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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

When the United States established its independence in 1776, there were no federal laws governing the food and agricultural industries, no Departments of Agriculture (USDA), Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW), or Food and Drug Administration (FDA), no federal feeding programs, and no concern for the nutritional status of the citizens of the newly formed republic. In the course of 200 years, the situation has changed markedly.

During the initial stages of the United State's first century most people grew their own food or purchased it from their neighbors in unprocessed condition at the open market. Nine out of ten Americans were engaged in farming, food was homegrown and the purchaser was expected to inspect the freshness and wholesomeness of the products that he was acquiring (89). At this time both quantity and variety of foods were limited but gradually the diet became more elaborate. As the country grew and industrialized, more and more people lived in the expanding towns and cities that sprouted across the land.

By 1850, fewer than half of all Americans were engaged in farming (89). Urbanites purchased most of their food. Because of the increased number of purchasers, the food industry expanded rapidly in the provision of food and food related services. As a result, the consumer was able to select from a wide variety of foods and services. Freedom
of choice has been a liberty not only long enjoyed by the consumer, but also one of the tenets on which this country was founded.

In the 20th Century advances in technology and transportation made an abundant food supply available in all parts of the country year round at reasonable cost. With the abundance and variety, nutrient needs could readily be met. In addition to 'fresh' foods, the availability of processed and fabricated foods created a never-ending stream of new items from which the consumer may choose. Today the United States produces a quantity of food far in excess of the amount a population of 220 million can consume.

Other nations of the world are less fortunate. The climate in many areas is unsuited to the variety of crops and livestock produced in the United States. Many nations have not had the resources or chosen to allocate the resources needed to develop both the agricultural and industrial aspects of their economies. The development of the infrastructure system in many countries is limited to systems advantageous only to a cash crop for export which may keep the economy solvent but falls short of providing a food supply capable of satisfying the nutritional needs of their respective populations (30). The total agricultural production of developing countries is limited due to lack of support for modern techniques. The problem of ever-increasing population throughout the world has compounded the limited food production in those areas that are least able to satisfy their own food needs.
Government Involvement

During the twentieth century, the United States government has become increasingly involved with regulation of food. Nationally, interest was focused on the quantity and quality of the food supply. Abundant crops early in the 1900's created surpluses and a dip in farm prices (48). The agricultural subsidies program was established to control the amount of production and maintain the income of farmers. Other programs were created to distribute any remaining surplus commodities to the needy through private and state welfare agencies to control the amount held in storage. Concern about the safety of food led to the development of a system for the inspection of foods during production, processing, storage and distribution (89). Additional quality checks were required for foods transported in interstate commerce prior to their entry into the food supply. More recently, regulation has been expanded to include truth in advertising and labeling, monitoring the safety of food additives and improving ingredient and nutrient information available for the consumer.

Government involvement in food regulation in international markets has also increased. Imports of petroleum and other raw materials are needed to support industry in the United States and the exports of food produced in the United States are needed in other countries. In some instances the surplus of a farm product has been sold or given as emergency aid for either economic or humanitarian reasons. In other instances the U.S. imports foods not produced in the quantities in which they are used under strict inspection standards. From this involvement
in the balance of trade, many questions have arisen about the use of food as a political weapon (25).

Through production, fabrication and importation, the food supply available in the United States is the largest and offers the most variety of any nation in the world today. Thus, it is a paradox that hunger and malnutrition exist in the United States. To be well fed is considered an unalienable right of every citizen in our land of plenty, yet some individuals lack the financial resources and educational background to obtain food to support health and general well-being. Over the past twenty years evidence has been accumulated that even those who have adequate resources to purchase food which will provide enough of the essential nutrients may have compromised their health due to the composition and quantity of their diets.

In the 1970's inflation, rapidly rising food prices and droughts in several areas of the world drastically altered the availability of food and consequently the cost to the American consumer. Hardest hit by the changes in the food supply were the poor, the most vulnerable group in terms of nutritional risk. As a result of all the concerns related to food intake, the federal government has assumed the responsibility of nutrition policy making.

Nutrition Policy Making
Prior to the 1960's

During the first half of the twentieth century, awareness and concern about nutrition was reserved for scientists who investigated the clinical aspects of nutrition, generally focusing attention on nutritional status in underdeveloped nations (86). Within the United States, attention centered on programs to use farm surpluses in order to
maintain agricultural prices and the income of farmers. Any attempt to improve the nutritional status of high risk groups was an indirect outcome of these agricultural programs (48).

During the Depression, the welfare of malnourished children was addressed to a limited extent by such programs as food stamps, direct distribution of surpluses and school lunch; however, responsibility for implementation of these programs was considered to rest with the states. Nutrition did not receive widespread attention until it was perceived to be important to national defense during the second World War (48).

In the United States Congress, all legislation that deals with agricultural production, distribution and nutrition has traditionally fallen under the jurisdiction of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture. Decision making has been influenced primarily by the interests of United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), national farm organizations and the commodity interest groups who favor production of farm products, maintenance of farm prices and the farmer's income (8). Consequently, nutrition concerns have been of secondary importance and improvement of nutritional status has generally gone unrealized.

A very strong, but subtle influence on policy decisions has been the conservative position taken by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees and USDA. Despite enactment of food programs, appropriation of funds has been below moderate estimates to meet nutritional needs and efforts to implement the programs have been limited (48). The congressional committees have been chaired by Southern Democrats who are acknowledged segregationists. This group of legislators has favored a
conservative position with respect to policy making, desiring an end to positive federal legislation on social and economic issues. The Southerners who have favored the defeat of civil rights legislation, have collaborated with those Republicans whose principal desire is the scrapping of social welfare proposals. Together this coalition has supported the concerns of their agricultural constituencies in the form of price supports and production controls and at the same time has been generally antagonistic to programs to aid the poor (13). Southern conservatives in Congress dominate in policy making as a result of their seniority and accompanying positions of leadership on the Agriculture Committees. This dominance has not only delayed progress that otherwise might have been made in food programs but also fueled the activities of the hunger reform lobby.

Nutrition Policy Making
Highlights of the 1960's

There was a slow awakening of the public in the U.S. to the existence of hunger in America in the 1960's. In 1965 the Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty, organized by black leaders, created concern about education and urban problems, but above all, poverty. In 1966 the late Senator Robert Kennedy's description of the conditions he had observed in poverty areas of Appalachia prompted a Senate Subcommittee on Poverty to travel and hold hearings in the impoverished areas of the South (69). Several months later, a group of physicians sponsored by the Field Foundation reported on the deplorable health and nutritional status of the people living in the impoverished areas. In July, 1967, the Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty established an independent Board
of Inquiry to identify 'hunger counties' throughout the United States (62). The investigations culminated in 1969 in the formation of the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States (60).

Consequently newspapers and the radio and television networks officially recognized hunger as a problem. A powerful CBS television documentary entitled "Hunger in America", based on the findings of the Citizen's Board of Inquiry, proved to be the turning point in the realization that ill-fed Americans could no longer be ignored (86).

The federal government responded in several ways. President Lyndon Johnson set up a National Advisory Commission which studied rural poverty and the related problems of hunger and health (100). In 1969, President Richard Nixon convened the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health (WHC) with the primary purpose "to evaluate the state of nutrition and formulate the basis of a national nutrition policy" (157). The WHC, probably the largest nutrition meeting ever, brought together diverse interest groups who examined the nation's resources which might be used to resolve the problem of hunger.

As a result of the Senate Subcommittee on Poverty hearings held in the South, Congress enacted legislation in 1968 authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make a comprehensive survey of hunger and malnutrition in America; the outcome was the Ten-State Nutrition Survey under the direction of Dr. Arnold Schaeffer (141). Within the House of Representatives, a bipartisan group of members attempted to set up a House "hunger" committee (69) but the maneuver was unsuccessful. Within the Senate, food advocates were more successful in their efforts for federal feeding programs.
Nutrition Policy Making
Activity in the Senate

By mandate of Senate Resolution 281 (138), the Senate unanimously authorized the establishment of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs (SCN) on July 30, 1968. The committee was created with the responsibility to "evaluate our food, nutrition, education, health and welfare programs, particularly with respect to delivery of services at the state and local levels" (138). The intent was to bridge the gap between the food and farm interests in the Senate Agriculture Committee and the health, welfare and research concerns in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The SCN was empowered with "oversight responsibilities" in nutrition which could be pursued through investigations, hearings, reports and the drafting of legislation. Any legislative recommendations from the SCN were then subject to review by the appropriate standing committee before passage. The original resolution limited the SCN to completion and termination of its activities by June 30, 1969. However, legislation continuing the committee was renewed on an annual basis for nearly a decade.

Membership on the SCN was designated by the original resolution to consist of 12 Senators. Five Senators were to represent each of the two standing committees, three selected from the majority and two from the minority memberships, respectively. Two additional members were to be appointed from the Senate-at-large. Senator George McGovern, chief sponsor of Resolution 281, served as chairman of the SCN during the ten year period. A number of notable Senators served as committee members on SCN (136).
Initially the SCN focused attention on the nutritional status of Americans and methods to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in the United States. Investigations then were directed to the effectiveness of federal food programs and the development of a national nutrition policy. By the mid-70's, the committee redirected its efforts to address the growing concern that diet is linked to the diseases which are the major causes of death in the United States. Improved nutrition appeared to be a key part of the solution to the imbalance between curative and preventive medicine.

The work of the SCN culminated in the publication of *Dietary Goals for the United States* (132) in February, 1977. The first comprehensive recommendations on dietary intake issued by any branch of the federal government appeared in this document. The report detailed a plan of action in terms of six goals to modify the U.S. national diet. The recommendations included a relative increase in the consumption of complex carbohydrates and limits for the intakes of salt, sugar, fat and cholesterol (132). Buying guides were provided to assist the consumer to attain these goals. Finally, recommendations were made for industry and government to promote and facilitate achievement of the dietary modifications.

The release of the SCN publication caused a wave of mixed reaction from nutritionists, physicians, consumer groups, food industries and the press. Therefore, the committee held further hearings to explore additional opinions on how diet was related to what the committee termed the 'killer diseases'(135). In many cases witnesses presented a different set of findings and conclusions than those stated in the *Dietary*
Goals for the United States. In May, 1977, the committee solicited opinions from fifty members of the medical community who had not previously testified before the SCN. The responses were published in November, 1977 in a summary entitled Dietary Goals for the United States - Supplemental Views (134).

By December, 1977 the SCN published a second edition of Dietary Goals for the United States in which certain modifications had been made in the six original goals and a seventh recommendation for weight control was added (133). The changes were based on the research evidence presented by consumers, scientists and industry representatives since publication of the first edition.

The SCN was disbanded in December, 1977, the result of the general reorganization of Senate committee structure undertaken by the Senate in the first month of the 95th Congress. The Senate overhaul sought to realign legislative responsibility and focus senatorial energies by defining committee jurisdictions to reflect current issues and by limiting the number of committee responsibilities an individual senator could take on. As part of the proposal to reduce the number of Senate committees from 31 to 15, the resolution recommended that all special, select and joint committees be abolished. Despite an amendment sponsored by Senator McGovern to retain the SCN, the committee was allowed to continue in existence only until the end of 1977 (28).

In January, 1978, primary authority over nutrition in the Senate was transferred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and a Subcommittee on Nutrition was established. The Subcommittee resembles its predecessor in a number of ways: the same
chairman, the same senators representing agricultural interests and essentially the same staff. However, there is not representation of interests from the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. ¹ Therefore, policy making will have only limited representation for the urban sector, depending on how well urban interests are represented in the full Senate Agriculture Committee. The current subcommittee has legislative authority, a power not enjoyed by the SCN. As a result, the policy output of the Subcommittee on Nutrition may be expected to be different from that of the SCN.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose in this study was to examine the influence and effect of the organizational structure and process of decision making on policy decisions related to nutrition legislation formulated in the U.S. Senate.

