonstrate unanimity.⁸³ Government, international organizations, NGOs and industry created the code as states in the developing countries gave up their desire for more restrictive regulations; the code was a "no more than a recommendation to guide health officials" and the companies in negotiating the tricky terrain of global infant feeding in a corporate age. The faculty members also demonstrated the "courageous stand" of Dr. Stephen Joseph and Eugene Babb, who resigned in protest from senior health positions.

Congress responded to the hundreds of newspaper articles, editorials and television reports about the No Vote. In 1981, when he tried to curb tax breaks on American formula companies if they violated the spirit of the WHO Code, congressman Tom Harkin noted that "to the credit of members of this body, our reaction to this diplomatic blunder was swift and decisive." The House Joint Resolution 287, introduced by the Foreign Affairs Committee, 301 to 100 "expressed 'dismay' at the negative U.S. Vote and urged 'the U.S. Infant formula industry to abide by the guidelines of that code,'" and that the Senate dealt similar, passing a resolution 89 to 2.⁸⁴ This noisy moment during the first two years of Reagan's presidency would fade as market consensus continued its global spread.

The Incorporation of Humanity and the Privatization of Life Itself

Breastfeeding declined precipitously in the twentieth century. It reached its lowest point in the United States after World War II, when, as Linda Bloom has shown, "only 25

⁸³ Johns Hopkins Faculty, "Telegram to Dr. Mahler, WHO," Government Files, ACA Collection, MHS, Box 4.

⁸⁴ Tom Harkin, Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 97th Congress, First Session 127, No. 124 (Sept. 24, 1981).

percent [of infants were] breastfed at birth and less than 10 percent continued beyond the early weeks."⁸⁵ Gabrielle Palmer, as did the INFACT activists and their sympathizers around the world, claimed that low rates of breastfeeding could be blamed on the "medical profession and the corporate producers of breast milk substitutes."⁸⁶ Scientific motherhood, the statistical organization of society, and the medicalization of childbirth also contributed to dramatic breast-feeding declines.⁸⁷

Mothering as seen through the androcentric, patriarchal vision of total human survival – some blamed it on capitalism – was fraught with difficulties. At times the activists in the boycott glossed over the complexities of raising families, from women in the workforce to the very real issue that childrearing is very difficult in any age; many ignored the idea that some women did not want to breastfeed for whatever reason. Many women - in fact most women - did not want to feed their babies breast milk; formula worked fine if used properly; the American Academy of Pediatricians supported the formula companies; the U.S. government validated the formula companies; and women did not want to feel any social shame for using bottles instead of their own breasts. The incorporated body and decisions made differed widely. But the fact remained, baby feeding lay at the center of local, national and global policy.

Where once there was not a Code, the world witnessed the first attempt to create a code of conduct for MNCs. And, the next phase commenced, ushering forth the "code watch" phenomenon, and other code attempts across industries. These codes remained

⁸⁵ Linda Blum, At the Breast: Ideologies of Breastfeeding and Motherhood in the Contemporary United States (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999); Between Feminism and Labor: The Significance of the Comparable Worth Movement (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

⁸⁶ Gabrielle Palmer, The Politics of Breastfeeding (London: Pandora, 1988).

⁸⁷ See Ian Hacking, The Taming of Chance, Ideas in Context (Cambridge University Press, 1990).

voluntary, with little regulatory or legal bite. However, corporate conduct on the global stage now entered full policy, investigative, and legal oversight arenas, ushered in multiple social science studies, and created the Center on Transnational Corporations at the UN and global governance conversations that remained very real. Historian Elizabeth Borgwardt has commented on the ideals of the Atlantic Charter and the Universal Declaration, as have others. Scholars have shown how the ideal framing of documents such as the Declaration of Independence, created by political striving and a particular use of language, affect political and social organization. Other scholars, such as philosopher John Searle have demonstrated how human language creates new institutions, and even legal and cultural frameworks that affect human social organization.⁸⁸ That the WHO code included 119 countries and countless human health officials, corporations, activists, and real people making political and survival decisions, indicated the kinds of awareness that arose in the 1970s.

In a study covering "appropriate technology, inappropriate marketing" on the WHO leadership in the 1970s and 1980s, Nitsan Chorev outlined a shift toward neoliberal insinuation at the WHO, and international health more generally. One thing was clear, geopolitical human and economic health were no simple matters - not for ordinary people nor for multinational corporations. In fact, that the activist coalition believed Congress or WHO/UNICEF could or would do anything to keep companies in check demonstrated an idealistic faith in benevolent international organizations. Formula was no simple breastmilk substitute - when broken down into its formulaic parts it

⁸⁸ John Searle, Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010). See also Elizabeth Borgwardt, A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005); and Lynn Hunt, Inventing Human Rights: A History (New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2007).

seemed more like a complex medicine. Pharmaceuticals, too, remained almost too complex an issue to tackle, especially given the rising AIDS/HIV crisis. The WHO expert class walked a fine line between regulating or alienating private capital and developed countries. The larger story of WHO's evolution, in fact, was a narrative of international public-private tension, and negating developed and developing country health requirements.

Director General Mahler learned his lessons from the bottle-breast controversy, and picked his battles carefully. Not until the tobacco crusades in the 1990s did WHO realistically confront organized private companies head-on; with tobacco, they had a clear moral imperative. With infant formula, and malnourished infants, WHO did not. Chorev wrote that the "WHO leadership did not welcome the pressures put on the WHO to steer clear of issues that industrial countries disapproved, but they chose to avoid direct confrontation. In his speeches, Mahler began to warn member states against endeavors that would lead to conflicts with commercial interests and would therefore fail."⁸⁹ Again, the majority of these pragmatic politics existed because of economic, and the WHO leadership's desire for survival.

For the transnational elite class of experts, WHO endured intense criticisms. For one thing, as it venture beyond the "spheres of WHO's competence" the organization "was exposed to criticism on grounds of amateurism and indecision." Implicitly, these criticisms included developing countries - nations not-quite-there - and the entire NIEO alliance. Regions beyond WHO's ability to understand were those in which "giant

⁸⁹ Nitsan Chorev, The World Health Organization Between North and South, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 103.

multinational commercial interests operated."⁹⁰ One of the biggest questions became how WHO would deal with this neoliberal territory. There were hints of resistance with the NIEO, and with the WHO code process. "Socialist" responses, or simply community-oriented answers to major global problems, such as suggesting "collective purchasing, storing or local production of drugs, let alone to suggest that some drugs were so essential that they should be taken out of the ordinary commodity market" - as was articulated through the WHO code - "was a most ambitious undertaking, but it was important not to generate expectations that went beyond what the Organization could in fact deliver." Ultimately, WHO decide to join them rather than fight them.

Attempts at baby food regulations coupled with a felt need to control pharmaceuticals in developing countries. Mahler and WHO learned from code struggles. In a speech, according to Chorev, "Mahler congratulated member states for what had already been achieved, thereby implicitly closing the door on the possibility of more ambitious goals: 'There was still a long way go to, but WHO had been very courageous in even daring to promote that whole concept of essential drugs.'"⁹¹ Ideas of local production for drugs, as Chile had with formula, pharmaceutical companies effectively corralled. WHO stopped pressing for these kinds of restrictions on global capitalism: "This was justified not only by the necessity of protecting the organization's reputation but also by the argument that the local production of drugs was not economically rational."

Additionally, Chorev illuminated that "in 1978 UNIDO, which was responsible for

⁹⁰ Chorev, 103-110.

⁹¹ Mahler, speech in WHO Document, 1983, EB72/SR/1, 53, WHO Library, quoted in Nitsan Chorev, The World Health Organization Between North and South, 103. Also note Chorev's provocative chapters, and her language, in "Health in Economic Terms" and cost-effective "new universalism," 168-201.

providing the technological capability to produce essential drugs in the developing countries themselves, started warning about challenges in the production of drugs."⁹² The formula industry and individual companies had argued a similar vein about their formula products - too complex to regulate, too unrealistic, too amateurish, and too emotionally tied to images of malnourished or dead babies and not the real world.⁹³

The WHO Code, the meetings between delegates, corporations and activists, the World Health Assembly, U.S. Congress and other national legislative bodies, all fretted the meanings and implications of this first corporate code of conduct, even though it was voluntary, its language often ambiguous, and its consensus nearly universal regarding infant health, breastfeeding, and the need to regulate corporate marketing in vital bio-economic industries. According to Science, as the code completion and victory celebration commenced, as Nestlé acquiesced and the American companies fought any sort of compliance, the code would undergo "future WHO clarifications" and UNICEF would remove "ambiguities from the code."⁹⁴ Presumably these negotiations would involve similar coalitions and interest groups.

⁹² Chorev, 55n.

⁹³ Almost insurmountable issues existed for LDCs in the local production of pharmaceuticals: "They ranged from the strictly technological problem common to most industries of obtaining know-how held by companies in developed countries and of fostering indigenous innovation to the economic difficulties of reducing the costs of buying technology and products in highly imperfect and oligopolistic markets, the medical difficulties of ensuring rational and effective therapeutic practice, the social difficulties of providing for the basic health needs of large numbers of poor people, the legal difficulties of defining property right contracts and obligations in the context of the international operations of private firms, and the political difficulties of countering abuses in the present system, with its entrenched interests, by careful and well-directed policies. Consequently the task of pharmaceutical development is formidable." (Cited in Lall 1978: 1).

⁹⁴ Science, 1984.

The story has not ended, and voices of protest have become muted, fragmented, and absorbed by too much information and too many experts in the fields of science, health, business – the struggle for knowledge and power. Clarifications of the code, code watches, and a proliferation of "codes" have only complicated our understanding of global regulation and corporate governance. The companies succeeded in keeping hard regulations at bay, ultimately wrangled public relations in their favor over the long haul, and contributed to a solidification around health, breastfeeding and motherhood specifically. As Science phrased it in 1984, "although disagreements remain, the crucial concerns about educational materials, hazard warnings on product labels, gifts by the company to health professionals, and free supplies of infant formula to hospitals" were all, at least within the United States, "being addressed satisfactorily by the company."

The company, after the formation of NCCN, and NIFAC, and spending multiple millions of dollars and purported wasted energy dealing with WHO and other agencies, saw the official "ending" of the boycott as one successful piece to its overall strategy. And Edmund Muskie, former Secretary of State, presidential aspirant and liberal of the old school who ran NIFAC, agreed with these assessments, collected his paycheck, and held a few press conferences. NIFAC, in other words, helping maintain a voice in the construction of knowledge and power, ostensibly independent, "reached a similar conclusion" to INBC, INFAC and the other groups. Now, INFAC could move on to nuclear weapons, a ten-year-old controversy slipped away to be revived in watered-down, cyber-sphere form in the 1990s and 2000s, and began its morphing to ACA and CAI, tobacco lawsuits and finally back to Nestlé and the privatization of water – much of this

activism utilizing the World Bank and other institutions in the long, complicated, convoluted story of global governance in the era of humanity incorporated.

Reproductive Technologies and the Ownership of Health

In the first few years after the Code's passage, many participants who had gone through the boycott and the Code process voiced concerns over the Code's global effectiveness. Political scientist Kathryn Sikkink noted that not many states, though supporting the code, drafted enforcement measures.⁹⁵ ICCR's Edward Baer echoed this assessment, noting that governments initially approached the issue from a "softer pro-breastfeeding" and the "general area of promoting healthy infant feeding practices."⁹⁶ Governments saw this method as less political, easier, and avoided confrontation with "entrenched economic interests." Baer lamented that "few governments have moved decisively to implement the code as a minimum requirement as stipulated" by the WHA. Baer and other activists monitoring the code saw difficult obstacles for implementation, including the giant multinationals, the inability of WHO/UNICEF to actual provide "political and technical support . . . in part because the U.S. government has threatened to cut off funds." In the several years after 1981, national applications of the code were "spotty" while formula marketing continued, and so the WHA passed several resolutions "reaffirming the code and calling on the WHO Secretariat "to assist members states in their implementation work."⁹⁷ For many on the activist side, progress was slow. And

⁹⁵ Kathryn Sikkink, "Codes of Conduct for Transnational Corporations: The Case of the WHO/UNICEF Code," International Organization 40, no. 4 (October 1, 1986): 815–40.

⁹⁶ Baer, 121.

⁹⁷ Baer, 121.

notoriously, the formula industry was not eager to adopt the Code, especially in Europe and the United States.

These analyses contributed to comprehending how companies sought markets, lobbied politicians, and insisted on working on the code of conduct. They could better contain the code and its language, noted political scientist Kathryn Sikkink, rather than an effective boycott and consumer pressure in the public sphere. Companies lobbied Congress and created organizations for their own maintenance of power, and they lobbied health professionals and large international organizations. As negotiations for the WHO code continued, and as companies, health professionals, other "experts" fought for specific language and intent, "industry representatives stressed privately to the U.S. delegation that their major concern was not host-country regulation but increased activism."⁹⁸ Sikkink wrote that, "some in the business community feel that codes of conduct will proliferate and the corporations must get involved in their development. John Kline, for example, argues that 'a carefully structured participatory role . . . could turn challenge into opportunity, benefiting both individual corporations and the broader objective of an open international economic system.'"⁹⁹ Chorev echoed this assessment, as did the contingent history that unfolded.

⁹⁸ Ellen Lutz and Kathryn Sikkink, "Nongovernmental Organizations and Transnational Issue Networks in International Politics," Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law) 89 (April 5, 1995): 413–15; Kathryn Sikkink, "Codes of Conduct for Transnational Corporations: The Case of the WHO/UNICEF Code," International Organization 40, no. 4 (October 1, 1986): 815–40.

⁹⁹ See Sikkink, and John Kline, "Entrapment or Opportunity: Structuring a Corporate Response to International Codes of Conduct," Columbia Journal of World Business 15 (Summer 1980).