The following objectives were established:

1) to describe, explain and compare the activities of the Senate committees charged with nutrition concerns from 1966 to 1978

2) to identify the significant actors, events and conditions that have influenced policy decisions related to nutrition legislation

3) to describe and explain any changes in the process of nutrition policy making due to changes in the legislative subsystem responsible for nutrition policy

---

¹Formerly the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, its name was changed as part of the 1977 Senate reorganization of committees.
Significance of the Study

Examination of nutrition policy making is important for several reasons. For students and practitioners concerned with policy development, this study provides a basis for understanding and explaining phenomena which result in policy decisions. All organizations are regulated by policy and a primary reason to study policy is the effect it has on the way an organization is run. The study identified relationships that may be tested in future studies. The relationships may be applied to 1) other policy issues, and 2) formulation of a model of political interaction which determine policy outcomes. Interest groups may use the conclusions drawn from the study to develop their own influence resources. Identification of the key actors and variables in the political arena may enable nutrition interest groups to have a greater impact on nutrition policy legislation in the future.

The substantive aspects of nutrition policy have been discussed in the literature. Little research has been reported in which the nutrition policy process or identification of the actors and forces influencing this area of legislative work have been examined. An investigation of the process and participation of actors is thus a unique contribution to the literature on the subject. Finally, the application of field research methodology in the study of nutrition policy making is unique. This investigation is an initial attempt to apply field research methods to the political aspects of nutrition policy making.
Definitions

For purposes of this investigation, the following definitions will be used.

**Actors:** members of Congress, the executive branch and interest groups who interact in the political arena.

**Agency:** an organization, either public or private which deals with issues in the political arena.

**Implementation:** the process by which actions are taken after policy is enacted to put it in operation, including resources and personnel commitments, rule making and allocation of resources to goals.

**Integration:** degree to which there is a working together within a committee to minimize conflicts and maximize mutual support to achieve its goals.

**Investigation:** a detailed examination by a committee in order to keep up to date in a given policy area under the committee's jurisdiction.

**Norm:** those widely held expectations of what members must, should or ought to do in particular circumstances and the violations of which will result in sanctions exercised by other members.

**Nutrition:** the science of food, the nutrients and other substances therein, their action, interaction and balance in relation to health and disease, and the processes by which the organism ingests, digests, absorbs, transports, utilizes and excretes food substances. In addition, nutrition must be concerned with certain social, economic, cultural and psychological implications of food and eating.
Nutrition policy: the evolving purpose and plan of a nation to
direct all its programs, projects and other activities related
to food and health.

Oversight: supervision of agency involvement in the formation or
implementation of legislative policy to achieve legislative intent.

Policy agenda: set of concrete, specific items scheduled for active
and serious consideration by a particular institutional decision
making body.

Public policy: purposive course of action followed by government
dealing with some topic or matter of public concern.

Select committee: a temporary committee which lasts only through
the life of the Congress in which it is created.

Significant actors: individuals and groups identified as being
instrumental in the initiation, modification, adoption and imple­
mentation of major policy decisions in a given policy area.

Standing committee: permanent work unit in each legislative chamber
with jurisdiction over a specific substantive area.

Subgovernment: tripartite, but informal groups consisting of interest
group leaders, administration agency personnel and congressional
committee members and staff with a particular policy domain.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this investigation was to determine how the organizational structure and policy making process of Senate sub-systems has influenced and contributed to policy decisions related to nutrition legislation. No research reports on nutrition policy have been found in the literature of either a descriptive or empirical nature. Therefore, it was necessary in formulating this investigation to rely on the available research conducted on legislative behavior, particularly Congressional committees and the policy making process. This discussion will be divided into five sections: organization of legislative work, theory of decision making, subgovernments, select committees and committees as a political arena.

Organization of Legislative Work

Originally, the task of policy making was assigned to Congress in the Constitution (125). In principle, Congress is organized to perform this task efficiently. The institutional structure of both houses is divided into committees whose responsibilities are assigned based on substantive area, such as foreign affairs, agriculture, commerce and transportation (79). The standing committees have been created over time in response to pressing national problems. As the permanent work units of the Congress, the standing committees handle the bulk of the work by screening, examining and reporting on legislation and other
business referred to them. As a result, the committees exist to speed the work load, to facilitate meaningful deliberations on important measures and issues, to develop a degree of expertise among committee members and staff, and to serve as a convenient graveyard for inept proposals (10). Because of their size and volume of work, many committees have divided their labors among a number of subcommittees. Subcommittees represent the ultimate division of labor; they hold hearings, examine and mark-up legislation\(^1\) (107).

The division of labor in standing committees results in a number of norms\(^2\) which govern Congressional behavior. The Congress is a social system characterized by stable patterns of action and by widely shared standards of what that action should be. The standards, called norms are informal rules which may govern conduct more effectively than any written rules. Norms have developed out of the system's needs, and to perpetuate and extend certain system characteristics. Norms have an influence on social action and provide a linkage between past and future action. Since Congress can not control the selection of its own members, norms provide the basis for socialization by promoting group cohesiveness and conformity to organizational goals.

Several norms are pertinent to this investigation. Each of the norms discussed is enforced to various degrees by different committees. The orientation of newcomers is considered an apprenticeship period

\(^1\)Mark-up legislation: the process of informal consensus of each section of a bill without a formal vote, occurs during executive session.

\(^2\)Norm: those widely held expectations of what members must, should or ought to do in particular circumstances and the violation of which will result in sanctions exercised by other members.
during which they are expected to learn both the norms and the subject matter of their committee assignments before taking an active role in the work (83). Freshmen Representatives and Senators are expected to be fairly unobtrusive, to do their homework and not to take too noticeable a part in debate, speaking last, if at all. Influence and deference belong to those members with the longest tenure.

Committee autonomy restricts participation in the work and decisions to only those members who are assigned to the committee. The number of committee assignments and volume of work of each committee necessitates limitations on participation. Negotiation and compromise take place in the subcommittee, where members give and take until a unanimous recommendation is achieved.

Reciprocity allows a given committee to make recommendations on the legislative work it is assigned with expectations that the recommendations will be accepted by non-committee members in the voting process on the floor of the chamber (59). The result is that the subcommittee decisions are usually accepted by the full committee and the full chamber. Basic to the norm of reciprocity is accommodation to other members' specializations and constituency concerns. Specialization develops out of autonomy and reciprocity; the members of a given committee are given deference by nonmembers to make decisions in the subject matter in which the committee members have developed expertise. Members are expected to carve out their own area of expertise and to defer to the expertise of their colleagues in other subject matter areas. Thus members will rely on the judgment of the experts on the committee when information is needed, particularly at the point of
a floor vote. Given the opportunity to indicate committee preferences, a member can become influential in those policy areas most aligned with his interests.

The seniority system is the hierarchy for ranking members in each chamber by party, and according to years of consecutive service both within the chamber and on a given committee (85). Within the chamber, a member with the longest period of service will receive preference in committee assignments. Senior members enjoy committee influence and can dominate floor debate because seniority signifies experience and experience brings a combination of subject matter expertise and political wisdom which is held to qualify members for leadership. Once assigned to a committee, the member of the majority party having the longest consecutive term of the committee automatically becomes chairman. The chairman has a significant influence on the activities of the committee (83).

Unfortunately, Congress is far from 'expert' on all facets of our increasingly technological and professional society. Rarely do members of Congress arrive in Washington as specialists, but develop expertise in a limited number of policy areas over time. As a result, Congress is highly dependent on others as information resources. In addition there are numerous influences on the establishment of agenda items. The White House, executive departments and organized interest groups are the principle sources of legislative input (79). Congress is rather small (435 Representatives and 100 Senators) and understaffed compared to the massive organization of the executive branch and numerous interest groups. The work load is such that cooperation
with outside groups and organizations is essential for effective policy making to occur. At the same time, Congress possesses two vital powers: the mandate of constitutional legislative authority\(^3\) and the power of the purse\(^4\) (79). Armed with these resources, Congress retains an important role in the policy process.

**Theory of Decision Making**

A number of theories have been developed to explain how decisions are made in the political arena. The democratic theory holds that voters are the major policy makers through the election of representatives who respond to the electorate's policy preferences (79). Failure to respond to the electorate's preference will hamper attempts for re-election. The elitist model maintains that political power is concentrated among a small group of governing elites who arrange policy distributions to favor their own values and interests (8). Public policy in this model is decided by the ruling elite. The demands and actions of the majority of the people do not determine public policy. In contrast, the concept of pluralism contends that the holding of power in the political system is complex and unequally dispersed, creating a competition for power among many interests (79). Because political resources are unequally dispersed, but substitutable, there are numerous alternate sources of political influence by which one

---

\(^3\) Legislative authority: power assigned to a committee to review proposed legislation by all appropriate activities.

\(^4\) Power of the purse: authority to control all federal funding appropriations.
may attain a desired goal. The traditional pluralist assumption is that competition is pervasive and that power sharing produces policy sharing.

Some attention has been given to the concept of noncompetitive elites. In this theory numerous autonomous and powerful interest groups each press for some policy salient to group interests. Groups develop and monopolize a particular domain within the government and rarely have a confrontation with another group (79).

A similar theory was described by Lowi (80) as 'interest group liberalism'. The theory can be considered liberalism because it expects the government to take an expanding role in promoting the private sector. It is interest group liberalism because it is a basic tenet of the theory that the organized interests in society will determine the policy agenda and public interest.

The following assumptions form the basis for Lowi's philosophy:

1. Organized interests are homogeneous and each to define, sometimes monolithic. Any 'duly elected' spokesman for any interest is taken as speaking in close approximation for each and every member.

2. Organized interests pretty much fill up and adequately represent most of the sectors of our lives, so that one organized group can be found effectively answering and checking some other organized group as it seeks to prosecute its claims against society.

3. The role of government is one of ensuring access particularly to the most effectively organized and of ratifying the agreements and adjustments work out among the competing leaders and their claims (80).

Based on Lowi's theory, the major difference between liberals, conservatives and the various partisan groups in the political arena is the interest groups with whom each choses to identify, which means
dealing only with those organized claims that have been adopted as legitimate. Conflicts between interest groups are resolved by parceling a share of benefits to each of the interest groups.

Subgovernments

The result of interest group liberalism is a government composed of subgovernments. Such a government system was originally described by Cater (24) and more recently by Ripley and Franklin (108). This phenomenon is a tripartite alliance of 1) the interest group, 2) the agencies within the bureaucracy that support and collaborate with the group and 3) the congressional committees that have jurisdiction over and a membership allied with the interests of the interest group and agency. This type of arrangement provides access for non-governmental actors to policy and program content. The non-governmental actors of a subgovernment are generally the lobbyists for the limited number of interest groups with the most concern in a given area of governmental policy. Bureaucrats are likely to head those agencies which have jurisdiction over policy/programs salient to the interest groups. The members of Congress and their staff serve on the committee/subcommittee with principle or exclusive responsibility over the policy area which is the domain of the subgovernment. Generally the congressional members would be the most senior members of that committee.

Policies have been classified in the past in a number of ways: substantive content, impact on society, clientele group benefited, process by which made or budgetary allocation (108). The basis for any such classification is the identification of characteristics that components of the policy share. Ripley and Franklin (108) have
suggested a six category scheme for the classification of governmental policy. Under domestic policy are three categories: distributive, regulatory and redistributive. Foreign and defense policy are classified as non-domestic policy and divide into one of three subgroups, structural-distributive, strategic-regulatory or crisis policies. The characteristics of each type are identified according to major features of the policy, the principle actors, the kind of interaction among the actors, the stability of the relationship among actors, the most important party in the policy making decisions and the relative influence of the various actors. Delineation of these characteristics in each case provides a composite picture of each subgovernment. For example, distributive domestic policy is the subgovernment classification in which Ripley classified agriculture.

The essence of distributive policy is decentralized decision making in distributing resources to a number of recipients. The recipients do not compete directly for subsidies but seek a high level of support for themselves without being particularly aware or concerned about other recipients or their subsidies. The interaction of members of the subgovernment are characterized by a low level of public visibility, a high degree of cooperation within the subsystem and mutually rewarding logrolling among the members (108). Substantive change is gradual and the cast of actors changes little from year to year.
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The bureau-committee relationship is at the heart of this subgovernment, and these actors usually make the final decisions (Figure 1). Distributive decisions are made individually without regard to their interrelationship or overall impact. The activities of the government consist of routine matters which means that policy making decisions do not involve a high degree of controversy, there is not likely to be any major change in the policy and so participation is limited to those most interested in implementation and minor alterations. As a result, the subgovernment can frequently operate for long periods of time without interference or control from outsiders. Because the chances of fundamental policy change increase when non-members become involved and may result in realignments unfavorable to the interests of the members of the subgovernment, there is a
strong incentive to reach compromises. Client group satisfaction can produce critical political support for both the bureau and the committee as they seek to enhance their position in their respective institutional settings.

Price support policy in the area of agriculture is a good example of distributive domestic policy. In the early 1920's the agricultural depression, which was touched off by the decline from the wartime demand for farm products, led to a new strategy by farm groups for exertion of political influence. The strategy was to elect members of Congress who were sympathetic to agricultural interests, regardless of party affiliation, and then to organize them into a disciplined and unified 'farm block' to secure desired farm legislation. The farm problem was diagnosed as a combination of low farm prices which produced low farm incomes. To remedy the problem the government enacted a variety of price support programs which sought to raise prices by restricting production while at the same time payments were made to farmers to increase their income.

Farm organizations have continued to exert pressure group activity intended to influence the formation and administration of agricultural policies. At the same time technology and economic pressures on the farmer have precipitated conflicts and divergence among farm groups and interests. The result is that there is no single farm interest, but distinct agricultural group politics which has induced commodity consciousness rather than broad agrarian consciousness (1). One commodity group will likely have little or no interest in a price support program which is considered vital to another commodity group.
More likely, the interests of different commodity groups may directly conflict. A price support program which will raise the price of feed grains may draw the opposition of poultry and dairy producers because it will raise the cost of the feed they buy. Diversity and conflict among agricultural groups has undoubtedly contributed to the tendency of Congress to follow a commodity-by-commodity rather than a general farm approach in enacting price support legislation.

The agriculture committees are organized along commodity lines for handling price support legislation. The House Committee on Agriculture has a number of permanent subcommittees on each commodity, each of which is dominated by representatives from districts producing the commodity in question. In the Senate committee, the chairman, under an informal arrangement, tends to defer to committee members whose states have substantial farm interests in particular commodities for decisions on those commodities. According to Lowi (80):

"That agricultural affairs should be handled strictly within the agricultural community is a basic political principle established before the turn of the century and maintained since then without serious reexamination."

Ripley and Franklin (108) have suggested there are a number of instances in which the normally closed, low profile of a subgovernment may be interrupted by nonmembers. The members of a subgovernment may disagree to such an extent on some point that the controversy gains publicity with subsequent attention and intrusion from outsiders. The President or high ranking official of the executive branch or a member of Congress can chose to aggressively inquire into the functioning of a subgovernment. A new issue may attract the attention of outsiders and once introduced result in jurisdictional changes for members of
the subgovernment. In any of these situations the subgovernment is challenged and it either prevails or is defeated. In cases where it prevails, the subgovernment may suffer a weakening of its power triangle.

The notion of subgovernments, especially the distributive domestic policy type, is aligned with the philosophy of interest group liberalism described by Lowi (80). Lowi's conceptualization is dominated by the activity and representation of the interest group itself in the governmental sphere at the stage of implementation of policy. While the interaction of the interest group with the appropriate congressional committee prior to implementation is not specifically stated, the relationship is implied. In addition, the assumption that the role of government is one of ensuring access to those interests that it has adopted as legitimate also implies excluding interest groups that it does not consider legitimate. It is more appropriate to use the subgovernment concept as developed by Ripley and Franklin (108) in this investigation because the concept focuses on legislative work of committees and outside groups.

Nutrition has traditionally been placed under the jurisdiction of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture. Ripley and Franklin (108) have categorized agriculture policy under distributive domestic type of subgovernment. Therefore, it would seem appropriate to use the theory of subgovernments in considering the nutrition policy process.
Committees as the Political Arena

The theory of interest group liberalism described by Lowi (80) suggests that major actors outside the legislature are involved in decision making. In the work on subgovernments, Ripley and Franklin (108) focus on the relationship between the committee and outside groups, executive branch and interest groups participating in the decision making process. However, as far back as 1885 Woodrow Wilson (159) wrote that 'the Congress in session is the Congress on display, while the Congress at work is the Congress in committee!' It was Wilson's contention that congressional committees dominated congressional decision making. A corollary to that assertion is that committees are autonomous units which operate virtually independent of external influences. Supporting views are that members specialize in the committee's subject matter and hence each committee becomes the source of legislative expertise within its jurisdiction; that committee decisions are generally accepted and ratified by the other members of the chamber; and that each chairman can wield a great deal of influence over his committee. To some extent, these generalizations are no doubt true. However, the application of these generalizations has been questioned by researchers whose investigations have been based on the concept that committees are markedly different from one another (83). Each committee has a specific policy jurisdiction and a unique combination of chairman, members and external influences. Thus, the importance of studying a specific congressional committee to investigate the importance of the policy area that falls under its jurisdiction is obvious.
In a number of studies of congressional committees the internal and external working relations of the different subsystems and their respective roles in policy making have been examined. Indepth examinations of the congressional finance committees have been made by Manley (83) and Fenno (38). In each case the investigator examined recruitment and preference for assignment to certain committees, the integration and exchange within the committee and the chairman, and relations with the full House, Senate and the executive branch. Their conclusions included 1) the committee chairman plays a significant role in influencing policy outcomes; 2) the conservative coalition has played a prominent part in the politics of both chambers for a number of years; 3) members' goals and chamber expectations play a major part in subsequent policy decisions; and 4) governmental institutions are competitive with one another in the representation of group interests.

In earlier work, Fenno (37) looked at the integration of the House Appropriations Committee and concluded that the working relationship of members within the committee was determined by 1) the consensus on the committee's tasks and goals; 2) the non-partisan 'business' attitude toward their work and 3) conformity of members to the norms which determined their original assignment to the committee and subsequent working effectively together as a committee member.

Committee assignment and integration were explored in several other studies. Master (84) reviewed the selection process for committee assignments. The general criteria for assignment to most of the committees were 1) a particular committee would help insure reelection to the member; and 2) preference will go to the senior
member, if two members request the same slot. Preference for assignment to a committee which will promote reelection was supported in a study of the House Agriculture Committee done by Jones (65). He also reported Congressional members representing a constituency with significant interests in farm policy appeared to be assigned to subcommittees based on their individual commodity interests.

In a subsequent study, Jones (66) compared the integration in the House Agriculture Committee with what Fenno (37) had observed in the House Appropriations Committee. While the same norms appeared to operate in both groups, integration was achieved to a more limited degree in the Agriculture Committee because of a strong partisan climate created by diverse constituency interests. The subcommittee functions and committee integration seemed to be affected by the identification between the commodity and partisan interests in the specific commodities subcommittees which had an adverse effect on the outcome of comprehensive farm legislation.

Fenno (39) compared six House committees and their Senate counterparts in the context in which each shaped decisions. The study was based on the premise that demands and resources create the environment in which committee's work proceeds and these factors have their respective effects on the eventual policy outcome. The members of a given committee have certain personal aspirations that they wish to achieve presumably through membership on that committee. Each committee also operates with a set of environmental constraints, primarily the expectations of interest groups. As a result, each committee develops strategies for accommodating the achievement of
individual member goals within the context of environmental constraints. These strategies become the premises on which a committee's decision making processes are based. The theory of Fenno (39) is delineated in the following scheme:

Four basic goals of members — reelection, influence within the chamber, good public policy and career ambitions beyond the chamber — were identified by Fenno (39). While each member presumably seeks to attain all four goals, each would have his own mix of priorities and intensities which may change over time. The opportunity to achieve these goals appeared to differ within each committee. Congressional members, therefore, match their individual pattern of aspirations to the diverse patterns of opportunity offered by the respective committees. The matching process usually can be assumed to take place as the member seeks an original assignment or transfer to a committee he believes will satisfy his goals.

The most prominent groups of nonmembers who attempt to persuade committee decisions were identified as members of the parent chamber, members of the executive branch, members of interest groups and members of the two major political parties, primarily the leadership. Each group had an interest in committee behavior and resources to influence behavior. Each member appeared to be most constrained by the outsiders who are most likely to affect his personal goals.
Given individual members' aspirations and the environmental constraints in which these aspirations are pursued, some guidelines for decision making would seem to be necessary to make a committee a working group. Fenno (39) used the term 'strategic premises' to describe the accommodation of individual and interest group goals to help promote collective action for committee decisions. For a committee to make substantive decisions, it formulates a set of rules to simplify the task by developing standardized decision contexts and responses to them.

In decision making process, several other aspects of committee arrangement appeared to come into play (39). Each committees' internal structure is constrained by certain formal and informal norms of the parent chamber. There exists a set of procedural rules fixed by the chamber. Size and party ratio of a committee determines how decision making can be best handled. The most consequential constraint is the informal seniority rule for designation of the committee chairman. The chairman is the most influential member of the committee and, if he choses, can use his position to limit committee activity to meet his own goals. Finally, the congressional electorate decides at the polls which party shall control all committees. The importance of partisanship during the deliberative stage of committee work varies and may be limited to the norm of 'restrained partisanship'. As described by Manley (83), a member is expected to demonstrate responsible behavior while thoroughly studying the technical complexities
of the bills under consideration. Partisanship as a rule for decision making occurs at the point of decision, that is, committee and floor votes.

Select Committees

In contrast to standing committees, the work of a select committee is unique. To begin with, a select committee is a temporary entity which lasts only through the life of the Congress in which it is created (109). Select committees have generally been created for at least one of the following reasons: to study and investigate problems of mutual interest which cross the jurisdictions of several committees; to serve interest groups that feel they lack access through an existing standing committee; to serve individual members or make use of their particular talents; and/or to evade a standing committee when circumstances make it necessary (154). A secondary function has been the educational, promotional or representative role serving to lay the groundwork for long run legislative objectives (155).

Passage of a resolution for the creation of a select committee needs the consent from either the majority leaders and/or the standing committees involved (155). The members of this special group are chosen several ways: members of the standing committees whose jurisdiction are to be represented; members with constituencies affected by the committee's work; membership representative of the chamber, i.e. sectional, political; or senior members (154). The individual named to the chairmanship of a select committee is generally the person who first urged its creation, if he is a member of the majority party (154).
With few exceptions, a select committee is not empowered to report bills to the floor of their chamber (155). The reports and recommendations generated by this investigative unit are primarily advisory; the members of a select committee are expected to take up the legislative recommendations in their standing committees. If it serves an individual or group interests not addressed by a standing committee, the select committee may promote a cause effectively enough so that a standing committee must give attention to those interests. While the select committee has no power to dictate to the standing committee, the leaders of the select body frequently have enough prestige and power to win support in the standing committee and on the floor of the chamber for legislation with genesis in the select committee to be enacted.