Also, it is possible to view the Code process and the focus on human health and wellbeing within a vision of a universal health standard. For example, Robert Cox, a political scientist and expert on international political economy, mentioned the structures and instruments of international agreements and relationships, as did Akira Iriye in Global Community.¹⁰⁰ But what does "global community" really mean? These types of questions, and the answers that often flowed from multidimensional expert sources, revealed an increased concern for humanity as a whole. Cox, according to Sikkink, detailed "the role of international organization in the institutionalization of hegemony – the universalization of norms proper to a structure of world power – and also the possibility that international institutions may become vehicles for the articulation of a coherent counter-hegemonic set of values."¹⁰¹ In other words, we might see the boycott against food companies and the resulting code as indicators of this new politics in the global sphere.

There were ample opportunities for hegemony-consolidation. But new kinds of actors – activists, protestors, church groups, radicals, and consumers – played a role in the code construction and in pressuring corporations in novel ways that none of the TNCs could ignore. These changes were incremental and occurred within the larger dominant structures of power. For some, the boycott created better corporations, improved

¹⁰⁰ See Akira Iriye, Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Leslie Sklair, "The Transnational Capitalist Class and Global Politics: Deconstructing the Corporate: State Connection," International Political Science Review / Revue Internationale de Science Politique 23, no. 2 (April 1, 2002): 159–74; Richard Sklar, Postimperialism and World Politics (Westport, Conn: Praeger, 1999). Richard Sklar, African Politics in Postimperial Times: The Essays of Richard L. Sklar. Classic Authors and Texts on Africa (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2002).

¹⁰¹ Robert Cox, "The Crisis of World Order and the Problem of International Organization in the 1980s," International Journal 35 (Spring 1980).

consumers, and grew proper economic citizens, which ultimately cultivated a neoliberal worldwide organization of food and resource distribution. TNCs, according to Stephen Hymer, required detailed information and organization in order to function across nations and reach different sorts of consumers everywhere. Sikkink also added that "the ability to organize worldwide depends in part on the maintenance of legitimacy or ideological hegemony." Businesses, therefore, fought the activists in the interest of protecting and consolidating this ideological hegemony. Most states and international organizations worked within this field of legitimacy, substantiating the "free enterprise system" and the existing methods of resource distribution. The stakes here, besides the ownership of the means of production and of power pure and simple, were the ways survival would be organized across nations.

The struggle to save the world encompassed reproductive rights, women's health and conceptions of the normal family. For conservatives in the U.S., babies were to be born in a nuclear household with a father who worked and a supermom capitalist mother who stayed home and raised economic citizens competing efficiently in the market. Just how, in a "man-made" and scientifically advanced world, people not only raised children but carried babies to term, gave birth to them, and fed them to maturity all played out in culture and society. These issues went far beyond nuclear families, but also asked questions about whether or not mothers should carry their own children, whether fathers should stay at home, whether two women could marry, two male partners raise kids, and where should infant and child food come from. These social explorations existed within the framework of attempts to privatize everything and fragment the material and intellectual world into ever smaller parts.

Breastfeeding and bottle-feeding illuminated much of the political struggles over the corporatization of health and growth. Within national and international organizations concerned about health and well-being, the neoliberal paradigm remained absolutely dominant. Companies made billions in infant feeding. However, as anthropologist Penny Van Esterik emphasized, "immunization, family planning, growth monitoring, and oral rehydration therapy, all provide opportunities for pharmaceutical companies to make large, profitable contracts with governments, aid agencies, and multilateral organizations." UNICEF emphasized these programs, as did WHO and most national governments. Large companies profited on the global monitoring of bodies and creating universal health norms. Bodily health and growth existed firmly within a neoliberal world structure that ran in deep and complicated ways.¹⁰²

The privatization of life itself, and regulatory attempts at curbing the tsunami of global commodification, drove the various voices involved in the long controversy. Historian Linda Blum noted that "with reproductive technologies closing in on the artificial womb and the latest surrogacy cases denying the birth-giving woman any relationship to the child, we may want to argue in a complex way, to both honor women's bodies and enlarge the availability of (women-centered) options for those who cannot have or do not want the embodied experiences."¹⁰³ This feminist view, and its internal complications within the equality-difference divide, highlighted the sometimes simplistic and androcentric view of the WHO code of conduct, as Rafael pointed out in her

¹⁰² Penny Van Esterik, Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy (New Brunswick, New Jersey), 198. See also Paul Farmer, and Dying for Growth, and Sickness and Wealth.

¹⁰³ Blum, "Late Capitalism," 301.

testimony before Congress.¹⁰⁴ Not only were American middle-class feminist perspectives not taken into account at the UN, neither were the urban poor, women marked by racial or ideological difference, nor Third World mothers with their own cultural interpretations of child-rearing and infant feeding.

This was a key perspective for critiquing the Code and placing its institutional framework into larger cultural, social and ideological complications across the globe. The way the WHO Code, Congressional hearings, general public or the UN viewed corporations was one thing in particular, based on a critique of multinationals. But also whether or even how to regulate their products, especially medical products such as vaccines, pesticides like DDT or survival foods such as formula baby food. As historian Michael Willrich showed in Pox, state regulation of the private market existed in areas of public health and social control, and competed with religious views, political ideology and even regional cultural differences. But when corporations, through their scientific products and by accident, killed large numbers of people, especially infants and young children, nation-states took notice.

And so what is world health? Nestlé supplied part of the answer, indicating in the process a global vision, and the political economy of global health and improvement: "A long-term answer to the problems of infant nutrition in the developing countries will only be achieved by close cooperation between the international health agencies, governments, health professionals, well-informed and concerned individuals and the Infant Formula Industry. The activities of ICCR, INFACT and related groups do nothing to foster that cooperation. The negativism of their infant formula campaign and the use of questionable

¹⁰⁴ Blum, "Late Capitalism," 301.

tactics which are intended to arouse emotional responses actually discredit those organizations."¹⁰⁵ Intelligent critics of multinational capitalism had no place in this search for order, growth and development. Nor did ordinary mothers and children.

Consumer groups continued to see the WHO's official sanction of formula manufacturing as evidence of insidious corporate presence in global health. However, the companies truly saw the UN's stamp of approval as justification for existing. Furthermore, industry, and especially Nestlé, could not understand activist's universalizing ire. The arguments rarely departed from this central pivot. Local differences, and laws, they respected. But industry assumed a universality and worked through a set of norms of health and productivity that visualized bodily, natal, and species-level compliance with private property. Improvement, health, and growth existed within the managed health of united nations.

The infant formula companies begrudgingly offered rhetorical promises to self-regulate their activities. The activists began with specific targets and lofty visions of corporate accountability in a complex world, and ended with a concept of universal health. Baer noted that the stakes in the boycott and code ultimately rested with the "intent of the World Health Assembly for one universal health care standard."¹⁰⁶ The corporations, too, sought universality, in their visions of total growth, total open markets, and a conception of a one world. The political economy of the individual body, and the corpus known as an organism on a planet, arose out of the modern mass administration of

¹⁰⁵ Guerrant Letter to Tim Smith, Kennedy Hearings, 630-650.

¹⁰⁶ Baer, 121.

billions of bodies, and the mixed economic realities of that system. James Scott called this 'high modernism.'¹⁰⁷

Measures of triumph and failure are unclear in this story. Activists claimed a stunning, impressive success in raising consciousness, engaging direct action, and leading to institutional changes locally and globally. They accomplished far more than simply bringing the massive food and pharmaceutical companies to the bargaining table. They actually performed and reflected the kind of activism that did indeed change the world, and mirrored the larger structural changes that occurred. Baer wrote that citizens groups – and these citizens were now properly consuming, economic citizens – "learned to work together in international cooperation."¹⁰⁸ They utilized "grassroots economic pressure on international health and corporate policymakers," and employed the entrenched expert field, the professionalized activist in mass society to "marshal scientific facts and evidence in defense of people's basic economic and political rights to freedom from hunger and exploitation."

This viewpoint mirrored ideas such as freedom from hunger, and, reflected Britain's group War On Want, freedom from want, freedom from starvation and death in a capitalist world system. These visionaries believed in and re-conceptualized human rights within the incorporated age (the 1999/2000 attempt at a Universal Human Rights Guidelines for Companies mimicked this freedom from hunger and want call, attempting

¹⁰⁷ James Scott, Seeing Like A State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976).

¹⁰⁸ Baer, 121.

to enact freedom from exploitation, and economic justice).¹⁰⁹ Baer urged people to "recognize that our political and economic institutions, no matter how awesome they seem, are, in fact, vulnerable to popular pressure." Within this convergence of human rights, popular pressure, and huge delegations of power, existed the struggles within the incorporation of humanity.

The UN megaconferences, declarations and attempts at codes of conduct helped define the era. For many expert observers, pundits and ordinary men and women, a "predicament of mankind" existed. First, there was a universal humanity, and second that this collective experienced drastic danger, and third, that a body of experts could identify the problem, outline some answers, and engage expert policy channels to affect the material world and save as many people as possible.¹¹⁰ One of the most famous of the megaconferences - the World Food Conference, Rome 1974, in the wake of severe famines in Bangladesh - while attempting to solve the world food crisis, also dealt with

¹⁰⁹ See Draft Universal Human Rights Guidelines for Companies, Introduction, U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/WG.2/WP.1 (2001), a draft version at the University of Minnesota Human Rights Library, which detailed the labors of the Working Group on the Working Methods and Activities of Transnational Corporations of the Sub-Commission in August 1999. This particular code, mentioned in Sol Picciotto, Regulating Global Corporate Capitalism, and part of the code impulse that reflected the anxieties and queries of the international community about TNC activities in the world and their import, the consequences of their power, and their roles as social institutions. This UN investigation mirrored the Church hearings, and involved many activists, government agencies, and companies around the world. Leah Margulies embodied a living body within this historical context, with her ambitions, politics, hopes and beliefs. This type of politics established the general outlines of the multinational moment. This particular Human Rights code "would attempt to involve in a constructive manner the relevant business communities, governments, and NGOs having expertise on the subject." Again, the productive politics from above organized this impulse within the global expert class.

¹¹⁰ See The Club of Rome, The Limits to Growth; see "predicament" in Introduction, and note President Carter's Global 2000 Report.

the problem of infant and child feeding.¹¹¹ The world body adopted a Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition.¹¹² Concerned delegates, activists and expert professionals declared to "resolve the world food problem within the broader context of development and international economic co-operation." Therefore, development and The Economy stood at the center of solving the food crisis in the international community.

This framework, within a universal rights discourse, assumed family planning, population control, interconnected intimate states, and the monitoring and management of the human. This particular food declaration followed the Universal Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, and other voiced ideals of human global peace and prosperity. It also reflected some of the postcolonial, non-aligned movement thinking expressed in the NIEO. "The grave food crisis" that impacted the "peoples of the developing countries" threatened world health, and the principles of "the right to life and human dignity as

¹¹¹ United Nations, General Assembly. "Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition," November 16, 1974.

¹¹² Recall Alan Berg's The Nutrition Factor, and the growing awareness of the role of nutrition and child-citizen growth and development as necessary for national development. Dr. Jelliffe echoed this economic analysis of breast-feeding and nutrition for human development. Most hoped to ward off Mike Davis's prophesy of a coming "planet of slums." See Alan Berg, The Nutrition Factor; Its Role in National Development (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1973), and Berg and World Bank, Malnourished People: a Policy View. Poverty and Basic Needs Series (Washington, D.C., 1818 H St., N.W., Washington 20433: World Bank, 1981; also note Mike Davis, Planet of Slums (London ; New York: Verso, 2006); and Paul Farmer Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor, California Series in Public Anthropology 4 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); and Susan George, Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994); How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger (Montclair, N.J: Allanheld, Osmun, 1977); Ill Fares the Land: Essays on Food, Hunger, and Power (Washington, D.C: Institute for Policy Studies, 1984); Susan George, and Institute for Policy Studies, Feeding the Few: Corporate Control of Food (Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1978). These text joined many others within the food, capitalism and survival political and cultural nexus; many are cited throughout this dissertation.

enshrined in the Universal Declaration." Hunger and malnutrition as catalogued evils arose because of historical "social inequalities," that stemmed from "alien and colonial domination, foreign occupation, racial discrimination, apartheid and neocolonialism in all its forms." This litany explained why humanist scholars, especially historians, have hesitated when faced with universals such as a human "species."¹¹³ And yet, with the "united" universal era within the "UN System" totalizing ideas flourished even as many of them came from Western institutions. The idea of "world health" remained a problem for some, as it continued a kind of paternalist, colonial vision of a proper way of social being.

The healthy state of humanity reflected these impulses and found local resistances to them. Demographic pressures and the world economic crises exacerbated world hunger, a narrative that included dying babies, refugees, and the rise of corporate feeding systems. A "world food security system" should be established to compete with inadequacies in the world privatized system. This belief, though, set the stage for ideological and practical struggles, especially given that the corporate, classical liberal model viewed open and private markets as necessary for the proper "production and distribution" of foods, able to efficiently resolve scarcity and feed all the peoples of the world. If regulators, activists and IOs would just leave companies alone, even the "vagaries of weather" would not derail the human feeding system. Contemporaries noted the widening gap between rich and poor within developed nations, and across the globe. This situation, worsening in the 1970s, did not change. In fact, it became the pattern for most societies.

¹¹³ See discussion in Chakrabarty, "The Climate of History."

Reflecting the ideas inherent in the postwar order as outlined by the victorious powers, the "new deal for the world," people should be free from want and suffering. "Every man, woman and child has the inalienable right to be free from hunger and malnutrition in order to develop fully and maintain their physical and mental faculties." Food security should be a fundamental human right. This conception came up against the underlying structures of private power, mostly emanating from the west, but also connected to elite classes across nations. Abundance and scarcity troubled many thinkers and activists of the age, expressing shared beliefs that there existed enough food to feed the poor and hungry across the globe. "Society today already possesses sufficient resources, organizational ability and technology" and the knowledge to achieve the objectives outlined by the Declaration. Every body possessed rights; and bodies must be free from want in order to "develop fully," and maintain matter and mind; the same might be said for the state, and for the capitalist mind and body, as well.