Institutional attitude toward a select committee is such that this type of committee may fail to influence decision making (154). A select committee is disliked by members of Congress primarily because it is perceived as encroaching on the jurisdiction of at least one standing committee. Despite representation of its membership in the select group, jealousy and friction generally exist and dissension extends to its recommendations. Distrust is minimized if the select committee confines itself to a role of study and investigation, remaining subservient to the standing committee's legislative powers. Members on a select committee come from rival centers of power and lack the zeal to cooperate; this is aggravated further if several committee chairmen serve as members of the group. This lack of zeal is intensified by the limited time available to devote to a select
committee's work on top of a members' other committee assignments. Finally, members on a select committee may not be able to agree for either substantive or partisan reasons on what proposals should be submitted in reporting the committee's investigative findings. As a result of the above factors, select committees tend to serve on the periphery of the legislative power structure. They serve as a vehicle for individual members, primarily the chairman, to satisfy their own interests or acquire a degree of policy specialization.

A review of the literature on legislative behavior, particularly congressional committees and the policy making process, reveals certain aspects which are relevant to understanding nutrition policy making. The organization of legislative work in all substantive areas occurs in committees, or, more specifically, subcommittees. The patterns of action by which committee work proceeds are called norms. Seniority dictates the leadership of a committee and, to a certain extent, the committee's membership. Due to their command of the subject matter, deference is given to the most senior committee members in influencing the course of the committee's work. Committee autonomy and reciprocity allows committee members to complete the committee's assigned work without interference from nonmembers and once a unanimous recommendation has been achieved, the recommendation will be accepted by non-committee members in the voting process. An investigation of nutrition policy making in the Congress needs to examine the committees with jurisdiction over nutrition issues, and the committee's working relationship among other committees in the chamber.
A number of theories have been developed to explain how decisions are made in legislative work. The theory of subgovernment appears to be pertinent to a discussion of nutrition policy making. The theory of subgovernments focuses on the relationship among the interest groups, administrative agencies and Congressional committee specifically concerned with a particular issue and identifies the role of each of these critical actors in this tripartite alliance to achieve their common interests. In the distributive domestic type of policy making decisions are made with little outside influence beyond the sphere of the tripartite interaction of the interest groups, agencies and committee directly involved. The relationship and role of interest groups and administrative agencies to the Congressional committees making nutrition policy, and the extent to which that relationship excludes other actors in the policy making process are concerns that must be addressed in an investigation of nutrition policy.

Each committee has a specific policy jurisdiction and unique combination of chairman, members and external influences. Therefore, an investigation of the policy making in a specific substantive area such as nutrition requires an examination of the integration and exchange within the committee and the chairman, and relations with the chamber and executive branch. The role of the chairman and the working relations of members can be expected to be influenced by personal aspirations, the expectations of the interest groups with whom they deal, and the social, economic and political environment in which a given decision is made.
Finally, a select committee is a unique entity among Congressional committees. The status that a select committee achieves is determined by the receptivity of the rest of the chamber to the work of the select committee, which is usually advisory. The institutional attitude toward select committees in general is such that this type of committee frequently fails to influence decision making. Select committees usually exist only through the Congressional session in which they are created. A select committee that exists for a decade might be expected to have unusual characteristics which contributed to its longevity.

Wheare (83) has written that:

"the student of committees has to make a choice. Either he can try to hack his way through the jungle on foot or he can try to get a bird's eye view of the terrain from the air. If he chooses the first alternative, the most he can hope for is to clear a portion of his territory; if he chooses the second, the most he can hope for is to produce a rough sketch map of the whole area".

Since the purpose of this investigation was to determine how organizational structure and policy making processes of the Senate committees charged with jurisdiction over nutrition policy may have changed from 1966 to 1978, this would suggest the importance of studying the specific committee responsible for the policy area of nutrition. An investigation of nutrition policy making in the U.S. Senate during a 12 year period should examine the role of the committee chairman and committee members, the relationship of administrative agencies and interest groups, to policy decisions and the status of
nutrition among other legislative activities. Delineation of these aspects of nutrition policy will provide insight into the policy making process.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The investigation was designed to examine the critical actors, events, and conditions that influenced policy decisions related to nutrition legislation in the U.S. Senate. An intensive examination of the three Senate committees with primary jurisdiction over nutrition issues from 1966 to 1978 explains the nutrition policy process and leads to a better understanding of the priority given nutrition in relationship to other policy issues such as energy, defense, and trade that must be considered by policy makers in the federal government. This chapter includes a review of the literature pertinent to the research design, the method of data collection from documents and the literature, and a description of the interview process.

Research Design

The investigation was an exploratory case study. This type of orientation, as described by Kerlinger (67), enables the investigator to 1) discover significant variables in the field situation that otherwise might not be identified; 2) describe the interaction or relationship among variables; and 3) provide the background for later systematic research.

The term field refers simply to some relatively circumscribed and abstract area of study. The addition of the term research provides a qualitative change in meaning by adding a locative
Field research studies are generally *ex post facto* scientific inquiries aimed at discovering the relationship and interactions among social, political and economic variables in real social structures. Any scientific investigations, large or small, that systematically pursue relations, that are *ex post facto* in nature and that are done in life situations, such as communities, schools, organizations or institutions are considered field studies (113). The investigator in a field study first identifies a social or institutional situation and then studies the relations among the attitudes, values, perceptions and behaviors of individuals and groups in that situation. The researcher must get close to the people whom he studies for only in that situation are their actions best comprehended when observed in that ongoing, natural environment where they live and work. Ordinarily no independent variable is manipulated.

Katz (40) has divided field studies into two broad types, exploratory and hypothesis-testing. The exploratory type 'seek what is' and has three purposes: 1) to discover significant variables in the field situation; 2) to discover relations among variables; and 3) to lay the groundwork for later, more systematic and rigorous testing of hypothesis. This type of investigation may have two stages; the first stage may be used to determine the significant variables while the second may go a step further to explore the relationships among those variables determined to be significant. These activities are preliminary to hypothesis-testing in scientific research in areas of investigation which have received little or no previous study, or function as an initial stage of a continuous
research process. In order to achieve the desirable aim of hypothesis-testing, preliminary methodological and measurement investigations must often be done.

The second type of field studies, hypothesis-testing, is aimed at discovering or uncovering relationships. This type of investigation goes a step further than the exploratory type by including the statistical evaluation of the variables that are examined.

There are a number of strengths and weaknesses of field research studies (67). Field studies are strong in realism. They are closest to real life of all types of studies so there can be no complaint of artificiality. Social significance does not guarantee scientific significance so while field studies may be designed for the ultimate solution of practical problems the researcher must avoid becoming so fascinated by the examination of complex human relations and activities that he fails to focus on the theory he is trying to develop and test. Field studies are highly heuristic. One of the research difficulties of a field study is to keep the investigation contained within the limits of the originally defined problem. Hypotheses frequently emerge in the field rich in potential discovery. Field studies are used in situations which are continuous over time so it is possible to continue to observe or return at a later date. In addition, if further questions come up after studying in the field, it is possible to return to the study environment to obtain the answers. The field situation provides the opportunity for direct observation and interaction in the natural environment. The methods permit reciprocal perceptions and interdependent reactions from different individuals.
whose behaviors are interrelated to make the social structure which is under investigation. Agreement of perceptions contributes to greater confidence in the validity of the study if the consensus exists across different points of the organization. At the same time an exception, a deviation, an unusual interpretation may suggest a revision, a reinterpretation, an extension or a new approach to pursue since the primary emphasis is on the discovery of ideas and insight (33). Finally, field studies are valuable in that the source of information to be obtained goes beyond a single instrument. The field situation lends itself well to use of observation, interviews, review of documents of an organization and case study.

Despite the strengths of field studies, there are a number of weaknesses. The most serious is its generally ex post facto nature. Statements of relations are weak and interpretation of those relations which do appear is handicapped. The field situation is further complicated by a plethora of variables and variance over which there is no control. Another methodological weakness is the lack of precision in the measurement of field variables. Much of the lack of precision is due to the complexity of the field situation. Other weaknesses are practical problems: feasibility, cost, time and sampling (67). These four difficulties are really potential weaknesses which must be weighed against the research question being considered, the resources available to the investigator and alternative designs.

The social units analyzed and compared in this investigation included 1) the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 2) the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and 3) the
Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition. The data were collected from three sources: the recorded events and documents of the committees; interviews with significant actors who interacted in the committees' work; and a review of the literature of health professional organizations, food and trade industries which have reacted to the work and policy decisions of the nutrition committees. Significant actors included three groups of individuals: Senators who were members of any of the three committees during the period under study; Congressional staff of all three committees; and witnesses who testified from nutrition and medical groups, DHEW, and USDA, consumer groups, food industry and agriculture interests. Key actors were selected on the basis of their observed involvement in the primary activities of the three committees. Since these committees have been responsible for formulating nutrition policy in recent years, comparison was made of the respective policy making processes and contributions of the process to policy changes.

Data Collection from the Documents

The initial step was the review and analysis of documents of the three committees under study from 1966 to 1978. The documents included records of testimony, recommendations concerning legislation, drafts of bills, enacted legislation and government publications (Table 1). These sources were used to identify significant actors. Examination of events in the popular press during the period under study provided insight into the social, political and economic climate. Data collected from newspapers, lay press and government
Table 1:
Documents Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Subcommittee on Poverty</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee on Nutrition</td>
<td>1968-1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition</td>
<td>1977-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Prints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee on Nutrition</td>
<td>1968-1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Quarterly Almanac</td>
<td>1968-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Journal</td>
<td>1966-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americana Annual</td>
<td>1966-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Street Journal</td>
<td>1966-1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

documents were developed into a chronological scheme of factors that appear to have shaped the major events of interest to the research problem. Sources of data were organized by date, author and classified as a factual report or opinion (43). The chronological review of events and individuals involved provided a framework for the development of specific questions to be used in the interview schedule and selection of the significant actors.

Development of the Interview Schedule

In the field setting, data are frequently collected via questionnaires or interviews. Either technique requires a heavy reliance on the subject's report of information regarding their opinions or experiences to which he was exposed and knowledge of the behavior involved. As a result of the subjective nature of the report, analysis
must be made on the face value of the report and interpretated in relation to other information, the motivation of the subject to be candid and ability to answer.

Certain advantages would favor the use of questionnaires. The questionnaire is economical in terms of time, money and skills. Questionnaires can be mailed to a large number of individuals simultaneously. The impersonal nature of this type of instrument provides greater uniformity from each respondent, greater confidence in anonymity to get frank answers and less pressure on the respondents for immediate responses.

The interview is a face-to-face interpersonal role situation in which one person, the interviewer, asks a person being interviewed, the respondent or interviewee, questions designed to obtain answers pertinent to research questions (67). The interview has been used systematically for scientific purposes, both in the laboratory and in the field. An interview can be used for three main purposes. First, it can be an exploratory device to help identify variables and relations, to suggest hypotheses, and to guide other phases of the research. Second, the interview can be used as the main instrument of the research with questions designed to measure the variables of the research included in the interview schedule. And, third, it can supplement other methods or go deeper into motivation of respondents and their reasons for responding as they do (67).

The use of the interview for data collection is preferable in certain research situations. The interview can be used with all segments of the population regardless of educational levels since
there is greater flexibility than with a questionnaire to assure questions are understood. In addition, questions only require a verbal reply so there is a greater chance for a better sample. The interview is superior for exploration of areas in which little information exists since the technique allows the flexibility to probe responses and seek clarification. The interview provides an opportunity to appraise the validity of reports, to record what and how responses were made and follow-up the responses. The technique allows the examination of complex emotionally laden subjects or probe sentiments underlying opinions by creating a social atmosphere in which feelings or behaviors that are generally disapproved of may be expressed freely. Finally, the interview is a source of information that can not be gleaned by any other means and requires going to the individuals who know to obtain the information (33).

Most of the advantages of the questionnaire technique are lost by the use of the interview. The interview is more expensive to administer and requires greater time and skill. The respondent may be unwilling or unable to provide answers on the spot, especially because of confidentiality and/or memory loss. The interviewer is directly involved in data collection which may result in bias in administering the questions, recording and interpretation of the data.