EPILOGUE

The Liquids of Life

And after all that, the boycott's end lasted only four years. Though the first Nestlé boycott ended in 1984, the international coalition of activists continued finding Code violations in urban and rural areas around the world. The International Baby Food Action Network (IBFAN), working within WHO/UNICEF, began compiling evidence of marketing abuses soon after the first agreement. In 1988, the International Code Documentation Center (ICDC) published IBFAN's findings, called State of the Code.¹ With repeated transgressions, Action for Corporate Accountability (ACA), formerly INFACT and still in Minneapolis, resumed the boycott of Nestlé, and added American Home Products. ACA exhorted other groups to follow.²

¹ International Code Documentation Center (ICDC) and IBFAN, State of the Code by country and by company, 1988. ICDC began publishing state of the code charts in 1986, when monitoring became an important tool after phase one of the boycott ended; they published these official reports, officially accepted by WHO and UNICEF, in 1986, 1988, 1989, 1991, 1994, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2006 2009, and 2011. According to ICDC, in 2006 32 countries "have implemented most of the Code and subsequent World Health Assembly resolutions by means of a comprehensive law, decree or other legally enforceable measure." This doubled the 16 countries actively implementing the Code in 1997, noted in this chapter. See "State of the Code By Country," <http://www.ibfan.org/art/298-11.pdf> (accessed January 22, 2014). Monitoring groups extended their categories from four to nine by 2006. The US, rated last in 1997, still upheld its determination not to implement any aspect of the Code, rated 8, or "no action." An asterisk, however, noted that Massachusetts partially enacted elements of the Code.

² Recall that INFACT split into two groups, one remained with infant formula activism (ACA), the other, called Corporate Accountability International (CAI), moved on to other corporate issues related to General Electric's involvement in the nuclear arms race, Nestlé's privatization of water, and the massive tobacco settlement in the 1990s.

With the boycott resumed in many countries, the Code's influence grew in institutional importance. In 1992, UNICEF started the Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative (BFHI).³ This program sought to increase breastfeeding rates in hospitals around the world and decrease corporate marketing presence.⁴ UNICEF, health professionals and individual women labored to keep formula products away from newborns, and BFHI helped them achieve breastfeeding targets. UNICEF's 1998 The State of the World's Children, which focused on global nutrition, detailed the community-based importance of breastfeeding to lowering malnutrition and increasing growth. The report also stressed the connection between nutrition and economic health, and the need to empower and educate women and girls, especially in poor countries.⁵ The intensity of the fight to keep mothers and babies together reflected the entrenched structures that had to be overcome.⁶

³ See "Highlights of the Year," UNICEF Annual Report, which noted that BFHI came out of "two landmark documents," the 1990 Innocenti Declaration on the Protection, Promotion and Support of Breastfeeding and the World Summit for Children Declaration and Plan of Action." The Innocenti Declaration, noted earlier, aimed to press nations to enact "laws to enforce" the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes and to help protect women's breastfeeding human right in the marketplace, http://www.unicef.org/about/history/files/unicef_annual_report_1997.pdf, (accessed January 15, 2014), 39.

⁴ See among many possible sources, Reverend Simon Barrington-Ward, "Putting Babies Before Business," in Progress of Nations, (UNICEF, 1997), 16.

⁵ See, UNICEF, The State of the World's Children, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 37, 39, and 47-50. Echoing the women's health movement noted in Chapter One, nutrition and infant health required "the empowerment of women" as vital "to improving nutrition of both women themselves and their children. This includes legislative and political efforts to combat discrimination against and exploitation of women and measures to ensure that women have adequate access to resources and care at all levels of society. Improving education for girls and women is also vital." This perspective included the complex relationship between "growth monitoring" of individual children and of community health and economic growth. The difficulties contained within the politics of poverty and illness versus sickness and wealth remained.

⁶ UNICEF periodically published BFHI hospital status by country. In March 2002, for example, Nigeria had 1147 such maternity wards, Kenya 232, Iran 376, Egypt 122, China 6312, Philippines

By the 1990s, monitoring the code had become a life's work for some professional activists. IBFAN's monitoring techniques continued to focus on national implementation of the International Code. ICDC listed the formula companies - such as Nestlé, Dumex, Abbott Ross, Danone, Friesland/Coberco, Gerber, Heinz, Mead-Johnson/Bristol Myers Squibb, Meiji, Milupa, Morinaga, Cow & Gate, Snow Brand and Wyeth - and assessed company compliance with the Code. The group monitored companies according to specific articles of the Code, such as promotion to the public and health workers, adherence to labeling standards, and whether companies offered free or low-cost supplies to pregnant and post-partum mothers.⁷ The group found that Nestlé, which dominated the world market, "unfortunately matched with its record as the worst Code offender." Nestlé claimed that it followed the Code via its "own in-house instructions." The activists insisted that company codes and voluntary rules always failed to match the International Code or stop harming babies. The American companies - Mead Johnson, Abbott Ross and Wyeth - violated "the Code in a blatant manner." Nestlé often complained that it lost market share to the American companies because it followed the Code as best the company could, and the American firms did not.

1047, Thailand 780, India 1250, Mexico 692. Canada possessed 1, and the United States 25. The charts demonstrated most significantly that developing countries took the Code far more seriously, and that WHO retained a much more important voice, than in industrialized countries. This trend also held for national legislation dealing with breastfeeding and the Code standards. UNICEF also published BFHI News, a newsletter on updates, data and success stories. Success stories centered on developing countries increasing breastfeeding, such as Cuba going from 25 percent breastfeeding in 1990 to 72 percent in 1996, or China reaching nearly 70 percent breastfeeding in rural areas in 1994. See UNICEF, "The Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative," <http://www.unicef.org/programme/breastfeeding/baby.htm#10>, (accessed January 22, 2014).

⁷ See IBFAN, State of the Code by Company, 2004, which reflected in a similar way all other years and can stand here as an example, <http://www.ibfan.org/art/298-9.pdf> (accessed January 22, 2014)

More than a decade after the most intense international focus on Nestlé commenced, the company refused to accept allegations of wrongdoing or unethical conduct. Carol Bellamy, Executive Director of UNICEF, while pushing the Code in official capacity,, complained to Nestlé about its responses and denials to IBFAN's monitoring work, and to the basic meaning and intent of the International Code. In November 1997, Bellamy wrote Peter Brabeck-Letmathe, Nestlé Executive Vice-President, and stated that differences between UNICEF and Nestlé appeared to be irreconcilable.⁸ According to activists in England, Nestlé responded to Cracking the Code, an IBFAN publication, on BBC, saying that, "the company 'was not prepared to accept reproaches from self-appointed groups.'" Though as self-appointed as industry, IBFAN continued publishing marketing and promotional violations within the auspices of WHO for dozens of countries. For Mexico, a labeling infringement included a message under the lid for Wyeth's Promil Gold brand, which that the powdered formula was excellent "for babies that devour the world."⁹ The organization never possessed a radical anti-capitalism vision, though Leah Margulies and others pushed the limits of liberal church sensibilities. Often various leaders and local congregations held serious

⁸ Carol Bellamy, Letter to Peter Brabeck-Letmathe, November 3, 1997. Brabeck-Letmathe became Nestlé Chairman, and he continued to establish networks between business, government and policy professionals in the realm of global health. For example - and derided by activist groups - he, Nestlé, and the Inter-American Development Bank, ran the Creating Shared Value Forum in 2013 on "how to accelerate sustainable development," and "the changing role of business in development," with business imperatives answers and neoliberal at the center of prescriptions. Ann Veneman, former Executive Director of UNICEF attended, as did some academics, NGO representatives and politicians. See <http://www.Nestlé.com/media/mediaeventscalendar/allevnts/creating-shared-value-forum-2013> (accessed January 17, 2014).

⁹ IBFAN, Breaking the Rules, Stretching the Rules, (2004), 77-81.

disagreements about the direction and the inherent politics involved in corporate accountability activism.¹⁰

Assessing the successes and failures of the boycott remains essential for this project. The activists raised consciousness about these issues – infant formula specifically, breastfeeding declines and multinational corporations generally. The boycott helped infants and mothers, and raised awareness of global health. The activists also established and helped create international networks, within NGOs and international organizations such as WHO. They lay the groundwork for consumer advocacy and anti-corporate boycotts, witnessed in the pesticides and chemicals industry, and in the current "water wars." The Code itself contributed to MNC awareness and further code attempts, and served as a model for regulatory attempts on global capital and corporations. Additionally, the boycott helped achieve consciousness of corporate social responsibility and accountability, and provided insight into the need for international regulation of multinational companies. Plus, NGOs now largely have a "seat at the table," possess the

¹⁰ Leah Margulies often highlighted the difference between "social responsibility" and "corporate accountability," noting that, at least according to her, the social responsibility side came out of the moral social gospel factions, from the churches mostly, reflected by ICCR, Timothy Smith, and even Doug Johnson's morally-inflected non-violent Gandhi-ism and Saul Alinsky methods of social justice action. Leah Margulies, Interview with Author, February 6, 2013. Doug Johnson explained his admiration for Alinsky, mentioning his book Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals (New York: Random House, 1971), and Alinsky's role as a founder of modern community organizing. Alinsky was a principal organizer with the New Left, and founded Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) in 1940, which he used to train community organizers, and which influenced a long line of American activists, from Fred Ross, Cesar Chavez, Dolores Huerta, Jesse Jackson, Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama and the American Tea Party movement. Sanford D. Horwitt, Let Them Call Me Rebel: Saul Alinsky: His Life and Legacy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989), and Nicholas von Hoffman, Radical: A Portrait of Saul Alinsky (New York: Nation Books, 2010). For an engaging and thorough account of Alinsky and the Industrial Areas Foundation, plus direction to many excellent archives, see Mark Edward Santow, "Saul Alinsky and the Dilemmas of Race in the Post-War City," unpublished dissertation, Department of History, University of Pennsylvania, 2000, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text.

ear of corporations and governments, and remain strong contributors to the social and economic justice "conversation," although this relationship remains a struggle.

But the triumphs also come with reservations, and severe limitations. Part of the reason for the absorption of activist energy into totalized incorporation stemmed from the fact that, "the boycott has done Nestlé little harm."¹¹ The company made most of its revenues from 99% of its other businesses besides infant formula, and as the world's largest food corporation, it worked hard to contain the boycott. But ultimately, the economics of the boycott and of its global presence never faltered. "Since the beginning of 1977, the company's share price has increased by 1,592 per cent, outperforming Morgan Stanley's European stock index by 166 per cent." Where Nestlé has always hoped to grow, develop and produce, it has done so with remarkable success. A 43-year-long campaign, and the formula companies continued doing what they always have: marketing their products in the Third World, seeking increased growth and development, expanding market share, and advertising their beneficial role in the struggle to survive.

Infant formula and baby feeding, breastfeeding patterns, and corporate privatization efforts remain concerns all over the world today. Almost weekly, articles in major newspapers, magazines and websites illustrate Nestlé's attempt to own food and water, formula companies selling their products directly to consumers, and the relationships to bodily and environmental health. One article in the New York Times in July 2013 discussed Chinese purchases of infant formula outside of China, often in European or "westernized" countries such as Germany, England, New Zealand, and

¹¹ Michael Skapinker offered a few economic facts about Nestlé. "It was rated the world's 11th most respected company in this year's Financial Times/PwC survey and has been in the top 20 every year since 1998, when the survey began," and that "Nestlé says that infant formula accounts for no more than 1 per cent of its revenues."

Holland. According to journalist Edward Wong, Chinese tourists abroad purchase enough formula that they cause national shortages in the West. The story seems never to end, and it will not, so long as states, IOs, and companies seek bodies to commoditize within the realms of baby feeding. Markets, international relations, and consumption patterns possessed "far-reaching impacts on critical daily goods around the world."¹² Indeed, these commodities are critical for survival, and contested within politics and society at every turn.

We know water to be an elemental, universal requirement for sustaining human life, as are infant milks - whether breastmilk or artificial - and as such many consider water to be a mineral resource, a valuable commodity for life itself. Resource extraction by the powers that be, whether during the imperial era or the capitalist one, always existed as a top-down proposition, even with local resistance. The laws favor the controllers of knowledge and the law. In one example of hundreds, Nestlé Waters Canada, according to the Vancouver Sun, has "extracted millions of liters of groundwater, for free" from Canadian territories previously settled by First Nations people. Water extraction, mineral exploitation and fracking must pass through a consultation process with the native people, a process that often has been ignored by the government and the large companies. The law stipulates that indigenous people must be "consulted," but not compensated. According to the Chawathil First Nation, Nestlé takes 265 million liters of water annually from a well. Nestlé claimed that they bought the well and have operated it smoothly without any local fuss. Note the burden of proof as

¹² Edward Wong, "Chinese Search for Infant Formula Goes Global." The New York Times, July 25, 2013, sec. World / Asia Pacific. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/26/world/asia/chinas-search-for-infant-formula-goes-global.html>.

outlined by Nestlé: the native peoples and their representatives should have known. In this case, Nestlé possessed the technologies and funding to remove the water, truck it, bottle it, store it and sell it in markets around the world – demonstrating primitive accumulation in its purest form. According to laws developed during the beginning of petroleum extraction the United States, Nestlé possessed rights to this water, thus it could “distribute the water that it obtained for free.” But the First Nations people contested these rights because the land “belonged” to them.¹³ One chief noted that they were not anti-business; they simply wanted their legal ownership rights respected. This phrase has been key for activists in the corporate age: You eat in business, grow in business, and die in business. You cannot be anti-business.

Ironically, and illustrating the limits of consumer activism in a deepening, widening, neoliberal age, anti-formula news articles are often supported by formula advertising. When viewed on the web, a critique in The Independent exposing food giant Danone's misleading advertising in 2013 included an advertisement for Enfamil, a Mead Johnson product, click and roll over to free gifts for eager parents. After reading the article one could fill out the Enfamil form and received “Free informative articles, booklets and emails; Free goodies, such as an Enfamil Parent Support Kit; Free samples and discounts, put to \$60 in savings on any Enfamil formula.”¹⁴ When a parent signed up for the free samples, the company included a lure for formula and supplements beyond

¹³ Kelly Sinoski, “Nestlé’s Extraction of Groundwater Near Hope Riles First Nations.” Www.vancouversun.com, August 22, 2013. <http://www.vancouversun.com/life/Nestlé+extraction+groundwater+near+Hope+riles+First+Nations/8817969/story.html>.

¹⁴ The advertisement appeared on the following article, Melanie Newman and Oliver Wright, “After Nestlé, Aptamil Manufacturer Danone Is Now Hit by Breast Milk Scandal.” The Independent. Accessed July 2, 2013. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/after-nestl-aptamil-manufacturer-danone-is-now-hit-by-breast-milk-scandal-8679226.html>.

infancy. They called the entire promotion "infant family beginnings." The family, the human mammal's breast, and the market existed as ideologies and practical norms that corralled much of the denunciatory weight of the original article.

And so the boycott continues to this day, amid a world defined by too much information and everything for sale. INFACT Canada pushed a Nestlé Free Week, from October 28 to November 3, 2013, stating that the week was "a time for people who boycott Nestlé over the way it pushes baby milk to do more to promote the boycott - and for those who don't boycott to give it a go."¹⁵ Baby Milk Action advertised the weeklong protest week, and offered a "Nestlé-Free Zone poster" that consumers could place in their windows, and various guides to Nestlé products, including an iPhone app "to detect Nestlé products." Links to the Baby Feeding Law Group allowed concerned economic citizens to learn about code violations, monitoring techniques and continuing campaigns around the world.¹⁶ INFACT Canada exhorted potential boycotters to say "No Nestlé for

¹⁵ Boycott Nestlé, "Nestlé-Free Week," <http://www.ibfan.org/code-monitoring.html>, (accessed January 14, 2014). Baby Milk Action promoted the 2014 event, allowing concerned economic citizens to send complaints to Nestlé via Twitter and email "calling on it to stop its misleading marketing of baby milk." One could also click to spread the boycott Nestlé week on Facebook. Further, in October, 2014, Nestlé held what it called Creating Shared Value Global Forum," which, according to its critics, was a "strategy to promote itself as having a solely beneficial impact and to put itself at the center of policy setting on development, nutrition, the environment and so on," among many other events, petitions and protest possibilities. See "International Nestlé Free Week," <http://www.ibfan.org/code-monitoring.html>, (accessed January 12, 2014). For Nestlé's position, its vision of global infant, corporate and economic health, see <http://www.Nestlé.com/media/mediaeventscalendar/allevnts/creating-shared-value-forum-2013>, (accessed January 14, 2014).

¹⁶ The Baby Feeding Law Group hoped to implement the International Code and "subsequent resolutions" from the WHA into national legislation in the UK. See Baby Feeding Law Group, <http://www.Nestlé.com/media/mediaeventscalendar/allevnts/creating-shared-value-forum-2013>, (accessed January 14, 2014). The Law Group consisted of over twenty members, such as the Royal College of Midwives, Royal College of Nursing, Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, UK Association of Milk Banking, UNICEF UK Baby Friendly Initiative, Women's Environmental Network, La Leche League, Baby Milk Action, the Association of Breastfeeding Mothers, and the Association of Radical Midwives.

Halloween!" and add "Nestlé-Free" labels to Halloween candy bags. Not exactly a revolutionary call for social change: the international boycott groups urged interested consumers to boycott Nescafe first and foremost, and to "try giving all Nestlé products a miss for this week," stating that, "if you don't boycott because you don't want to miss out on a Nestlé brand, try boycotting for this week." Over the course of the boycott, industry learned how to manage this type of soft activism. Meanwhile, Nestlé continued to dominate markets, and much of health policy around the world. The evidence of industry's early scramble to consolidate its influence, control of the discourse, and even direct local and global policy in the second boycott and beyond, demonstrated the distinct power and influence of the MNCs.

Formula companies still provide free formula to pregnant women. The industry mails samples to their homes, to mothers with newborns in hospitals, and to health care professionals. These companies successfully market their products throughout the North and South, urban and rural, rich and poor, radical feminist or conservative housewife. Smiling infants still grace the canisters, and multinationals retain a presence in health care facilities and a voice in Congress and the United Nations. A 2008 article in the Wall Street Journal enthusiastically detailed how advertising and MNCs continue the business of selling in poor regions. Advertising firm McCann, a division of Interpublic Group, started a new division in 2008 called "Barrio," hoping to train its marketing professionals in the consumption habits of the world's poor, and training them to appreciate the structures of selling to people who consume products from small stores throughout the impoverished, or "thin wallet," consuming world. The advertising agency called these poor buyers "emerging consumers." Companies won most political battles, they prevailed

in the realm of values, and they subtly and coercively achieved victory over hearts and minds, over healthy growing bodies and growing economies as well.¹⁷

Concerned consumers and anti-corporate agitators still monitor MNC activity around the world, and western newspapers are only too happy to report their findings. This liberal angst continues with groups such as SumOfUs, which recently collected signatures for a petition sent to Nestlé SA over its attempts to patent nigella saliva, or the fennel flower, which "has been used as a cure-all remedy for over a thousand years." Nestlé scientists, after research in its laboratories, published a paper that "claimed to 'discover'" that fennel extract "could be used for 'nutritional interventions in humans with food allergy,'" among other salves. Health and ownership continued in Nestlé's technological and scientific work to discover and own core elements of human existence. And the rallying cry still remained "fighting for people over profits," as it had during the Nestlé boycott and infant formula global conundrum.¹⁸ Added to this growing list, Nestlé and other companies are paying mothers for their breastmilk, storing it, and selling it on the market.¹⁹ Critics fear that impoverished women will submit to a new work discipline on human dairy farms.

But do consumers around the world really care about corporate behavior?

Companies were concerned about their brand image in the world, and they spent millions

¹⁷ Antonio Regalado, "McCann Offers Peek at Lives of Latin America's Poor: Interpublic Unit Forms Bodega Division to Tutor Clients in Marketing to the Region's 'Emerging Consumers,'" Wall Street Journal, December 8, 2008.

¹⁸ "Nestlé Wants to Patent This Natural Medicine That Has Been Freely Available for 1,000 Years." SumOfUs. Accessed April 22, 2013. <http://action.sumofus.org/a/Nestlé-nigella-sativa/7/3/>.

¹⁹ Andrew Pollack, "New Breast Milk Products Are on the Rise, but Commercialization Troubles Many," New York Times, March 20, 2015.

protecting and extending this self-reflection. Consumer perceptions of social responsibility led to an intense focus on companies in South Africa and contributed to some impressive changes. But overall, over an extended time, some scholars doubted the efficacy of corporate concerns about their own social responsibility. There appeared to be an "attitude-behavior" gap in consumer behavior.²⁰

The impact of boycotts has been difficult to determine. Upper-middle-class consumers shopping at Whole Foods or avoiding sweatshop materials seemed not to penetrate the broader public. If this is true, then we can see in the longue duree of the first and second Nestlé boycotts the strengthening of corporate hegemony. Certainly, consumer politics and buying choices, including boycotts, remained embedded in the larger structure of political, cultural and economic behavior. "Consumer thoughts and deeds may vary considerably," some students of consumer behavior noted. Additionally, we know that companies spend millions on their branding, and most do not desire an image of irresponsibility or willing negligence. "Publications such as Boycott Action News might track the number of boycotts in existence," wrote the authors of this study, "but whether they translate into substantial financial losses is more sketchy. Estimates that Nestlé have lost over \$40 million because of the US boycott of their products are debatable." Not only are these numbers in question, but Nestlé has only grown over time, continues to market formula how it will, where it will, and attempts to privatize the world's water. In other words, "the firm remains a daunting force in the global consumer

²⁰ Boulstridge, Emma, and Carrigan, Marylyn. "Do Consumers Really Care About Corporate Responsibility? Highlighting the Attitude-Behavior Gap." Journal of Communication Management 4, no. 4 (2000): 355–368.

market."²¹ The boycott demonstrated a possibility, and a new form of global politics. But it also showed the incorporation of this kind of politics into a broader structural paradigm.

Furthermore, and central to understanding corporate hegemony vis-a-vis consumer activism, most information on corporate behavior that reaches the public comes from media outlets, themselves privately owned. Most people do not read corporate information and have no access to actual company activities and policies in order to make informed buying choices. Emotionalism and Naomi Klein types of anti-corporate, anti-globalization writing sustains western liberals, whose political bite on any radical scale remains close to nil. Generally, especially across national boundaries and within the Third World, there has been "low levels of awareness."²² This perspective, perhaps, reflects one lasting universal.

Universality met alienation, especially in global thinking and understanding. "Ideas of nature," as Raymond Williams demonstrated, were "the projected ideas of men." Conflicts between projections and manifestations existed throughout this baby food and corporate accountability story. The problems of the world, including Williams' own interpretation, would continue, "nothing much can be done, nothing much can even be said, until we are able to see the cause of this alienation of nature, this separation of nature from human activity." Humanity has alienated itself (not empire, not God, not

²¹ Ibid, 16; see also Nelson-Horchler, J. 1984, "Fighting a boycott: Image Rebuilding." Industry Week 220 (54); 54-56.

²² Boulstridge and Carrigan reported that "many consumers are relatively uninformed about responsible corporate behavior and activities." Additionally, "the idea that consumers should be a main target for corporate activities related to responsibility and reputation building may itself be inherently flawed. Other groups - government regulators, activists, city financiers, industry press and employees - may be more responsive than consumer to the efforts of reputation management," in "Do Consumers Really Care," 9.

nature, not labor, not capital), and engaged in a huge disavowal of its actions in the world, its exploitation no matter the political economy, its imperialist tendencies, and its over-consumption. Blame is placed everywhere, utopias created, worlds saved - and meanwhile, the species reproduces and absorbs and uses all the more.²³

²³ Raymond Williams, "Ideas of Nature," in Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays, (London: Verso, 1980), pp. 67-83. See also William Cronon, "The Densest, Richest, Most Suggestive 19 Pages I Know." Environmental History 10, no. 4 (October 1, 2005): 679-681. And Raymond Williams, whose The Country and the City treated this issue at length, and which I referenced in the Introduction, pondered the exploitation of people, of land, in various political economies, and especially within capitalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives and Collections

Boise State University Library
Frank Church Papers

Harvard University Libraries
Baker Library, Harvard Business School
Harvard's Multinational Enterprise Project, begun in 1965
Ford Foundation materials at HBS
Harvard's Center for International Affairs, materials on MNCs and INCs for postwar period

Historical Society of Pennsylvania
National Council of Churches Materials

Interviews and Conversations

Leah Margulies
Doug Johnson
Mark Ritchie
Dr. Milton Ochieng

John Hay Library, Brown University
Hall-Hoag collection of dissenting and extremist printed propaganda
John Birch Society Archive
Wells (H.G.) Collection (for insight into his One World, Human Rights, and Global Visions)
Business Community Militants (BCM)
Free Market Advocates (FMA)
Libertarian Archives
Ralph Nader Family (RNF)

- Center For The Study Of Responsive Law
- Multinational Monitor/ Essential Information, Inc.
- Public Citizen/ Ralph Nader/ Big Business Day
- Public Citizen/ Ralph Nader

Think Tank Right (TTR)

Minnesota Historical Society
Action for Corporate Accountability Records Collection
Infant Formula Action Coalition (INFACT) Records
Company Files

- International Council of Infant Food Industries (ICIFI)
- Corporate Information

Nonessential Company Files
Abbott/Ross Laboratories
American Home Products/Wyeth Laboratories, 1973-1989
Bristol-Myers (Mead Johnson)
Nestlé 1974-1994
Baby Milk Action Coalition (BMAC)
ICCR, 1973-1993
IBFAN, 1979-1994
International Nestlé Boycott Committee (INBC)
Infant Formula Issue Research Literature
Grassroots Boycott Collection, including Church Materials
Marketing Materials and Photographs Collection
Press and Publication Files
Legal Files
UNICEF
United States Government Files, 1976-1994
War on Want
World Health Organization (WHO)
World Health Assembly (WHA)

New York University, Tamiment Library

Center for the United States and the Cold War
Robert Wagner Labor Collection

Northeastern University Library
(where I finally tracked down a copy of Peter Krieg's film Bottle Babies).

Presbyterian Historical Society
Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility Materials
Nestlé Infant Formula Audit Commission (NIFAC) Materials

Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Schlesinger Library
Boston Women's Health Book Collective
National Organization for Women

United Nations Online Databases

UNICEF Publications Database
UN Documents Center
WHO Publications
WHO Documents
WHO Library and Information Networks for Knowledge

Selected Published Primary and Secondary Sources

Aaronson, Susan A. Taking Trade to the Streets the Lost History of Public Efforts to Shape Globalization. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Abramovitz, Moses. Thinking about Growth and Other Essays on Economic Growth and Welfare. Studies in Economic History and Policy. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Aburdene, Patricia. Megatrends for Women. 1st ed. New York: Villard Books, 1992.
Adverse Effects of Foods. New York: Plenum, 1982.

Aharoni, Yair, Raymond Vernon, Howard Raiffa, and John Virgil Lintner. State-Owned Enterprise in the Western Economies. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Alinsky, Saul David. Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals. Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1989.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Rev. and extended ed. London ; New York: Verso, 1991.

Appleby, Joyce Oldham. The Relentless Revolution: A History of Capitalism. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2010.

Apple, Rima D. Mothers and Medicine: A Social History of Infant Feeding, 1890-1950. Wisconsin Publications in the History of Science and Medicine, no. 7. Madison, Wis: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

— — — . Perfect Motherhood: Science and Childrearing in America. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 2006.

— — — . Vitamania: Vitamins in American Culture. Health and Medicine in American Society. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 1996.

Arrighi, Giovanni. Essays on the Political Economy of Africa. Modern Reader, PB-250. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973.

— — — . The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times. Verso, 1994.

Ashby, LeRoy. Fighting the Odds: The Life of Senator Frank Church. Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1994.

Avery, Dennis T. Saving the Planet with Pesticides and Plastic: The Environmental Triumph of High-Yield Farming. Indianapolis, Ind: Hudson Institute, 1995.