There are two main types of interviews: structured and unstructured. In the structured interview, the questions, their sequence, the wording and frequently the choice of responses are fixed, allowing the interviewer little leeway in asking questions. In contrast, the unstructured interview is more flexible and open,
frequently employing an open-ended interview schedule. Riesman (33) has termed this type of instrument as an elite interview; it is an interview with any interviewee who in terms of the current purposes of the interviewer is given special, nonstandardized treatment. By nonspecialized unstandardized treatment is meant:

1. stressing the interviewee's definition of the situation,

2. encouraging the interviewee to structure the account of the situation, and

3. letting the interviewee introduce to a considerable extent his notions of what he regards as relevant, instead of relying upon the investigator's notions of relevance (33).

In elite interviewing, the investigator is willing to let the interviewee teach him what the problem, the question, or the situation was, at least to the limits of the interviewer's ability to perceive relationships pertinent to his basic problem in the research investigation.

The open-ended interview has certain advantages. The open-ended interview is particularly useful in the situation where the issue is complex. The interviewer has access to not just the surface content of a response, but also the reasoning and premises behind it, especially when interest lies in exploring the process or an individual's formulation of an issue from his frame of reference, the factors salient to the issue and his motivations underlying his opinions. At the same time, the interviewee is not locked into the choice from a set of responses, especially when the relevant dimensions are unknown to the investigator ahead of time. In addition,
the open-ended response is likely to generate unexpected information pertinent to the research questions. This type of research instrument is oriented to flexibility and probing so that a response may be pursued in greater depth and greater adaptation is possible which will enable the investigator to apply what he learns while still in the field. When the discovery of patterns is relevant to the investigation, the incorporation of the respondent's organizing principles may be an asset to collect as data. Finally, elites tend to hold strong views and are able to articulate them clearly which makes an open-ended interview in a conversational setting flow with minimal guidance (1).

On the other hand, the limitations to the open-ended interview must be considered. Questions are not always asked in exactly the same fashion. Generally small samples are the case in interview studies with elites due to their availability and the time required for interviewing. Sizeable losses of information can result from attempts to transform responses into quantitatively useable data (33). The investigator must be well steeped in the topic to make appropriate discounts for interview statements. A heavy reliance upon elite interviews requires a contingency plan so that if the elite interviews prove basically uninformative some other techniques can be substituted (1). The unbounded interview situation presents dilemmas to any researcher seeking to code responses systematically. Open-ended interviews are time-consuming to administer and transcribe for subsequently analysis.
Still, the choice of procedure should follow rather than dictate the character of research concerns. In interviewing elites, highly structured questions are best for measuring choices between well-specified behavior alternatives. They are inappropriate where the range of responses is either unknown in advance or complex. Dexter (33) concluded that interviewing is the preferred tactics for data collection when in fact it appears likely that it will get better data or more data at less cost than other tactics. Interviews should be undertaken when it is clear that the following conditions can be met: 1) alternative techniques have been seriously considered in terms of the research issues; 2) the research issues have tended to determine the selection of techniques, rather than the reverse; and 3) inferences drawn from the interviews can be subjected to some independent sort of criterion or vigorous test (33).

According to Van Meter (153), the policy analyst can assume that interviewees will tend to distort information about their own actions based on their perspective of a given situation. The investigator's strategy should then be to both surround the event in question with a series of interviews with all major actors and to supplement the interviews with documents from their files and the public record. Actors at different levels of the system will inevitably have differing interpretations of the same event of policy. This strategy also reflects the fact that if one wants to know what a given actor thinks about a policy, one would not only ask him, but also the individuals he interacts with, superiors and subordinates (153).
Following the review of documents, the interview schedule was developed. Specific questions were generated to elicit answers to the general questions developed for use in the study and modified by incorporation of specific events identified from the review of documents (Appendix A). The schedule was open-ended and respondents were encouraged to give short answers. The interview schedule was divided into three parts: 1) policy making by the Senate Agriculture Committee, 2) policy making by the SCN, and 3) policy making by the Subcommittee on Nutrition (Appendix B). Only those parts of the schedule which related to the individual actor were used in the interview.

In order to obtain some idea of the appropriateness of the questions in the interview schedule, several congressional staff were asked to review the questions and offer any suggestions of pertinent items which might have been overlooked by the investigator. Appropriate changes in the interview schedule were made prior to the first structured interview.

**Selection of Significant Actors**

Sampling is the process of taking any portion of a population as representative of that population or universe (40). This definition does not mean that the portion of the population taken is representative; rather it is 'considered' to be representative. Random sampling is that method of drawing a portion of a population so that all possible samples of a fixed size have the same probability of being selected. While random sampling is the model on which all scientific sampling is based, it is not the only kind of
sampling used in behavioral research. Random sampling is relatively uncommon for describing characteristics of populations and the relations between such characteristics.

One type of nonrandom sampling is the purposive or selective sample. This form of sampling is characterized by the use of judgment and deliberative effort to obtain representativeness by including presumably typical populations of interest in the sample (151). A selected group of individuals can be identified from documents and informants as having certain elements crucial to the problem under investigation. The only way to assure that they are in the invited sample is to directly and deliberately select them in the sample. The researcher must work from the premise that in any human organization, people stand in different relationships to the whole of that organization, in some important respects probably viewing and using it differently. These differences can be gleaned from what people say and how they act within their respective environments. For that reason, the researcher should select from among the universe of people according to their function in an organization that will meet his research purposes.

Since a selective sample is not a random selection procedure, it can be criticized for being a biased sample for which there is not strong defense. Since a selective sample is often a practical and theoretical necessity, the weakness can be mitigated to some extent by using knowledge, expertise and care in selecting the sample and by replicating studies with different samples.
Interviews were planned with significant actors identified from the literature, government documents and other actors as having interacted in nutrition policy making in one of the three committees. Senators were selected on the basis of attendance at twenty-five percent or more of the SCN hearings during tenure on the SCN and a personal staff member was identified as a potential interviewee. Professional staff members were selected on the basis of attendance at twenty-five percent or more of the SCN's hearing during tenure on the committee's staff. Witnesses were selected on the basis of either a) presenting testimony twice during the SCN's existence or b) testifying that government intervention through a national nutrition policy or nutrition education was crucial to the health and welfare of the nation. Interviews were then conducted with all selected individuals who were willing to participate in the study.

**Interview Process**

The interview process was conducted in Washington, D.C. during an eight week period. During the first week a general schedule of the Congress was obtained which provided an opportunity to identify when individuals associated with the Congress might be available.

The first ten days of the eight week period was spent locating the previously identified significant actors. Letters were sent out to the first 15 of 50 potential interviewees (Appendix C). The lag time between sending letters and the letter actually reaching each potential interviewee forced the investigator to contact the rest of the interviewees directly by telephone.
During the initial contact by telephone, each potential interviewee was provided the introductory statement from the letter which described the investigation. The option of participating in the investigation was presented to each individual contacted. Each interviewee was required to sign a consent form prior to commencing the interview (Appendix C).

By the end of the second week, the open-ended interviews were begun. During the interviews, the interviewer recorded answers on the interview schedule. All interviews were transcribed as soon as possible after each session. Each transcription included the responses to the planned questions and any additional information generated by the interview discussion.

Descriptive Data: Interviews and Interviewees

A total of 42 persons was contacted by telephone. Thirty-one interviews were set-up and successfully completed (Appendix D). Of the 11 individuals not interviewed, one individual was out of the country, one was on leave of absence, two claimed to know nothing about the subject under study and seven were unable or unwilling to agree to an interview. In only one case was a personal contact impossible so the interview was conducted on the telephone.

The length of the interviews ranged from 30 to 150 minutes. The average length was 63 minutes. With two exceptions, the interviewees were anxious to cooperate and interested in the study to the point of apologizing if the interview had to be cut short. In every case the researcher was encouraged to contact the interviewee, if any further help or information was required.
The academic background of the individuals interviewed was varied. Nine individuals held the Ph.D. degree of which six were in nutrition, two in the biological sciences and one in American literature. Eight of the interviewees held law degrees and three were medical doctors. At the Master's level, three degrees were in journalism, and one each in public health, history, and economics. Five individuals held baccalaureate degrees as the highest level attained. Two baccalaureate degrees were in history, and one each in public administration, English and civil engineering; and one of these individuals was also a paralegal aide.

Table 2:
Employment of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Held</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1967-78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private agencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of the interview about one-third of the individuals interviewed currently worked as staff on Capitol Hill (Table 2). Five were personal staff to Senators and seven were professional staff working directly for a committee. Of the remaining nineteen interviewees, ten were employed in the executive branch, six in private agencies and two were self-employed. During the 12 year period from 1966 to 1978 a number of the individuals interviewed had held more
than one position in which they had been involved in nutrition policy making (Table 2). The majority had held positions in agencies or as staff in the Congress. Approximately equal numbers worked either as committee or personal staff in the Congress, or they had worked for either the executive branch or private agencies. The remaining 8 individuals were either students, university professors or journalists during the period.

Most interviewees became personally involved with nutrition policy making during the period of 1966 to 1977. Nine individuals first became involved as a result of the civil rights movement and the identification of the existence of malnutrition as a national issue in the period from 1967 to 1969. They became involved through the Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty, the Citizen's Board of Inquiry, the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States or more than one of these organizations. Most of the rest of the individuals interviewed became involved from the effect of the hunger reform movement on the positions which they then hold in various agencies, public and private. The exception was the ten individuals who joined the SCN as professional staff at different points through the decade that it existed.

Reactions to Nutrition Policy Decisions

A review was made of the literature, government documents, and position papers of health professionals, food and trade industries who have reacted to the document *Dietary Goals for the United States* and other general remarks concerning the respective congressional
nutrition committees and their policy making decisions. The reactions were classified according to the opinion of each commenter on the dietary goals document.

Data Presentation

The data were described and classified according to the actors, interest groups, events and other variables identified as having influenced nutrition policy making from 1966 to 1978.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The findings of the investigation are delineated and described in three phases: nutrition policy making prior to establishment of SCN, following establishment of SCN and following the establishment of the Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition. Specifically described are the key actors, legislative activities, key events and outside influences that affected policy decisions during each phase at which nutrition jurisdiction changed as identified by the interviewers. Also described are the reactions to the document Dietary Goals for the United States as reported by the interviewees and recorded in the literature.


Very few of the respondents could provide any insight into the policy making activities of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with respect to nutrition policy making prior to the 1968 resolution which established the SCN. Most remarks were very general with respect to Congressional activities which were primarily independent of the events in the private sector throughout this period.
Key Actors

The key actors within the Congress were four men who controlled the two Agriculture Committees (Senator Ellender and Congressman Poage) and the two Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittees (Senator Holland and Congressman Whitten). One interviewee indicated that these men were so powerful that career bureaucrats contacted them before the Secretary of Agriculture. This relationship began to change in 1967 when Senator Joseph Clark took the members of the Senate Subcommittee on Poverty to the Mississippi Delta for hunger hearings. During that trip Senators Clark and Robert Kennedy toured several counties identified as extremely poor. In July of the same year, Clark's subcommittee held two days of hearings during which the Field Foundation doctors, Mississippi State Public Health Department officials, private citizens and Administration representatives testified for the first time concerning hunger. At that hearing, Senators Clark, Kennedy, Javits and Murphy were most actively involved. The general counsel to the Subcommittee William Smith and Kennedy aide Peter Edelman were also involved in the Mississippi and Washington hearings.

The interest groups related to the hunger problem outside the Senate consisted primarily of activists involved with the civil rights movement. Groups included the Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty, the United Auto Workers, the National Council of Churches, the Field Foundation, the Citizen's Board of Inquiry and the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States. Individuals actively involved were Richard Boone, Leslie Dunbar, Robert Choate,
John Kramer, Marian (Wright) Edelman, Jean Mayer, Walter Reuther and Benjamin Mays. During this time several activist organizations independent of the government Children's Foundation, the Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) and the Community Nutrition Institute (CNI) were established.