Backer, Kellen. "World War II and the Triumph of Industrialized Food." Ph.D., The University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2012.

- Backer, Larry. Multinational Corporations, Transnational Law: The United Nation's Norms on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations as Harbinger of Corporate Responsibility in International Law. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, April 5, 2005.
- Baer, Edward. "An Update on the Infant Formula Controversy." Studies in Family Planning 14, no. 4 (April 1, 1983): 119–22.
- Baer, Edward C. "Breastfeeding and Family Planning: Meaningful Integration of Services." Studies in Family Planning 12, no. 4 (April 1, 1981): 164–66.
- — —. "Promoting Breastfeeding: A National Responsibility." Studies in Family Planning 12, no. 4 (April 1, 1981): 198–206.
- Baer, Edward, and Leah Marguiles. "Infant and Young Child Feeding: An Analysis of the WHO/UNICEF Meeting." Studies in Family Planning 11, no. 2 (February 1, 1980): 72–75.
- Baer, Hans A. "On the Political Economy of Health." Medical Anthropology Newsletter 14, no. 1 (November 1, 1982): 1–17.
- Baker, James C. "The International Infant Formula Controversy: A Dilemma in Corporate Social Responsibility." Journal of Business Ethics 4, no. 3 (June 1, 1985): 181–90.
- Barnet, Richard J. Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations. A Touchstone Book. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.
- Barnett, Michael N. Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- — —. The Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism. Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Baumslag, Naomi, and Dia L. Michels. Milk, Money and Madness: The Culture and Politics of Breast Feeding. Bergin & Garvey, 1995.
- Bell, Daniel. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society; a Venture in Social Forecasting. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- — —. The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- — —. The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Bender, Thomas. Rethinking American History in a Global Age. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

- Berg, Alan. A Case for Promoting Breastfeeding in Projects to Limit Fertility. World Bank Technical Paper, no. 102. Washington, D.C: World Bank, 1989.
- — —. The Nutrition Factor; Its Role in National Development. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1973.
- Berg, Alan, and World Bank. Malnourished People: A Policy View. Poverty and Basic Needs Series. Washington, D.C. (1818 H St., N.W., Washington 20433): World Bank, 1981.
- Bhargava, Alok. Food, Economics, and Health. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Bhargava, Alok, and Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy (World Health Organization). Modeling the Effects of Health on Economic Growth. World Health Organization, 2000.
- Block, Fred. “Think Tanks, Free Market Academics, and the Triumph of the Right.” Theory and Society 42, no. 6 (November 1, 2013): 647–51.
- Blum, Linda M. At the Breast: Ideologies of Breastfeeding and Motherhood in the Contemporary United States. Boston: Beacon Press, 1999.
- — —. “Mother-Blame in the Prozac Nation: Raising Kids with Invisible Disabilities.” Gender and Society 21, no. 2 (April 1, 2007): 202–26.
- — —. “Mothers, Babies, and Breastfeeding in Late Capitalist America: The Shifting Contexts of Feminist Theory.” Feminist Studies 19, no. 2 (July 1, 1993): 291–311.
- Blum, Linda, and Vicki Smith. “Women’s Mobility in the Corporation: A Critique of the Politics of Optimism.” Signs 13, no. 3 (April 1, 1988): 528–45.
- Bockman, Johanna. “The Long Road to 1989: Neoclassical Economics, Alternative Socialisms, and the Advent of Neoliberalism.” Radical History Review, no. 112 (January 1, 2012): 9.
- Boies, John L. Buying for Armageddon: Business, Society, and Military Spending since the Cuban Missile Crisis. The Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series of the American Sociological Association. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 1994.
- Boltanski, Luc. The New Spirit of Capitalism. London: Verso, 2007.
- Borgwardt, Elizabeth. A New Deal for the World: America’s Vision for Human Rights. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Borstelmann, Thomas. Apartheid’s Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- — —. The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality. America in the World. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2012.

- — —. The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Boserup, Ester. Population and Technological Change: A Study of Long-Term Trends. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- — —. Woman's Role in Economic Development. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.
- Boston Women's Health Book Collective, and History of Science Collection (Brown University). Our Bodies, Ourselves: A Book by and for Women. 2d ed., completely rev. and expanded. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Boulstridge, Emma, and Carrigan, Marylyn. "Do Consumers Really Care About Corporate Responsibility? Highlighting the Attitude-Behavior Gap." Journal of Communication Management 4, no. 4 (2000): 355–68.
- Boyer, Paul S. By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Bradshaw, T. Corporations and Their Critics: Issues and Answers to the Problems of Corporate Social Responsibility. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.
- Brandt, Willy. A Programme for Survival: Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues. Pan Books, 1980.
- Braudel, Fernand. Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th Century. 1st U.S. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Brick, Howard. Age of Contradiction: American Thought and Culture in the 1960s. Twayne's American Thought and Culture Series. New York : London: Twayne Publishers ; Prentice Hall International, 1998.
- — —. Daniel Bell and the Decline of Intellectual Radicalism: Social Theory and Political Reconciliation in the 1940s. History of American Thought and Culture. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.
- — —. Transcending Capitalism: Visions of a New Society in Modern American Thought. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Brown, Lester R. Full Planet, Empty Plates: The New Geopolitics of Food Scarcity. W. W. Norton & Company, 2012.
- — —. Saving the Planet: How to Shape an Environmentally Sustainable Global Economy. 1st ed. The Worldwatch Environmental Alert Series. New York: W.W. Norton, 1991.
- Bryant, Dé. "The Evolution in Canada of the Citizen's Movement against Nestle, 1978-1984 a Descriptive Study." M.A. thesis, Wilfrid Laurier University (Canada), 1985.

- Burke, Timothy. Lifebuoy Men, Lux Women: Commodification, Consumption, and Cleanliness in Modern Zimbabwe. Body, Commodity, Text. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Canaday, Margot. The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America. Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Centre on Transnational Corporations (United Nations). Bibliography on Transnational Corporations. Bibliographiesur Les Societes Transnationales. United Nations. [Document] ; ST/CTC/4. New York: United Nations, 1979.
- Centre on Transnational Corporations (United Nations), and United Nations. Transnational Corporations: Issues Involved in the Formulation of a Code of Conduct: Report of the Secretariat. [Document - United Nations] ; E/C.10/17. New York: United Nations, 1976.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Radical Histories and Question of Enlightenment Rationalism: Some Recent Critiques of 'Subaltern Studies.'" Economic and Political Weekly 30, no. 14 (April 8, 1995): 751–59.
- — —. "The Climate of History: Four Theses." Critical Inquiry 35, no. 2 (Winter 2009): 197–222.
- Chavkin, Wendy and Ellen Chesler. Where Human Rights Begin: Health, Sexuality, and Women in the New Millennium. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 2005.
- Chetley, Andrew. The Baby Killer Scandal: A War on Want Investigation into the Promotion and Sale of Powdered Baby Milks in the Third World. London: War on Want, 1979.
- — —. The Politics of Baby Foods: Successful Challenges to an International Marketing Strategy. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- Chorev, Nitsan. Remaking U.S. Trade Policy: From Protectionism to Globalization. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- — —. The World Health Organization between North and South. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Church, F. Forrester. Father and Son: A Personal Biography of Senator Frank Church of Idaho. 1st ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Clarke, Adele. Disciplining Reproduction: Modernity, American Life Sciences, and "the Problems of Sex." Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Club of Rome, and Potomac Associates. The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind. 2d ed. New York: Universe Books, 1974.

- Cochran, Thomas C. Frontiers of Change: Early Industrialism in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Cohen, Lizabeth. A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America. New York: A.A. Knopf, 2003.
- Comaroff, John L., and Jean Comaroff. Ethnicity, Inc. Chicago Studies in Practices of Meaning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Commoner, Barry. Science and Survival. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- — —. The Closing Circle: Nature, Man, and Technology. 1st ed. New York: Knopf, 1971.
- Competitive Enterprise Institute. The True State of the Planet. New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Connelly, Matthew. "Population Control Is History: New Perspectives on the International Campaign to Limit Population Growth." Comparative Studies in Society and History 45, no. 1 (January 1, 2003): 122–47.
- Connelly, Matthew James. Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Cooper, Frederick. Africa since 1940: The Past of the Present. New Approaches to African History. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- — —. Decolonization and African Society: The Labor Question in French and British Africa. African Studies Series 89. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Cosgrove, Denis. "Contested Global Visions: One-World, Whole-Earth, and the Apollo Space Photographs." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 84, no. 2 (June 1, 1994): 270–94.
- Cosgrove, Denis E. Apollo's Eye: A Cartographic Genealogy of the Earth in the Western Imagination. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Cottingham, Jane. Bottle Babies: A Guide to the Baby Foods Issue. Rome: ISIS- Women's International Information and Communication Service, 1976.
- Cowie, Jefferson. Capital Moves: RCA's Seventy-Year Quest for Cheap Labor. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- — —. Stayin' Alive: The 1970s and the Last Days of the Working Class. New York: New Press : Distributed by Perseus Distribution, 2010.
- Cronon, William. Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England. 1st ed. New York: Hill and Wang, 1983.

- — — . Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West. New York: W.W. Norton, 1991.
- — — . "The Densest, Richest, Most Suggestive 19 Pages I Know." Environmental History 10, no. 4 (October 1, 2005): 679–81.
- Crosby, Alfred W. Children of the Sun: A History of Humanity's Unappeasable Appetite for Energy. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006.
- — — . Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900. Studies in Environment and History. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Cudahy, Brian J. Box Boats: How Container Ships Changed the World. New York: Fordham University Press, 2006.
- Cumings, Bruce. Dominion from Sea to Sea: Pacific Ascendancy and American Power. New Haven [u.a.]: Yale Univ. Press, 2009.
- Cunningham, Allan S., and UNICEF. Breastfeeding, Growth and Illness: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: UNICEF, 1992.
- Dahlem Workshop on Integrated History and Future of People on Earth. Sustainability or Collapse?: An Integrated History and Future of People on Earth. Dahlem Workshop Report. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press in cooperation with Dahlem University Press, 2007.
- Daunton, M.J. and Matthew Hilton. The Politics of Consumption: Material Culture and Citizenship in Europe and America. Leisure, Consumption and Culture. Oxford: Berg, 2001.
- Davin, Anna. "Imperialism and Motherhood." History Workshop, no. 5 (April 1, 1978): 9–65.
- Davis, Flora. Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America since 1960. Urbana ; Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Davis, Gerald F. Managed by the Markets: How Finance Reshaped America. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Davis, Kathy. The Making of Our Bodies, Ourselves: How Feminism Travels across Borders. Next Wave. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Davis, Mike and Daniel Bertrand Monk. Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism. New York: New Press : Distributed by W.W. Norton & Co, 2007.
- — — . Planet of Slums. London ; New York: Verso, 2006.

- Della Porta, Donatella, et al. Transnational Protest and Global Activism. People, Passions, and Power. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.
- Deluca, Kevin Michael. Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Incorporated, 2005.
- De Vries, Jan. The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Behavior and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Dobbing, John. Infant Feeding: Anatomy of a Controversy, 1973-1984. London ; New York: Springer-Verlag, 1988.
- Doherty, Tanya, Mickey Chopra, Debra Jackson, Ameena Goga, Mark Colvin, and Lars-Ake Persson. "Effectiveness of the WHO/UNICEF Guidelines on Infant Feeding for HIV-Positive Women: Results from a Prospective Cohort Study in South Africa." AIDS 21, no. 13 (August 2007): 1791-97.
- Donchin, Anne. "Converging Concerns: Feminist Bioethics, Development Theory, and Human Rights." Signs 29, no. 2 (January 1, 2004): 299-324.
- Dryzek, John S. Rational Ecology: Environment and Political Economy. Oxford ; New York: B. Blackwell, 1987.
- — —. The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Eagleton, Terry. Why Marx Was Right. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Eden, Lorraine. Multinationals in the Global Political Economy. New York, N.Y: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Egri, Carolyn P., and David A. Ralston. "Corporate Responsibility: A Review of International Management Research from 1998 to 2007." Journal of International Management 14, no. 4 (December 2008): 319-39.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women. 1st ed. Garden City, N.Y: Anchor Press, 1978.
- — —. The American Health Empire: Power, Profits, and Politics. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. Institute for Policy Studies. Toward Economic Justice for Women: A National Agenda Forchange. Washington, D.C: Institute for Policy Studies, 1985.
- Ehrlich, Paul R. The Population Bomb. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968.

- Ekbladh, David. The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order. America in the World. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Engels, Friedrich. The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State. S.l.: Electric Book Co, 2001.
- Ergin, Ahmet, Celile Hatipoğlu, Ali İhsan Bozkurt, Aslı Erdoğan, Serdar Güler, Gülberat İnce, Nuran Kavurgacı, Ahmet Öz, and Mustafa K. Yeniay. "Compliance Status of Product Labels to the International Code on Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes." Maternal and Child Health Journal 17, no. 1 (January 1, 2013): 62–67.
- Farmer, Paul. Infections and Inequalities: The Modern Plagues. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- — —. Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor. California Series in Public Anthropology 4. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Fee, Elizabeth. Women and Health: The Politics of Sex in Medicine. Policy, Politics, Health, and Medicine Series 4. Farmingdale, N.Y: Baywood Pub. Co, 1983.
- Federici, Silvia. Caliban and the Witch. New York: Autonomedia, 2004.
- — —. Enduring Western Civilization: The Construction of the Concept of Western Civilization and Its "Others." Westport, Conn: Praeger, 1995.
- Ferguson, Niall. The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Fildes, Valerie A. Breasts, Bottles, and Babies: A History of Infant Feeding. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1986.
- Fildes, Valerie, Lara Marks and Hillary Marland. Women and Children First: International Maternal and Infant Welfare, 1870-1945. The Wellcome Institute Series in the History of Medicine 4. London ; New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Findlay, James F. Church People in the Struggle: The National Council of Churches and the Black Freedom Movement, 1950-1970. Religion in America Series. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Fine, Ben. The Political Economy of Diet, Health and Food Policy. Routledge, 2002.
- Fitouss, Jean-Paul, Amartya Kumar Sen, and Joseph E. Stiglitz. Mismeasuring Our Lives: Why GDP Doesn't Add Up. ReadHowYouWant.com, 2011.
- Fort, Meredith P. Sickness and Wealth: The Corporate Assault on Global Health. 1st ed. Cambridge, Mass: South End Press, 2004.

- Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- — —. The History of Sexuality. 1st American ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. Crisis in the Third World. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1981.
- — —. On Capitalist Underdevelopment. Bombay ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- — —. Reflections on the World Economic Crisis. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1981.
- Freidson, Eliot. Doctoring Together: A Study of Professional Social Control. New York: Elsevier, 1975.
- — —. Profession of Medicine; a Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- — —. The Hospital in Modern Society. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Friedman, Monroe. Consumer Boycotts: Effecting Change through the Marketplace and the Media. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Frieden, Jeffrey. Global Capitalism. New York: New Press : Distributed by W.W. Norton, 2000.
- Fuentes, Annette. Women in the Global Factory. INC Pamphlet, no. 2. New York, NY : Boston, MA: Institute for New Communications ; South End Press, 1983.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. American Capitalism, the Concept of Countervailing Power. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1952.
- — —. The Affluent Society. 3d ed., rev. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
- — —. The New Industrial State. 3d ed., rev. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.
- Galor, Oded. Unified Growth Theory. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- — —, and National Bureau of Economic Research. Population, Technology, and Growth: From the Malthusian Regime to the Demographic Transition. NBER Working Paper Series no.6811. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1998.
- Garcia-Amador, Francisco V. "The Proposed New International Economic Order: A New Approach to the Law Governing Nationalization and Compensation." Lawyer of the Americas 12, no. 1 (1980): 1–58.
- Garriga, Elisabet, and Domènec Melé. "Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory." Journal of Business Ethics 53, no. 1–2 (August 1, 2004): 51–71.

- George, Susan. How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger. Montclair, N.J: Allanheld, Osmun, 1977.
- — —. The Lugano Report: On Preserving Capitalism in the Twenty-First Century. London ; Sterling, Va: Pluto Press, 1999.
- George, Susan, and Institute for Policy Studies. Feeding the Few: Corporate Control of Food. Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1978.
- Gerber, Jurg. “Enforced Self-Regulation in the Infant Formula Industry: A Radical Extension of an ‘Impractical’ Proposal.” Social Justice 17, no. 1 (39) (April 1, 1990): 98–112.
- — —. “From Bottles to Bombs: The Transformation of a Social Movement Organization.” Ph.D. diss., Washington State University, 1988.
- Geyer, Michael, and Charles Bright. “World History in a Global Age.” The American Historical Review 100, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 1034–60.
- Giddens, Anthony. Capitalism and Modern Social Theory; an Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press, 1971.
- — —. The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Gilder, George. Men and Marriage. Pelican Publishing, 1992.
- Gilpin, Robert. The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Glickman, Lawrence B. A Living Wage: American Workers and the Making of Consumer Society. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- — —. Buying Power: A History of Consumer Activism in America. Chicago ; London: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Glickman, Lawrence. Consumer Society in American History: A Reader. Cornell Paperbacks. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Gluck, Carol and Anna Tsing. Words in Motion: Toward a Global Lexicon. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Guidry, John and Michael D. Kennedy. Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Glover, John Desmond. The Revolutionary Corporations: Engines of Plenty, Engines of Growth, Engines of Change. Homewood, Ill: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1980.

- Goddard, C. Roe. International Political Economy: State-Market Relations in the Changing Global Order. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Pub, 1996.
- Goede, Marieke de. Virtue, Fortune, and Faith: A Genealogy of Finance. Borderlines, v. 24. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Goldfrank, Walter, David Goodman and Andrew Szasz. Ecology and the World-System. Contributions in Economics and Economic History 211. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Gordon, Colin. Dead on Arrival - The Politics of Health Care in Twentieth-Century America. Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America Series. Princeton : Ewing: Princeton University Press California Princeton Fulfillment Services [Distributor], 2004.
- — —. New Deals: Business, Labor, and Politics in America, 1920-1935. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Gordon, Linda. Pitied but Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare, 1890-1935. New York : Toronto : New York: Free Press ; Maxwell Macmillan Canada ; Maxwell Macmillan International, 1994.
- — —. The Moral Property of Women: A History of Birth Control Politics in America. 3rd ed. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- — —. Woman's Body, Woman's Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America. New York: Grossman, 1976.
- Gorman, Robert F. Great Debates at the United Nations: An Encyclopedia of Fifty Key Issues 1945-2000. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Gosse, Van, and St. Martin's Press/Tor Archive (Brown University). The Movements of the New Left, 1950-1975: A Brief History with Documents. The Bedford Series in History and Culture. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005.
- Gottlieb, Roger S. This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Green, Mark. The Big Business Reader: On Corporate America. Revised and enlarged. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1983.
- Greene, Ronald Walter. Malthusian Worlds: U.S. Leadership and the Governing of the Population Crisis. Polemics Series. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 1999.
- Grossman, Lawrence S. Peasants, Subsistence Ecology, and Development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Hacking, Ian. The Taming of Chance. Ideas in Context. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Hakim, Peter. Development, Reform, and Malnutrition in Chile. International Nutrition Policy Series 4. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1978.
- Hall, Bill. Frank Church, D.C. & Me. Pullman, Wash: Washington State University Press, 1995.
- Hamilton, Shane. "Cold Capitalism: The Political Ecology of Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice." Agricultural History 77, no. 4 (October 1, 2003): 557–81.
- — —. Trucking Country: The Road to America's Wal-Mart Economy. Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Hardt, Michael. Empire. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Hartmann, Heidi. "Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex." Signs 1, no. 3 (1976): 137–69.
- Hartmann, Heidi I. "The Family as the Locus of Gender, Class, and Political Struggle: The Example of Housework." Signs 6, no. 3 (April 1, 1981): 366–94.
- Harvey, David. A Brief History of Neoliberalism. New York: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2007.
- — —. Spaces of Global Capitalism: [towards a Theory of Uneven geographical Development]. London ; New York, NY: Verso, 2006.
- — —. The Enigma of Capital: And the Crises of Capitalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- — —. The Limits to Capital. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- — —. The New Imperialism. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Hausman, William J. Global Electrification: Multinational Enterprise and International Finance in the History of Light and Power, 1878-2007. Cambridge Studies in the Emergence of Global Enterprise. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Hay, Bruce, Robert Stavins, and Richard Vietor. Environmental Protection and the Social Responsibility of Firms: Perspectives from Law, Economics, and Business. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, 2004.
- Henderson, Conway W. "Multinational Corporations and Human Rights in Developing States." World Affairs 142, no. 1 (July 1, 1979): 17–30.
- Hendrickson, Hildi. Clothing and Difference: Embodied Identities in Colonial and Post-Colonial Africa. Body, Commodity, Text. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.

- Hilton, Matthew. Prosperity for All: Consumer Activism in an Era of Globalization. Cornell University Press, 2009.
- Hilton, Matthew, James McKay, Nicholas Crowson, and Jean-François Mouhot. The Politics of Expertise: How NGOs Shaped Modern Britain. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. The Age of Capital, 1848-1875. History of Civilization. New York: Scribner, 1975.
- Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Knopf, 1966.
- Hopkins, Michael. Corporate Social Responsibility and International Development: Is Business the Solution?. Earthscan, 2007.
- Hopkins, Terence K. The Age of Transition: Trajectory of the World System 1945-2025. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books, 1996.
- Houck, John W., and Oliver F. Williams. Is the Good Corporation Dead?: Social Responsibility in a Global Economy. Rowman & Littlefield, 1996.
- Giugni, How Social Movements Matter. Social Movements, Protest, and Contention, v. 10. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Hunt, Lynn. Inventing Human Rights: A History. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2007.
- — —. Measuring Time, Making History. Natalie Zemon Davis Annual Lecture Series. Budapest ; New York: Central European University Press, 2008.
- Hunt, Nancy Rose and Tessie P. Liu. Gendered Colonialisms in African History. Gender & History. Oxford ; Malden [Mass.]: Blackwell, 1997.
- Hymer, Stephen. "Robinson Crusoe and the Secret of Primitive Accumulation." Monthly Review (New York. 1949) 63, no. 4 (September 1, 2011): 18.
- — —. "The Efficiency (Contradictions) of Multinational Corporations." The American Economic Review 60, no. 2 (May 1, 1970): 441–48.
- — —. "The Internationalization of Capital." Journal of Economic Issues 6, no. 1 (March 1, 1972): 91–111.
- — —. The International Operations of National Firms: A Study of Direct Foreign Investment. M.I.T. Monographs in Economics ; 14. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1976.
- — —. The Multinational Corporation: A Radical Approach: Papers. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

- Hymer, Stephen H. "Economic Forms in Pre-Colonial Ghana." The Journal of Economic History 30, no. 1 (March 1, 1970): 33–50.
- Holmes Rolston. "Four Spikes, Last Chance." Conservation Biology 14, no. 2 (April 1, 2000): 584–85.
- International Conference on Nutrition, National Development, and Planning. Nutrition, National Development, and Planning; Proceedings of an International Conference. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1973.
- International Statistical Institute. "The World Fertility Survey: An International Programme of Fertility Research." International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique 41, no. 3 (December 1, 1973): 303–14.
- Iriye, Akira. Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Jackson, Kenneth T. Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Jacobs, Meg. Pocketbook Politics: Economic Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America. Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- James, C. L. R. American Civilization. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1993.
- Jameson, Fredric. The Cultures of Globalization. Post-Contemporary Interventions. Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Jameson, Fredric. Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Post-Contemporary Interventions. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Jelliffe, Derrick B. "Bibliography On Breast-Feeding." The British Medical Journal 1, no. 5907 (March 23, 1974): 574.
- Jelliffe, Derrick B., and E. F. Patrice Jelliffe. "Human Milk, Nutrition, and the World Resource Crisis." Science 188, no. 4188 (May 9, 1975): 557–61.
- — —. "Mothers With HIV." BMJ: British Medical Journal 299, no. 6709 (November 11, 1989): 1219.
- Jelliffe, Derrick B., and E. F. Patrice-Jelliffe. "Maternal Nutrition, Breast-Feeding, And Contraception." British Medical Journal (Clinical Research Edition) 285, no. 6344 (September 18, 1982): 806–7.
- Jelliffe, Derrick Brian. Child Health in the Tropics; a Practical Handbook for Medical and Para-Medical Personnel. 3d ed. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co, 1968.

- — —. Growth Monitoring and Promotion in Young Children: Guidelines for the Selection of Methods and Training Techniques. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- — —. Human Milk in the Modern World: Psychosocial, Nutritional, and Economic Significance. Oxford Medical Publications. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Jenkins, Rhys. "Globalization, Corporate Social Responsibility and Poverty." International Affairs 81, no. 3 (2005): 525–40.
- Jensen, Bjarne and Kar-yiu Wong. Dynamics, Economic Growth, and International Trade. Studies in International Economics. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Jerven, Morten. "An Unlevel Playing Field: National Income Estimates and Reciprocal Comparison in Global Economic History." Journal of Global History 7, no. 01 (2012): 107–28.
- Jonsson, Fredrik Albritton. "Rival Ecologies of Global Commerce: Adam Smith and the Natural Historians." The American Historical Review 115, no. 5 (December 2010): 1342–63.
- Kain, Philip J. "Marx, Housework, and Alienation." Hypatia 8, no. 1 (January 1, 1993): 121–44.
- Kay, Geoffrey. The Political Economy of Colonialism in Ghana; a Collection of Documents and Statistics, 1900-1960. Cambridge [Eng.]: University, 1972.
- Keane, John. Global Civil Society?. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Keck, Margaret E. Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Kennedy, David M. Birth Control in America; the Career of Margaret Sanger. Yale Publications in American Studies 18. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Khagram, Sanjeev. Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks, and Norms. Social Movements, Protest, and Contention, v. 14. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Kim, Jim Yong. Dying for Growth: Global Inequality and the Health of the Poor. Common Courage Press, 2000.
- Kindleberger, Charles P., and David B. Audretsch. The Multinational Corporation in the 1980s. MIT Press, 1986.
- Kindleberger, Charles Poor. America in the World Economy. Headline Series ; No. 237. New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1977.

- — —. Comparative Political Economy: A Retrospective. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2000.
- — —. Power and Money; the Economics of International Politics and the Politics of International Economics. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Kinkela, David. DDT and the American Century: Global Health, Environmental Politics, and the Pesticide That Changed the World. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.
- Kirk, Andrew. "Appropriating Technology: The Whole Earth Catalog and Counterculture Environmental Politics." Environmental History 6, no. 3 (July 1, 2001): 374–94.
- Kline, Wendy. Bodies of Knowledge: Sexuality, Reproduction, and Women's Health in the Second Wave. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Krieg, Peter, and Tricontinental Film Center. Bottle-Babies. New Time Films [distributor?], 1980.
- Kubiszewski, Ida, Robert Costanza, Carol Franco, Philip Lawn, John Talberth, Tim Jackson, and Camille Aylmer. "Beyond GDP: Measuring and Achieving Global Genuine Progress." Ecological Economics 93 (September 2013): 57–68.
- LaFeber, Walter. Michael Jordan and the New Global Capitalism. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 1999.
- — —. The New Empire; an Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898. Ithaca, N.Y: Published for the American Historical Association [by] Cornell University Press, 1963.
- Landau, Ralph. The Mosaic of Economic Growth. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Langdon, Steven. Multinational Corporations in the Political Economy of Kenya. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.
- — —. "Multinational Corporations, Taste Transfer and Under-Development: A Case Study from Kenya." Review of African Political Economy, no. 2 (January 1, 1975): 12–35.
- — —. "The State and Capitalism in Kenya." Review of African Political Economy, no. 8 (January 1, 1977): 90–98.
- Latour, Bruno. Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory. Clarendon Lectures in Management Studies. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Lazier, Benjamin. "Earthrise; Or, The Globalization of the World Picture." The American Historical Review 116, no. 3 (June 1, 2011): 602–30.

- Lears, T. J. Jackson. Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- Ledogar, Robert J. Hungry for Profits: U.S. Food & Drug Multinationals in Latin America. IDOC/international Documentation, no. 70. New York: IDOC/North America, 1975.
- Levenstein, Harvey. "'Best for Babies' or 'Preventable Infanticide'? The Controversy over Artificial Feeding of Infants in America, 1880-1920." The Journal of American History 70, no. 1 (June 1, 1983): 75–94.
- Levenstein, Harvey A. Fear of Food: A History of Why We Worry about What We Eat. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- — —. Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- — —. Revolution at the Table: The Transformation of the American Diet. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Levinson, Marc. Beyond Free Markets: The Revival of Activist Economics. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books, 1988.
- — —. The Box: How the Shipping Container Made the World Smaller and the World Economy Bigger. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Levitt-Polanyi, Kari. "A Memoir: Stephen Hymer on the Multinational Corporation." Review (Fernand Braudel Center) 6, no. 2 (October 1, 1982): 253–79.
- Lichtenstein, Nelson. American Capitalism: Social Thought and Political Economy in the Twentieth Century. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Lindert, Peter H. Fertility and Scarcity in America. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Lindert, Peter H., and National Bureau of Economic Research. Does Globalization Make the World More Unequal?. NBER Working Paper Series no.8228. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2001.
- Lipson, Charles. "The Development of Expropriation Insurance: The Role of Corporate Preferences and State Initiatives." International Organization 32, no. 2 (April 1, 1978): 351–75.
- Litvak, Lawrence, Institute for Policy Studies, and South Africa Catalyst Project (U.S.). South Africa: Foreign Investment and Apartheid. Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1978.

- Lutz, Ellen, and Kathryn Sikkink. "Nongovernmental Organizations and Transnational Issue Networks in International Politics." Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law) 89 (April 5, 1995): 413–15.
- MacLaren, Peter, and Ramin Farahmandpur. Teaching Against the Tide: Global Capitalism and the New Imperialism: A Critical Pedagogy. Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.
- Magdoff, Harry. The Age of Imperialism; the Economics of U.S. Foreign Policy. 1st Modern reader ed. New York: [Monthly Review Press, 1969.
- — —. The Deepening Crisis of U.S. Capitalism. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1981.
- — —. The End of Prosperity: The American Economy in the 1970s. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977.
- Malnourished Children in the United States: Caught in the Cycle of Poverty. New York: Springer Pub. Co, 1993.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. Citizen and Subject: Decentralized Despotism and the Legacy of Late Colonialism. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- — —. The Myth of Population Control; Family, Caste, and Class in an Indian Village. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973.
- Mandel, Ernest. Late Capitalism. Verso Classics 23. London ; New York: Verso, 1999.
- — —. Long Waves of Capitalist Development: A Marxist Interpretation: Based on the Marshall Lectures given at the University of Cambridge. 2nd rev. ed. London ; New York: Verso, 1995.
- — —. Power and Money: A Marxist Theory of Bureaucracy. London ; New York: Verso, 1992.
- Man-Made Medicine: Women's Health, Public Policy, and Reform. Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Marable, Manning. How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America: Problems Inrace, Political Economy and Society. 1st ed. Boston: South End Press, 1983.
- Marcuse, Herbert. One-Dimensional Man; Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. Beacon Paperback BP221. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
- Marks, R. B. "World Environmental History: Nature, Modernity, and Power." Radical History Review 2010, no. 107 (April 26, 2010): 209–24.
- Marks, Robert. The Origins of the Modern World: A Global and Ecological Narrative from the Fifteenth to the Twenty-First Century. 2nd ed. World Social Change. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.

- Marx, Karl. Capital. Everyman's Library, Ed. by Ernest Rhys. Science. [no. 848-849]. London, New York: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.; E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc, 1934.
- Marx, Karl, and St. Martin's Press/Tor Archive (Brown University). The Communist Manifesto: With Related Documents. The Bedford Series in History and Culture. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.
- May, Elaine Tyler. America and the Pill: A History of Promise, Peril, and Liberation. New York: Basic Books, 2010.
- McCahery, Joseph. Corporate Control and Accountability: Changing Structure and the Dynamics of Regulation. New York: Oxford, England: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1993.
- McClintock, Anne, and American Council of Learned Societies. Imperial Leather Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- McLennan, A. K. "Food, Economics and Health. By Alok Bhargava. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008)" Journal of Biosocial Science 41, no. 02 (2009): 287–88.
- McNeill, John Robert. Something New under the Sun: An Environmental History Of the Twentieth-Century World. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.
- — —. The Human Web: A Bird's-Eye View of World History. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- Medvetz, Thomas. Think Tanks in America /. University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Mennis, Bernard. Emerging Forms of Transnational Community: Transnational Business Enterprises and Regional Integration. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books, 1976.
- Middlebury College Conference on Economic Issues. The Multinational Corporation in the 1980s. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1983.
- Miller, Fred Dycus. Out of the Mouths of Babes: The Infant Formula Controversy. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1983.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Mintz, Sidney Wilfred. Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History. New York, NY: Viking, 1985.
- Mintz, Steven. Moralists and Modernizers : America's Pre-Civil War Reformers /. The American Moment. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Morgen, Sandra. Into Our Own Hands: The Women's Health Movement in the United States, 1969-1990. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 2002.

- Morley, David. Paediatric Priorities in the Developing World. Postgraduate Paediatrics Series. London: Butterworth, 1973.
- Morely, David. Practising Health for All. Oxford Medical Publications. Oxford [Oxfordshire] ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Nader, Ralph. Unsafe at Any Speed: The Designed-in Dangers of the American Automobile. New York: Grossman, 1965.
- Nestle, Marion. Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health. California Studies in Food and Culture 3. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- — —. Why Calories Count: From Science to Politics. California Studies in Food and Culture 33. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
- Neurath, Paul. From Malthus to the Club of Rome and Back: Problems of Limits to Growth, Population Control, and Migrations. Columbia University Seminar Series. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1994.
- Newton, Lisa H. "A New Power Agenda: Tracking the Emergence of a New Global Polity in the Infant Formula Controversy." Business & Professional Ethics Journal 19, no. 2 (July 1, 2000): 5–39.
- — —. "A Question of Power: Science-Based Enterprise and the Non-Governmental Organization." Business & Professional Ethics Journal 20, no. 3/4 (October 1, 2001): 49–78.
- — —. "Greening Business, Root and Branch: The Forms and Limits of Economic Environmentalism." Business & Professional Ethics Journal 24, no. 1/2 (April 1, 2005): 9–34.
- — —. "The Internal Morality of the Corporation." Journal of Business Ethics 5, no. 3 (June 1, 1986): 249–58.
- — —. "The Turn to the Local: The Possibility of Returning Health Care to the Community." Business Ethics Quarterly 12, no. 4 (October 1, 2002): 505–26.
- Nichols, Francine H. "History of the Women's Health Movement in the 20th Century." Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing 29, no. 1 (January 1, 2000): 56–64.
- Novacovici, Anca. "Peak Oil? What About Peak Food? A Conversation With Lester Brown." Huffington Post, November 13, 2012.
- Novak, William J. The People's Welfare: Law and Regulation in Nineteenth-Century America. Studies in Legal History. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

- O'Connor, Martin. Is Capitalism Sustainable?: Political Economy and the Politics of Ecology. Democracy and Ecology. New York: Guilford Press, 1994.
- Oxfam. Regulating International Business: Beyond Liberalization. Basingstoke : New York: Macmillan in association with Oxfam ; St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Packard, Randall. International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Paddock, William. Famine, 1975! America's Decision: Who Will Survive?. 1st ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.
- — —. Time of Famines: America and the World Food Crises. A new ed. of Famine--1975! Boston: Little, Brown, 1976.
- Palmer, Gabrielle. The Politics of Breastfeeding. London: Pandora, 1988.
- Peet, Richard and Paul Robbins. Global Political Ecology. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.
- Peiss, Kathy Lee. Cheap Amusements: Gender Relations and the Use of Leisure Time in New York City, 1880 to 1920. [Providence, R.I: s.n.], 1982.
- — —. Hope in a Jar: The Making of America's Beauty Culture. 1st ed. New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998.
- Perelman, Michael. The Invention of Capitalism: Classical Political Economy and the Secret History of Primitive Accumulation. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Perrons, Diane. Globalization and Social Change. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Picciotto, Sol. Regulating Global Corporate Capitalism. International Corporate Law and Financial Market Regulation. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Pomeranz, Kenneth. The Great Divergence: Europe, China, and the Making of the Modern World Economy. Princeton Economic History of the Western World. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- — —. The World That Trade Created: Society, Culture, and the World Economy, 1400-the Present. Sources and Studies in World History. Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe, 1999.
- Poole, Robert. Earthrise: How Man First Saw the Earth. New Haven [Conn.]: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Popkin, Barry M., Richard E. Bilsborrow, and John S. Akin. "Breast-Feeding Patterns in Low-Income Countries." Science 218, no. 4577 (December 10, 1982): 1088–93.

- Popkin, B M, J S Akin, W Flieger, and E L Wong. "Breastfeeding Trends in the Philippines, 1973 and 1983." American Journal of Public Health 79, no. 1 (January 1989): 32–35.
- Population Council. Feeding Infants in Four Societies: Causes and Consequences of Mothers' Choices. Edited by Beverly Winikoff, Mary Ann Castle, and V. H. Laukaran. Contributions in Family Studies, no. 14. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.
- Pred, Allan. Reworking Modernity: Capitalisms and Symbolic Discontent. Hegemony and Experience. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 1992.
- Radice, Hugo K. International Firms and Modern Imperialism: Selected Readings. Penguin Books, 1975.
- Raffensperger, Carolyn. Precautionary Tools for Reshaping Environmental Policy. Urban and Industrial Environments. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2006.
- Ramamurti, Ravi, and Raymond Vernon. Privatization and Control of State-Owned Enterprises. EDI Development Studies. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1991.
- Ray, Dennis M. "Corporations and American Foreign Relations." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 403 (September 1, 1972): 80–92.
- Rediker, Marcus Buford. Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700-1750. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Richter, Judith. Holding Corporations Accountable: Corporate Conduct, International Codes, and Citizen Action. Zed Books, 2002.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas, et al. The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change. Cambridge Studies in International Relations 66. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Rockman, Seth. Scraping by: Wage Labor, Slavery, and Survival in Early Baltimore. Studies in Early American Economy and Society from the Library Company of Philadelphia. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Rolston, Holmes. "Environmental Protection and an Equitable International Order: Ethics after the Earth Summit." Business Ethics Quarterly 5, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 735–52.
- Rosenberg, Emily S. Financial Missionaries to the World: The Politics and Culture of Dollar Diplomacy, 1900-1930. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- — — . Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945. 1st ed. American Century Series. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.

- Rothberg, Robert, et al. Hunger and History: The Impact of Changing Food Production and Consumption Patterns on Society. Studies in Interdisciplinary History. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Rothman, Hal. Saving the Planet: The American Response to the Environment in the Twentieth Century. The American Ways Series. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000.
- Routledge. "United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations: Corporate Conduct and the Public Interest (Hardback) - Routledge." Text. Accessed February 28, 2015.
- Rowthorn, Bob. International Big Business 1957-1967; a Study of Comparative Growth. University of Cambridge. Dept. of Applied Economics. Occasional Papers, 24. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press, 1971.
- Ruggie, John Gerard. Just Business: Multinational Corporations and Human Rights. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2013.
- Ruzek, Sheryl Burt. The Women's Health Movement: Feminist Alternatives to Medical Control. New York: Praeger, 1978.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. Common Wealth: Economics for a Crowded Planet. Penguin, 2008.
- Sachs, Jeffrey, and World Health Organization, Commission on Macroeconomics and Health Staff. Macroeconomics and Health Investing in Health for Economic Development - Report Of the Commission on Macroeconomics and Health. Nonserial Publication. Geneva : Herndon: World Health Organization Stylus Publishing, LLC [Distributor], 2001.
- Sachs, Wolfgang. Planet Dialectics: Explorations in Environment and Development. Halifax, Nova Scotia : Johannesburg : London ; New York : New York: Fernwood Pub. ; Witwatersrand University Press ; Zed Books ; Distributed in the USA exclusively by St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Sagafi-nejad, Tagi. The UN and Transnational Corporations: From Code of Conduct to Global Compact. United Nations Intellectual History Project. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Sage, Colin. Environment and Food. Routledge Introductions to Environment Series. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Sasser, Jade. "Empower Women, Save the Planet? Science, Strategy, and Population-Environment Advocacy." Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, 2012.
- Sauvant, Karl. Controlling Multinational Enterprises: Problems, Strategies, Counterstrategies. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 1976.
- Sauvant, Karl P. Group of 77. The Third World without Superpowers, Second Series: The Collected Documents of the Group of 77. New York: Oceana Publications, 1981.

- Sauvant, Karl P. The New International Economic Order: Confrontation or Cooperation between North and South?. Westview Special Studies in International Economics. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 1977.
- Schechter, Michael G. United Nations Global Conferences. Global Institutions Series. London ; New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Schell, Jonathan. The Fate of the Earth. New York: Knopf, 1982.
- Schulman, Bruce J. From Cotton Belt to Sunbelt: Federal Policy, Economic Development, and the Transformation of the South, 1938-1980. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Schulman, Bruce. Rightward Bound: Making America Conservative in the 1970s. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- — —. The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics. New York: Free Press, 2001.
- Schwartz, Donald E. "The Public-Interest Proxy Contest: Reflections on Campaign GM." Michigan Law Review 69, no. 3 (January 1, 1971): 419–538.
- Scott, James C. Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- — —. Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Searle, John R. Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- — —. The Construction of Social Reality. New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Self, Robert O. All in the Family: The Realignment of American Democracy since the 1960s. First edition. New York: Hill and Wang, 2012.
- — —. American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland. Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Seligman, Mitchell. Development and Underdevelopment: The Political Economy of Global Inequality. 2nd ed. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998.
- Sethi, S. Prakash. Multinational Corporations and the Impact of Public Advocacy on Corporate Strategy Nestle and the Infant Formula Controversy. Issues in Business Ethics,; 6; Variation: Issues in Business Ethics ;; 6. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1994.