**Key Issues and Events**

The Senate Subcommittee on Poverty studied the War on Poverty programs for eight months. One of the main issues which emerged from this study was the identification of the degree and extent of existing hunger and malnutrition. The general attitude extended from skepticism that hunger was an issue to the actual observation of hunger by those who had toured the poverty areas of the South.

Table 3:

**Key Events Related to Establishment of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Citizen's Board of Inquiry</td>
<td>Hunger, USA (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark Subcommittee Hearings</td>
<td>Hunger &amp; Malnutrition in America (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Foundation tour</td>
<td>Children in Mississippi (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GBS Documentary</td>
<td>Hunger in America (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>USDA Conducts Survey of Household &amp; Individual Consumption</td>
<td>1968 Household Consumption Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Establishes SCN</td>
<td>S. Resoln 281 (138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen's Report on the School Lunch Program</td>
<td>Their Daily Bread</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued):
Key Events Related to Establishment of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Poor People's Campaign Converges on Washington, D.C. (Tent City)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen Groups Establish National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in United States</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nixon Administration Announces Commitment to Eliminate Hunger and Malnutrition</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health</td>
<td>Final Report (157)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key events of 1965-1968 which shaped the course of nutrition policy making included reports by public and private groups identified in Table 3. The visibility and influence of the activist groups was also a factor in policy making.

These key events influenced activity by both houses of Congress and culminated in the unanimous vote on Senate Resolution 281 by the Senate to establish the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs (SCN). The resolution was introduced by Senator McGovern who was later appointed chairman of the SCN.

Nutrition Policy Making Following Establishment of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs: 1968-1977

The interviewees identified a variety of committees which had some responsibility for nutrition legislative decisions. The committees most frequently mentioned were SCN, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (SAC), Senate Committee on Appropriations and the
Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Senate Committee on Human Resources. Less frequently cited were the Joint Committee on Economics and the House Committee on Education and Labor. In general, the committees named were identified in terms of their jurisdictional responsibilities concerned with nutrition such as federal food programs, health, manpower and trade. Without exception, however, the interviewees stated that the work of the SCN was used by SAC for legislative purposes.

Key Actors

When asked who were the key actors within the Congress, interviewees answered in one of three ways. Some identified both Senators and SCN staff, while others mentioned exclusively only individuals in one of these two groups. This difference may be due in part to the patterns of interaction that occurred between individuals on the Committee, Committee staff and those outside the legislature. The most frequently mentioned Senators of those who served on the SCN during the decade were George McGovern, Robert Dole, Hubert Humphrey, Henry Bellmon, Charles Percy, Richard Schweiker and Edward Kennedy. Consensus was that Senator McGovern in his role as chairman of the SCN was the primary spokesman and leader of the committee. He was also credited with the extraordinarily long tenure of the SCN, a ten year period. The interviewees commented on the commitment of Senator Humphrey to the committee's work but his involvement was limited by his failing health throughout this period, his desire not to jeopardize McGovern's authority and his active participation in
the work of many other committees. However, his dynamic leadership and his personal interest in the area of diet and health were identified as a positive, if sporadic, force in support of the SCN's work.

To a lesser extent eight other Senators were noted to have been interested in nutrition policy. These included Walter Mondale, Marlow Cook, Jacob Javits, Herman Talmadge, Phillip Hart, Allen Ellender, Mark Hatfield and Patrick Leahy. Some Senators who did not serve as members of the SCN were identified as highly interested in nutrition affairs. These were Frank Moss, Richard Clark, Clifford Case, Frank Church, Richard Lugar, Jesse Helms, Rudy Boschevitz, Milton Young, and John Melcher. The last five of this group currently serve on SAC and/or the Subcommittee on Nutrition.

Most interviewees agreed that the committee staff had been the key actors, even more so than the Senators, in the SCN's work. The team of Kenneth Schlossberg (staff director) and Gerald Cassidy were credited with the direction of the SCN's activities from 1969 through 1974; they gave the committee early momentum and viability which characterized SCN for a decade. A number of interviewees stated that "they (Schlossberg and Cassidy) made the committee what it was," with the implication that their ability and enthusiasm provided the key to the survival of the SCN. Two other staff members were mentioned as significant actors, Alan Stone and Marshall Matz, each of whom joined the staff in 1973 and remained after the SCN was disbanded. Less frequently mentioned as significant actors were Chris Hitt (SCN), Terry Lierman (Senate Appropriations), Richard Lieberman (SAC-Appropriations) and David Blumenthal (Senate Committee
on Labor and Human Resources-Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research). A number of other individuals were named once; each was a member of the personal staff to Senators on the SCN at some point in time.

The activities of the SCN staff as a whole were more frequently identified as exerting a significant influence in shaping the direction of nutrition policy of Congress than any specific Senator or SCN staff member. A number of reasons for the influence of the staff was identified. First, the staff was perceived as functioning from a "think tank" perspective in addressing the issues under the committee's jurisdiction. As such the staff dealt exclusively with substance while political considerations were the responsibility of each Senator's personal staff members. Second, the SCN staff were in a position to push the committee's work in directions that naturally evolved or were of particular interest to the staff.

The actual role of the staff of a given committee is defined by the committee members, primarily the chairman. In the case of the SCN, Senator McGovern allowed the staff to set policy by delegating responsibility and trusting their judgment. This delegation is not given by all committee chairmen. The committee staff under Senator McGovern were the key planners of the agenda of the SCN. Planning activities included the preparation and conducting of hearings, contributions to bill drafting, preparation of reports to accompany bills, and participation in executive sessions. Given this responsibility, the staff were in a position to select witnesses, define the subject of hearings, review committee reports and hearing transcripts
before their release, and interact with the Administration and private groups. The discretionary power of the staff was especially broad during the 18 month period of 1971-72 when Senator McGovern was running for President.

**Legislative Activities**

The main legislative issues addressed by the SCN can be classified under four headings: family food assistance programs, child nutrition programs, nutrition programs for the elderly, and human nutrition research funding. The final report of the SCN provides a comprehensive review of the provision of the bills enacted that address these issues (136). The primary concern of the committee was expansion of the domestic federal feeding programs. In large part the programs were given permanent entitlement as well as more federal funding. The implementation nationwide of the food stamp program with uniform eligibility and benefits replaced the commodity distribution program. In 1977, after a number of years of discussion, the food stamp program was completely revamped with the most significant change the elimination of the purchase requirement.

Included in the child nutrition programs are the school food service programs, the nutrition education and training program (NET) and the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children (WIC). The school food service programs include school lunch, school breakfast, special milk, summer feeding and nonfood assistance programs. All five program areas received expanded funding and uniform national guidelines for eligibility. Increases in the general assistance reimbursement, changes in commodities
procurement provision and type of foods allowed in federal programs were other major changes implemented. The WIC program was created in 1972 to provide supplemental food purchasing power to women and infants at high nutritional risk and was made permanent in 1976. The SCN was instrumental in preventing the elimination of the child feeding programs when each came up for reauthorization and reappropriation during the period. Finally, the committee supported the enactment of the NET program established in 1977 to promote the training of personnel and the inclusion of nutrition education in public school curricula.

The nutrition program for the elderly was created in 1972 through which primarily congregate feeding and some home delivered meals are made available to persons age 60 and over. The SCN conducted hearings to publicize the need for this program which was well-documented by research funded from Title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (129). The program was established by amendment (Title VII) to the original act.

The authorization of human nutrition research funding was an outgrowth of the attention directed in the 1970's to concerns about diet in relation to health. The funding has been directed to research related to cardiovascular, respiratory, and digestive diseases, cancer and diabetes with emphasis on the nutritional determinants and influences involved in the etiology and prevention. The National Institutes of Health have traditionally been the primary recipient of these research monies. More recently, the USDA has been designated
primary responsibility for conducting human nutrition and food research, and nutrition education activities (128).

The interviewees identified a number of issues to which the SCN gave limited attention and failed to attain enactment. Some of these issues were nutrition labeling, food safety, children's television advertisements, and diet related to chronic diseases. In some instances these issues were too new, that is, the issues had too little visibility, limited research documentation and consumer advocacy at the time they were considered.

The interviewees identified a variety of sources as origins of nutrition-related bills introduced in the Congress. A number of Senators introduced bills, most notably Senators McGovern and Humphrey. The committee's staff was responsible for writing the provisions of the bills sponsored by the Senators. The individuals who represented the hunger lobby, labor unions and religious groups, were identified by interviewees for their role in drafting bills either by submitting a bill or assisting the SCN staff in developing specific provisions of the bills. Administrative personnel indicated that they reviewed legislative work, but no nutrition-related bills had been initiated during their tenure in administrative positions.

The SCN appears to have created generally popular support for nutrition legislation. The interviewees indicated this attitude was not prevalent when the committee was first established because of the traditional conservative attitude within SAC toward social welfare programs. However, over time there appeared to have been a transformation of attitude. Food program bills which might have
otherwise been unpopular and gone down to defeat were included as provisions of agriculture bills. To obtain passage of the agriculture bills, the otherwise conservative Senators supported and needed the support of the Senators who favored the passage of certain food programs. The SCN created an awareness and greater sensitivity to hunger by holding hearings across the country which established the political base for feeding programs for the poor especially during its first five years. Coupled with this was the politically acceptable thesis that all individuals have the right to an adequate diet, thus the legitimacy for government to provide the means for that diet. The high visibility of the work of the SCN was a result of the support lent to nutrition issues by Senators McGovern, Humphrey and Kennedy with the accompanying attention these Senators command on the Hill and in the press. The committee's work provided legitimacy to the hunger reform organizations who needed access in order to promote change.

The opinion of those interviewed was that support for nutrition policy was bipartisan in nature throughout most of the decade. This had not been true at the outset of the SCN's work because of the traditional conservative attitude of the Senators who sat on the SAC. However, as the work of the SCN continued and the information produced pointed to the improvement in health that a well-balanced diet could provide, there was support from both Democrats and Republicans. For example, Senator Dole known for his conservative stand on most issues took a liberal stand on the issues addressed by the SCN. Several interviewees identified the team of Senators McGovern
and Dole, the chairman and ranking Republican respectively, for their work together on nutrition policy issues. A second team identified were Senators Bellman and Leahy who worked together later in the period. There were only two issues identified as precipitating a partisan split during the period: these were the food stamp program and formulation of the dietary goals document.

Outside Influence on Policy Making

An extensive list of interest groups and individuals who influenced nutrition legislation was identified by the interviewees as well as an estimate of the extent of influence (Table 4).

Table 4
Interest Groups Identified as Influencing Nutrition Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Group</th>
<th>No. of Times Identified</th>
<th>Extent of Influence&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy of Pediatrics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Dietetic Association</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X -- XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Dental Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Heart Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X -- X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Association</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-- X XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Public Health Association</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-- -- X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American School Food Service Association</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>XX -- X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Science in the Public Interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Foundation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>XX -- --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Not all interviewees identified the extent of influence of specific interest groups. X represents the number of times extent of influence was identified for any one group.
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Group</th>
<th>No. of Times Identified</th>
<th>Extent of Influence&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churches (all denominations)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Nutrition Institute</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>XX, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Federation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Union</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Industry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Research &amp; Action Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>XX, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Manufacturers of America</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X, X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals (independent of any organization affiliation)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland/Virginia Consumer Councils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for Advancement of Colored People</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Food Processors Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Welfare Rights Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Teachers Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Nutrition Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban League</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X, X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Not all interviewees identified the extent of influence of specific interest groups. X represents the number of times extent of influence was identified for any one group.
Only 25 of the 75 groups were identified by more than one interviewee. The groups can be divided into several categories: professional organizations, food industries, hunger lobby and consumer organizations, and civil rights groups. However, the frequency with which groups were mentioned is not a measure of the extent to which they influenced policy decisions. For example, the American Dietetic Association was the organization most frequently named, yet at the same time the interviewees had a low opinion of the extent of the organization's influence.