- — — . Up against the Corporate Wall: Modern Corporations and Social Issues of the Seventies. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Sikkink, Kathryn. “Codes of Conduct for Transnational Corporations: The Case of the WHO/UNICEF Code.” International Organization 40, no. 4 (October 1, 1986): 815–40.
- — — . The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions Are Changing World Politics. 1st ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 2011.
- — — . “Transnational Politics, International Relations Theory, and Human Rights.” PS: Political Science and Politics 31, no. 3 (September 1, 1998): 517–23.
- Simon, Julian Lincoln, et al. The State of Humanity. Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell in association with the Cato Institute, 1995.
- Simpson-Hebert, Mayling, and Lorna P. Makil. “Breast-Feeding in Manila, Philippines Preliminary Results from a Longitudinal Study.” Journal of Biosocial Science 17, no. Supplement S9 (1985): 137–46.
- Sklair, Leslie. “The Transnational Capitalist Class and Global Politics: Deconstructing the Corporate: State Connection.” International Political Science Review / Revue Internationale de Science Politique 23, no. 2 (April 1, 2002): 159–74.
- Sklair, Leslie. Capitalism and Development. London ; New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Sklar, Martin J. The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890-1916: The Market, the Law, and Politics. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Sklar, Richard L. African Politics in Postimperial Times: The Essays of Richard L. Sklar. Classic Authors and Texts on Africa. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2002.
- — — . Corporate Power in an African State: The Political Impact of Multinational Mining Companies in Zambia. Perspectives on Southern Africa 16. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Sklar, Richard. Postimperialism and World Politics. Westport, Conn: Praeger, 1999
- Skocpol, Theda. Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992.
- — — . Social Revolutions in the Modern World. Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Sloan School of Management. The International Corporation; a Symposium. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press, 1970.

- Smith, N. Craig. Morality and the Market: Consumer Pressure for Corporate accountability. Consumer Research and Policy Series. London ; New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Smith, Neil. The Endgame of Globalization. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- — —. Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space. New York, NY: B. Blackwell, 1984.
- Speth, James Gustave. Red Sky at Morning: America and the Crisis of the Global Environment. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Sridhar, Devi. "Economic Ideology and Politics in the World Bank: Defining Hunger." New Political Economy 12, no. 4 (2007): 499–516.
- Stackhouse, Max. On Moral Business: Classical and Contemporary Resources for Ethics in Economic Life. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans Pub, 1995.
- Stallard, Karin. Poverty in the American Dream: Women & Children First. INC Pamphlet, no. 1. New York, NY : Boston, MA: Institute for New Communications ; South End Press, 1983.
- Stanley, Amy Drub. From Bondage to Contract: Wage Labor, Marriage, and the Market in the Age of Slave Emancipation. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Stein, Judith. Pivotal Decade: How the United States Traded Factories for Finance in the Seventies. New Haven [Conn.]: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. Fair Trade for All: How Trade Can Promote Development. Oxford [England] ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- — —. Globalization and Its Discontents. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2002.
- — —. Readings in the Modern Theory of Economic Growth. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press, 1969.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. Capitalism and Confrontation in Sumatra's Plantation belt, 1870-1979. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- — —. Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Straub, Becky, Cathy Melvin, and Miriam Labbok. "A Descriptive Study of Cambodian Refugee Infant Feeding Practices in the United States." International Breastfeeding Journal 3, no. 2 (January 28, 2008).
- Sugrue, Thomas J. The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit. Princeton Studies in American Politics. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1996.

- Sutton, Francis X., Tom G. Kessinger, James P. Grant, and George Zeidenstein.
 “Development Ideology: Its Emergence and Decline [with Comments].” Daedalus 118,
 no. 1 (January 1, 1989): 35–60.
- Sweezy, Paul M. The Dynamics of U.S. Capitalism: Corporate Structure, Inflation, Credit,
 Gold, and the Dollar. Modern Reader, PB-225. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.
- Thames, Susan. The Breast: An Anthology. 1st ed. New York: Global City Press, 1995.
- Thompson, E. P. “Homage to Salvador Allende.” History Workshop, no. 34 (October 1,
 1992): 177–78.
- — —. “The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century.” Past &
 Present, no. 50 (February 1, 1971): 76–136.
- — —. “Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism.” Past & Present, no. 38
 (December 1, 1967): 56–97.
- Tilly, Charles. Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons. Russell Sage Foundation
 75th Anniversary Series v.2. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1984.
- Trentmann, Frank. “Beyond Consumerism: New Historical Perspectives on Consumption.”
Journal of Contemporary History 39, no. 3 (July 1, 2004): 373–401.
- Tsing, Anna. “The Global Situation.” Cultural Anthropology 15, no. 3 (August 1, 2000):
 327–60.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection. Princeton, N.J.:
 Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Tuyet, Le Thi Nham, and Annika Johansson. “Impact of Chemical Warfare with Agent
 Orange on Women’s Reproductive Lives in Vietnam: A Pilot Study.” Reproductive
 Health Matters 9, no. 18 (November 1, 2001): 156–64.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Companies without Borders:
 Transnational Corporations In the 1990s. 1st ed. London ; Boston: International Thomson
 Business Press, 1996.
- — —. Transnational Corporations and World Development. New York: Published by
 Routledge on behalf of the UNCTAD Division on Transnational Corporations and
 Investment, 1995.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, United Nations Conference on Trade
 and Development, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and
 International Organization for Migration. Foreign Direct Investment, Trade, Aid and
 Migration. Current Studies, no. 29. New York: United Nations, 1996.

United Nations, General Assembly. "Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition," November 16, 1974.

United Nations, and International Food Policy Research Institute. International Agricultural Research and Human Nutrition. Washington, D.C. : Rome: International Food Policy Research Institute ; UN Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, Sub-Committee on Nutrition, 1984.

United States. Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in the Developing Nations, 1978: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, Ninety-Fifth Congress, second Session ... May 23, 1978. Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off, 1978.

United States Senate. Nomination of Ernest W. Lefever :hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, , Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session, on Nomination of Ernest W. Lefever, to Be Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, May 18, 19, June 4, and 5, 1981. Washington, 1981.

United States. Overcoming World Hunger: The Challenge Ahead: Report Of the Presidential Commission on World Hunger. Washington, DC: The Commission : for sale by Supt. of Docs., U.S. Govt. Print. Off, 1980.

Utting, Peter. "Corporate Responsibility and the Movement of Business." Development in Practice 15, no. 3–4 (2005): 375–88.

Valenze, Deborah M. Milk: A Local and Global History. New Haven [Conn.]: Yale University Press, 2011.

Van Doren, Charles Lincoln. The Idea of Progress. Concepts in Western Thought Series. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1967.

Van Esterik, Penny. Beyond the Breast-Bottle Controversy. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

Velten, Hannah. Milk: A Global History. Edible. London: Reaktion Books, 2010.

Vernon, James. Hunger: A Modern History. Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Vernon, Raymond. Beyond Globalism: Remaking American Foreign Economic Policy. New York: Free Press, 1989.

— — — . Exploring the Global Economy: Emerging Issues in Trade and Investment. [Cambridge, Mass.] : Lanham, MD: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University ; University Press of America, 1985.

— — — . In the Hurricane's Eye: The Troubled Prospects of Multinational Enterprises. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1998.

- — — . Multinational Enterprise and National Security. Vol. no. 74. Adelphi Papers ; No. 74. London,: Institute for Strategic Studies, 1971.
- — — . Sovereignty at Bay; the Multinational Spread of U.S. Enterprises. The Harvard Multinational Enterprise Series. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- — — . Storm over the Multinationals: The Real Issues. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- — — . The Power of Multinational Enterprises in Developing Countries. Reprint Series. Boston, Mass.]: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1977.
- Vernon, Raymond, and Harvard University. Center for International Affairs. Exploring the Global Economy: Emerging Issues in Trade and Investment. Cambridge, Mass.] :Lanham, MD: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University ; University Press of America, 1985.
- Vernon, Raymond, Harvard University. Graduate School of Business Administration. Division of Research., and Harvard University. Graduate School of Business Administration. A Decade of Studying Multinational Enterprises: Tenth Annual Progress Report, Multinational Enterprise Project, Calendar Year 1975. Boston, Mass.]: Harvard Business School, Division of Research, 1976.
- Vernon, Raymond, and John F. Kennedy School of Government. Research Programs. How American Is the American Corporation?. Vol. R94-09. Faculty Research Working Paper Series ; R94-09. Cambridge, Mass.]: Research Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1994.
- Vernon, Raymond, and Brian Levy. State-Owned Enterprises in the World Economy: The Case of Iron Ore. Working Paper - Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University ; HBS 80-24. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1980.
- Vernon, Raymond, and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Restrictive Business Practices; the Operations of Multinational United States Enterprises in Developing Countries; Their Role in Trade and Development; a Study. Vol. TD/B/399. United Nations. [Document]. New York,: United Nations, 1972.
- Vernon, Raymond, and Switzerland) United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Session (1st : 1964 : Geneva. Problems and Prospects in the Export of Manufactured Goods from the Less Developed Countries. Vol. E/CONF. 46/P/2. [United Nations. Document]. New York,: United Nations], 1963.
- Vogel, David. Lobbying the Corporation: Citizen Challenges to Business Authority. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

- — — . The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2005.
- — — . The Politics of Precaution: Regulating Health, Safety, and Environmental Risks in Europe and the United States. Princeton [N.J.]: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- — — . Trading up: Consumer and Environmental Regulation in a Global Economy. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Vries, Jan de. “Measuring the Impact of Climate on History: The Search for Appropriate Methodologies.” The Journal of Interdisciplinary History 10, no. 4 (April 1, 1980): 599–630.
- Vries, Jan De. “The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution.” The Journal of Economic History 54, no. 2 (June 1, 1994): 249–70.
- Waddock, Sandra. “Building a New Institutional Infrastructure for Corporate Responsibility.” The Academy of Management Perspectives 22, no. 3 (August 1, 2008): 87–108.
- Wade, Nicholas. “Bottle-Feeding: Adverse Effects of a Western Technology.” Science 184, no. 4132 (April 5, 1974): 45–48.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. Africa and the Modern World. Trenton, N.J: Africa World Press, 1986.
- — — . Historical Capitalism ; With, Capitalist Civilization. New ed. London ; New York: Verso, 1995.
- — — . World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Watts, Michael. Silent Violence: Food, Famine, & Peasantry in Northern Nigeria. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Weiner, Lynn Y. “Reconstructing Motherhood: The La Leche League in Postwar America.” The Journal of American History 80, no. 4 (March 1, 1994): 1357–81.
- Weiss, Peter. Human Rights and Vital Needs. Transnational Institute, Sept. 1977,., 1977.
- Westad, Odd Arne. The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Wexler, Laura. Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism. Cultural Studies of the United States. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- White, Richard. The Organic Machine. New York: Hill and Wang, 1995.
- Williams, Alan. “Health Economics: The End Of Clinical Freedom?” BMJ: British Medical Journal 297, no. 6657 (November 5, 1988): 1183–86.

- Williams, Cicely D. Mother and Child Health: Delivering the Services. 2nd ed. Oxford Medical Publications. London ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- — —. “Protein Deficiency In Negro Infants.” The British Medical Journal 2, no. 4798 (December 20, 1952): 1360.
- — —. “Welfare Work A Branch Of Medicine.” The British Medical Journal 2, no. 4430 (December 1, 1945): 786.
- — —. “Whither Welfare?” The British Medical Journal 1, no. 4192 (May 10, 1941): 719–21.
- Williams, Cicely D., World Federation of Public Health Associations, and UNICEF. Primary Health Care Pioneer: The Selected Works of Dr. Cicely D. Williams. Geneva, Switzerland: World Federation of Public Health Associations and UNICEF, 1986.
- Williams, Eric Eustace. Capitalism & Slavery. London: Deutsch, 1964.
- — —. The Developing Nation in the Modern World. Fredericton, N.B: University of New Brunswick, 1965.
- Williams, Oliver. Peace through Commerce: Responsible Corporate Citizenship and the Ideals of the United Nations Global Compact. John W. Houck Notre Dame Series in Business Ethics. Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- Williams, Raymond. Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays. London: Verso, 1980.
- — —. The Country and the City. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- — —. The Long Revolution. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Willrich, Michael. Pox: An American History. New York: Penguin Press, 2011.
- Wimberley, Dale W., and Rosario Bello. “Effects of Foreign Investment, Exports, and Economic Growth on Third World Food Consumption.” Social Forces 70, no. 4 (June 1, 1992): 895–921.
- Winikoff, Beverly, ed. Nutrition and National Policy. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1978.
- Wolman, Leo. The Boycott in American Trade Unions. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Johns Hopkins Press, 1916.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. Empire of Capital. London ; New York: VERSO, 2003.
- Wood, Linda Sargent. A More Perfect Union: Holistic Worldviews and the Transformation of American Culture after World War II. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

World Commission on Environment and Development. Our Common Future. Oxford [Oxfordshire] ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Worster, Donald. "Are We Losing Ground? Environmentalism at the End of the Century." Ethics and the Environment 2, no. 1 (January 1, 1997): 71–79.

— — —. Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas. New ed. Studies in Environment and History. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

— — —. "The Vulnerable Earth: Toward A Planetary History." Environmental Review: ER 11, no. 2 (July 1, 1987): 87–103.

— — —. The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

— — —. "Transformations of the Earth: Toward an Agroecological Perspective in History." The Journal of American History 76, no. 4 (March 1, 1990): 1087–1106.

Zakim, Michael. Ready-Made Democracy: A History of Men's Dress in the American Republic, 1760-1860. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Zeitlin, Irving M. Capitalism and Imperialism: An Introduction to Neo-Marxian Concepts. Markham Pub. Co., 1972.

Zizek, Slavoj. Living in the End Times. London; New York: Verso, 2010.