The most obvious omission from this listing is identified involvement from administrative agencies and/or representatives of the administration. This may be due in part to the wording of the question. Several staff members suggested that for any issue there were generally six key people involved which included a couple of Congressional staff, a couple of administrative personnel and a couple of representatives from an interest group. These staff also were of the opinion that with fewer people involved it was easier to pass social welfare legislation.

The hunger lobby groups FRAC, Children's Foundation, CNI and the American School Food Service Association (ASFSA) were identified as having visibility and effectively influencing policy decisions. Those groups that influenced nutrition legislation appear to have interacted in a variety of ways as identified by the interviewees. In a number of cases the groups testified or recommended individuals who should be asked to testify during a hearing on a specific issue or bill. In conjunction with an issue the groups provided informative
reports on legislative history of an issue, position papers, program monitoring data and suggested legislative change for problems with program implementation. In addition the groups wrote or helped write a bill or its provisions and assisted the staff in the preparation for introduction and sponsorship by writing floor speeches. The advocacy groups helped organize coalition support for legislation that needed endorsement through grass roots campaigns among their constituency and direct contact with political leaders, sometimes working with other lobbyists. During the mark-up sessions on specific bills, generally executive sessions, the hunger lobby groups were frequently invited to participate since they were perceived as familiar with the process and experts due to their continued involvement in the issues. Finally, in those cases where lawsuits were filed by consumer groups, the litigation and its accompanying press coverage were a means used to influence legislation.

Certain other groups were identified as having sought to influence the policy process. These groups included labor, church denominations, health groups, women's organizations, academic groups, and certain groups among the food industry and agricultural producers. In many cases these groups were opposed to legislation supported by the groups mentioned above. The opposition was identified, however, as not very strong and generally of a philosophical nature without any institutional outlet in the Congress. These groups were identified as not being particularly effective in their attempts to influence policy decisions.
The interviewees stated that health professional organizations and individuals, especially nutritionists, were not well represented at all. The groups specifically identified as not well represented were American Dietetic Association (ADA), American Medical Association (AMA), American Society for Clinical Nutrition (ASCN), American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), American Public Health Association (APHA) and National Education Association. The interviewees reported that questions dealing with nutrition were resolved with answers from the hunger lobby-advocacy groups rather than from the professional groups.

Several reasons were suggested for the poor representation by nutritionists and their organizations. First, professional organizations did not interact with the same techniques employed by the hunger lobby groups. Nutritionists, as is common with other scientists, are without consensus on issues; as a result, it is difficult for politicians to determine their stand or reasoning on an issue. As a consequence, when policymakers need help with a decision they tend to turn to those groups and individuals who will support a position. In most cases, nutritionists were viewed as failing to address themselves to the federal feeding programs, treating them as poverty programs. This attitude has been perceived by policymakers as defeating nutritionists' interest. In addition when nutritionists have voiced opinions they appear to have more interest in preserving jobs for nutritionists than in nutrition itself. It was suggested that nutrition professionals lack a vehicle to make a contribution in the political arena. Nutritionists have not interacted with either the congressional Agriculture committees or administrative
agencies directly concerned with nutrition policy. There is apparently no mechanism within their organizations to mobilize or harness the membership to express views on an issue in a timely manner. The lack of aggressiveness coupled with the failure to build coalitions with other groups deprived the nutrition community of visibility and credibility in an environment which could otherwise have been receptive to their expertise.

Key Events

Certain events were identified as influencing the direction of the work and the status attained by the SCN. These events can be grouped roughly as political, social and economic. The recognition that hunger existed in the United States at a time when a great deal of concern surrounded the world hunger situation was critical to political receptivity by the country. The concern was capitalized on by holding SCN field hearings with press coverage across the country to show the national scope of the hunger problem. On the Hill, Senator McGovern's status as a possible presidential candidate lent political prestige to the work of the committee. Conversely, the SCN provided Senator McGovern a political forum from which to promote his presidential aspirations. The SCN hearings under Senator McGovern's direction promoted respectability for interest in hunger and nutrition which resulted in a change in attitude of many of Senator McGovern's colleagues.

From a social standpoint, the climate was right for implementation of the interests and activities of SCN. The right of every individual to have an adequate diet became a tenet that flourished
with the civil rights movement. Concomitantly, emphasis was placed on physical fitness and "back to nature" movements. There was a general awareness of the need for a healthful environment and one aspect focused on food, its quality and safety. In the 1970's the importance of health and lifestyle permeated all aspects of our society, even to the point of exaggerated claims for various nutrients.

The changes in the economy contributed to the achievements of the SCN. The spiraling inflation of 1973 and the oil embargo precipitated a sudden rise in food costs to all time high levels, creating a situation Americans had not experienced since the Depression. Uncertainty continued as to the availability of food and the price of oil. The droughts experienced in some areas of the world and the resulting poor production outputs in recent years have placed demands on the United States grain reserves contributing to high prices and inflation. The 1974-1975 recession which precipitated a rise in unemployment helped prevent cutbacks in appropriations to the federal feeding programs. High food prices created a constituency of poor individuals who were unable to be adequately nourished without the federal assistance of the feeding programs. Collectively, the economic, social and political environment and events created an atmosphere receptive to reauthorization of the SCN by the Senate for ten years.
Attitude Toward SCN as a Committee

Since a select committee is a unique entity among standing committees, interviewees were asked how the work of the SCN was received by the Senate as a whole. The fact that the SCN existed for ten years focusing greater attention on nutrition is evidence of its acceptance within the Senate. Part of the efficacy of SCN was its relationship with the SAC. Legislative authority, that is, the power to hold hearings on bills and report the bills out of the committee for a vote of the full Senate, theoretically remained with SAC. Senator McGovern brought to the SAC hearings the investigatory reports and expertise of the SCN which facilitated the legislative work of the SAC. However, when the SCN desired legislation not approved in SAC, SCN took substantive issues in the form of amendments to the floor of the Senate. Support for SCN's work was reflected in the fact that it never lost a vote on a substantive issue even when a substitute amendment was introduced which was different from the SAC version. Support is further reflected in the pressure which the SCN was able to exert when the Committee promoted change in regulations and other administrative activities.

Three former SCN staff members suggested that without the SCN there would have been little change from the nutrition policy of the 1960's and no current federal matrix for nutrition programs. One former staff member suggested that one need only compare the record of support for nutrition programs in the House to the record in the Senate on nutrition legislation during the same period.
Coexistent with the positive influence the SCN had on promoting nutrition issues was the traditional institutional attitude of antagonism toward select committees. The animosity that existed toward the SCN was a result of the affront to the standing committees. This animosity was manifested by SAC and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The general reorganization of Senate committee structure in 1977 lead to the ultimate end of SCN. The demise of the SCN is softened by the fact that it was sustained by Senate support for ten years, a period of time not enjoyed by most select committees.

Dietary Goals for the United States

The most controversial event that occurred during the SCN's existence was the formulation of Dietary Goals for the United States (132). The interviewees provided a number of opinions on the outcome the SCN expected from the release of dietary goals. Former SCN staff members claim that this report was written for two reasons. One reason was that the issue of nutrition for the general public had not been addressed by the committee since poverty had been the primary concern of SCN. The idea for the document came from within the ranks of the SCN staff. The SCN staff wished to produce a document directed to the lay public who wish to understand how they should eat to be adequately nourished, yet avoid excess consumption of foods that may be detrimental to their health. The document was designed primarily to impart information at a level which could be readily understood by the American people. A primary question was
why the nutrition community had not provided guidance for the public. The document needed to be produced while the credibility of SCN still existed. Former SCN staff members interviewed claim they did not perceive the report as controversial and were startled by the furor generated by its release. Generally at the time of completion of a committee document, the finished report is signed off by Congressional members of the appropriate committee. Apparently in this instance personal staff members of the Senators assumed this responsibility and signed the document for their bosses under the illusion that the document would be received with the same reaction received by other SCN committee reports.

Interviewees other than the original authors of the Dietary Goals for the United States reported other opinions about the expected outcome of the document. Because it was the first government document of its kind, it was designed to focus discussion on the diet and health relationship. One former staff suggested that the report contained inflammatory statements designed to create a furor. Several other interviewees were of the opinion that it was a document whose "time had come" and that it provided a focus from which to start discussion. There was concern voiced that the document was released without adequate review and consideration of SCN staff, as well as without proper previewing and briefing of the Senators who were SCN members. In addition, the document was presented as though it was a piece of legislation that was endorsed by the Senators and the SCN staff made no attempt to dispel that notion.
One respondent was of the opinion that the staff who prepared the document might have anticipated the reaction the report received if they had studied the relevant research available and understood why no consensus statements had emerged from the scientific community. An additional comment was that the authors were risktakers with nothing to lose among their professional peers. Despite the claims of one of the originators of the idea to write the goals that they had no idea of the impact the document would have, another interviewee stated that the authors were sure that the report would be controversial and that one well-known nutritionist asked about the idea for the goals assured them that he would denounce any such document. The three nutritionists who did review the goals ahead of time were handpicked because they were known to be in agreement with the evidence on which the goals were based, were without economic interests and could be counted on not to make a public statement until after the SCN's press conference to release the goals. Finally one individual viewed the document as a last ditch effort to save the SCN by creating a situation that would convince the Select Committee to Study the Senate Committee System that the SCN should remain in existence.

**Reaction to Dietary Goals for the United States**

The response to the dietary goals document by the scientific community was swift and ranged from outrage to support. Nutritionists and researchers perceived the listed goals as a mandate for a national nutrition policy and dictation of the American diet by politicians. Several interviewees commented that the scientific community viewed
the document both as an infringement of its prerogative and a chagrin because it had not been doing its own job. The interviewees perceived that nutrition researchers were concerned with the budget cuts that might be applied to lipid research projects. The interviewees were biased in expecting nutritionists would be predisposed to a negative reaction because they are expected to have pro-industry and USDA bias on this type of document. In addition scientists were perceived to view the goals as an "overshoot" of the research evidence to date and recommending the necessity to back off until more information was available. Eventually ADA (2) came out with a qualified statement in support of the document. The interviewees commented that the medical community reacted in a traditional fashion in opposing all preventive medicine measures (5). They recalled earlier AMA statements which opposed specific relationships between diet and heart disease.

The interviewees reported that members of the food industry and livestock producers were vehemently opposed to dietary goals. The report became a primary political issue for those groups directly affected, such as the cattle, pork and egg producers, and the food industry manufacturers. The political battle was seen as a continuing attempt of Senator McGovern and USDA to hurt certain commodity interests. However, other commodity groups, such as poultry producers, bakers, millers, fruit and vegetable growers, and the fishing industry supported the report. The reaction of the SCN staff to those producers who opposed the document was that the producers overreacted and misinterpreted the report which was not designed to put them out
of business. Politically these groups put pressure on Senators McGovern and Dole, both from agricultural states, to modify the original document.

Public reaction was perceived at least by one former staff to be favorable because of the number of requests for a copy of the document. The lay press publicized the contents of the report in a number of articles. One interviewee cited the number of requests to the USDA from the general public asking if the document was intended to dictate the diet they were to eat. Another view was that the general public perceived the goals as big government regulation of diet. One former staff member suggested that while the report was claimed to have been designed and directed to the general public that it would be tough for them to understand the goals and use them in a meaningful way unless the goals were translated into nutrition labeling, and useful research.

Future of Dietary Goals for the United States

The nutrition issues addressed in the Dietary Goals for the United States will have to be addressed eventually according to the interviewees. There is going to continue to be pressure on nutritionists to address specific issues that concern and interest the general public. The interviewees viewed the ASCN report (7) as one type of response the scientific community can give on controversial issues. Two specific issues for nutritionists to consider were identified by the interviewees. The first issue is delineation of specific nutrient levels. One of the main criticisms of dietary goals was the "levels" suggested in the document. If the state of the art is such that the
appropriate amount of a dietary constituent is impossible to define to promote health, then support for the goals as principles, i.e., reduce fats, carbohydrates, sodium and cholesterol, to approach in the American diet may be appropriate and promote increased public awareness of the suggested directions. The second issue to be addressed will be the resolution of the Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDA) into common dietary recommendations.

The interviewees have observed that one of the outcomes of dietary goals has been increased activities related to nutrition. Within the Congress, hearings on diet and health-related subjects have been held initially by the SCN and more recently by the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition. The nutrition consciousness of public officials has been raised and they have become aware of constituency interest in nutrition and health. Within the executive branch, the Secretaries of DHEW and USDA have been mandated to coordinate nutrition activities. This mandate has resulted in a joint nutrition coordinating committee between these two departments. Coordination of their efforts is proceeding in such areas as nutrition education and development of a joint statement called "dietary guidelines". Such a statement will have strong implications for food procured by the federal government for federal institutions and feeding programs.

Within the food industry certain changes are emerging, as identified by interviewees. There is evidence that effort is being made to address the nutrition concerns and needs of consumers. Partly, this has occurred through changes in the promotion and publicity
given to products. One company has set up a scholarship program to train nutrition educators for medical schools. One former staff member was of the opinion that Senator McGovern "sold out" to the food industrial complex through modification of Dietary Goals for the United States, Second Edition. One issue not yet addressed by either the Congress or the executive branch is the economic impact on producers and the food industry if the recommendation of the goals were implemented. To date there has not been any governmental discussion of the alignment of nutrition concerns and production interests. There is a need for nutritionists and academicians to recognize and work with trade associations, their lobbyists and agriculture interests. Several interviewees suggested that after all the dust has settled that the document Dietary Goals for the United States will fade into obscurity. While not so stated by others, this impression seemed to be supported by remarks that as a catalytic agent the document had served its purpose as a framework for future debate on diet and health, that it would precipitate labeling changes and that it would force the hand of other organizations to address nutrition issues. As one nutritionist put it, "thank goodness someone took a chance." A former SCN staff member predicted that the typical diet will eventually resemble the diet recommended in the document; however, his irony was that a greater change would be effected from economic and energy factors than from health considerations.
Reactions Derived from the Literature

Numerous responses to Dietary Goals for the United States and the general work of SCN have been published in the literature and government documents. With regard to the general work and activities of the SCN, there appeared to be support for the SCN's work up to the 1977 release of the goals and generally regrets with regard to the Senate reorganization which precipitated the Committee's demise. Because the opinions concerning the SCN's general work, however, appear with reactions to the goals, it is unclear if the support for SCN is sincere or an attempt to soften the criticism directed towards the goals.

Review of written comments on Dietary Goals for the United States range from complete support to complete opposition to the document. The responses reviewed include individuals who represent the food industry, producers, health professionals, consumer advocates and Administration officials. Reactions reviewed include both solicited [SCN hearings (135) and Supplemental Views (134)] and unsolicited opinions (journal articles and conference presentations). A number of the individuals who responded have numerous published responses and so they have only been recorded once since it is assumed each time the same opinion was expressed. A total of 130 available comments on the dietary goals document were reviewed. The reactions were classified according to the perceived opinion (support, qualified support, opposition or no opinion) of the individual commenting on the document (Appendix E).
Twenty-two percent (or 29) of the responses were clearly in support of the goals. The comments in this group primarily supported the document for three reasons. One reason given for support was that there would never be a factual basis that would completely satisfy everyone no matter where the goals were set. The second basis for support was that the RDA's have always been set based on the best evidence available with continuous review and periodic revision so the goals should be approached in the same manner. Finally the goals were endorsed for the reason that someone needed to establish a set of guidelines for the public since it had not been forthcoming from the scientific community.

Twenty-four percent (or 31) of the reactions to the goals were grouped as supporting the document with qualifications. For some of these responses it was difficult to determine if the person generally supported the goals or not or only certain aspects of the document. A number of qualifications were placed on support. More general comments supported the principle and direction of the goals, but not the accompanying changes in food selection, specific levels of intake and the way the goals were derived. A number of criticisms were voiced concerning the use of epidemiological data as the basis for the recommendations and lack of input from those with scientific expertise. Concerns were raised with regard to the lack of mention in the document of obesity, weight control, exercise, alcohol consumption and fiber. Some respondents supported all the goals except one or made no comment except in the area where they had done research. The greatest number of comments were in regards to fat,
cholesterol and the relationship of these dietary constituents to cardiovascular disease. Both support and criticism were voiced for change in intake and the extent of change as well as concerns about polyunsaturated fatty acids replacements. A few comments were made both for and against changes in sugar and salt consumption. Finally support was given by some commentors with the qualification that the unanswered questions and outcomes about dietary change be included in the document so that the consumer can decide for himself and his family what modifications he may wish to make in his own consumption habits.

About forty percent (or 52) of the reviews appeared to completely reject the goals. Some of the reasons given included the same qualifiers listed by the group that gave qualified support to the document. However, some stronger criticisms were also voiced. The primary concern appeared to be that the goals are premature based on the scientific evidence available and that a great deal more research needs to be done. Coupled with this is the fear that research money may be cut off if the goals are seen as an end point in the research already completed. In addition, the concern was expressed that the document is biased in nature, only addressing one side of the available research results, repeating the concern that all the questions concerning outcomes of dietary change are not available nor are the unanswered questions stated in the document. Further, concern is expressed with whether a dietary regimen should or can be formulated for the general population since individual differences probably determine the response to any dietary regimen.
The neglect of consideration for the economic consequences of the changes in food selection was also addressed by those who oppose the goals. The need for education, not legislative mandate of dietary changes, is recommended by the group who oppose the document. Finally, most of this group asked for the unconditional withdrawal of the document by the SCN.

In 14 percent (or 18) of the reactions reviewed no clearcut opinion for or against the report was given. This group included the American Society for Clinical Nutrition symposium (6), and several articles which are factual reports of what the goals are and request feedback from health professionals concerning the document.

Nutrition Policy Making Following the Establishment of the Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition: 1977-1978

There were a number of reasons given for the shift of nutrition jurisdiction from the SCN to the Subcommittee on Nutrition under SAC. The institutional reason was the general reorganization of the Senate committee system that occurred in 1977. The Select Committee on Reorganization, chaired by Senator Stevenson, was opposed to the continuation of all select committees then in existence and as a result there was only limited support for the SCN among the general membership of the Senate. One former SCN staff member suggested that the SCN's achievements were difficult for the rest of the Senate to accept since the SCN had been so successful in promoting change in nutrition policy. The staff member identified several reasons for deletion of the committee: eight years of animosity;
the success in changing the direction of nutrition; the food industry opposition to the SCN document (dietary goals); the decreased interest in the hunger movement and the more general liberal attitude of the Senate as a whole.

Among the former SCN staff there appears to have been limited support for continuation of the committee. The staff felt that the SCN had outlived its usefulness in promoting nutrition and that the response in SAC to nutrition issues and concerns were amenable to that which the SCN had fostered. Senator McGovern was recognized as commanding enough power within SAC to continue to promote focus on nutrition concerns. The Subcommittee under SAC would enjoy legislative authority, one of the limitations of the SCN. One argument that the staff avoided was the issue of health as related to nutrition. This argument might have resulted in the transfer of nutrition jurisdiction to the Senate Committee on Human Resources rather than remain with the Senate Agriculture Committee. If this occurred Senator McGovern would have no jurisdiction over nutrition and health issues.

Senator McGovern introduced an amendment to retain the SCN. This amendment only lost by five votes. However, Senator Percy sponsored an amendment which was adopted to allow the Committee to continue its existence until the end of 1977 with the membership reduced from 11 to 9. Senator Percy argued that the extension would allow the committee to complete several studies which were currently underway. On February 4, 1977 Senate Resolution 4 passed the full Senate transferring the function of SCN to SAC as of December 31, 1977.
In the meantime, a Subcommittee on Nutrition was established under SAC and functioned concurrently with the SCN through 1977. Senator McGovern was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition.

Interviewees were asked whether the Subcommittee on Nutrition under SAC would be as effective as SCN in nutrition policy making without the representation from the urban sector. Counted as losses were the decrease in manpower and funding for the independent research of issues, resulting in a greater reliance on outside sources of information. Subcommittees under SAC do not have individual budgets and do not retain staff. Thus, the staff of SCN which had at one time numbered twelve was now reduced to two members who were continuing to work on nutrition because of their previous experience with SCN. The subcommittee has a low profile under SAC without visibility, autonomy and resources to pursue new directions. Without its own budget, no initiatives can be launched in the nutrition area. Jurisdiction for health issues has been transferred to the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research under the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

Several gains occurred with the change in status to a subcommittee. The most frequently mentioned gain by the interviewees was the elevation in the power structure to authorize legislation, authority not enjoyed by SCN. This power allows the Senators and staff a greater role in influencing legislative output. In addition, the Subcommittee on Nutrition appears to have moved to a more conservative position than its predecessor. The focus is on existing laws and their re-authorization. One interviewee indicated that the momentum of the
SCN seemed to be continuing although it was still too early to tell its effect. While the Subcommittee has far fewer members than the SCN, half of the Senators on the subcommittee were formerly members of SCN. Added to this continuity was the appointment of two former SCN staff members to the SAC staff so that the working relationship has continued between the Senators and staff of the Subcommittee. At the same time a good rapport exists between the staff of the Subcommittee on Nutrition and the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research. The continued leadership of Senator McGovern as chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition and his position as second ranking member of SAC results in considerable leverage within SAC. One staff member suggested that as the number two man on SAC Senator McGovern was as good as if he were chairman. Several interviewees commented that Senator Talmadge, chairman of SAC, has a lack of interest in nutrition and therefore defers to Senator McGovern on matters in the area of nutrition.

Key Actors

When questioned about changes in actors with the advent of the Subcommittee on Nutrition, interviewees primarily identified changes of Senators. The death of Senator Humphrey was indicated as an irrereplaceable loss by interviewees. While the number of Senators has been reduced, three of the key ones remain; McGovern, Dole, and Leahy. Although he does not serve as a member of the Subcommittee, Senator Bellmon continues to have an interest in the Subcommittee's work. The Subcommittee is without the talents of Senators Kennedy and Schweiker who are members of the Senate Committee on Labor and
Human Resources. Senator Dole has relinquished his post as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee in order to become ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee. However, the strength of the team of Senators McGovern and Dole continues. The new minority leader is Senator Helms. Senator Helms presents strong opposition to the federal food programs and is supported by Senator Lugar.

While subcommittee staff indicated that there was continuing support from the hunger lobby groups, this effort is not as strong as in the past under SCN. Partly this is attributed to the change in personnel in these groups. A number of these individuals have moved into positions in the executive branch which may mean that they are still pursuing their concerns but in a more conservative manner in keeping with the Carter Administration's priorities. When staff identified with whom they had interacted in the past under SCN and now under the Subcommittee, the same individuals were named even though they no longer represented the hunger reform group. One advocacy group representative indicated that lobbying required greater effort now due to the conservative posture of the Subcommittee.

One staff member indicated that there was a greater input from industry now than under the SCN. This may be in part a reaction to dietary goals and in part due to the legislative authority of the Subcommittee.

Legislative Activities

Hearings conducted under the Subcommittee appear to be similar to those conducted by the SCN. The Subcommittee is more conservative in its work, primarily dealing with maintenance of the federal feeding
programs. The Subcommittee has far less visibility, and due to limited resources, pursues few new directions. However, the Subcommittee now controls its own markup of legislation.

There was no clear consensus among interviewees about partisan support for nutrition issues that come to a vote in the Subcommittee. It did appear that there is less bipartisan support for issues than there was under SCN.

The issues addressed by the Subcommittee appear to be different from SCN. One major activity of the Subcommittee has been on maintenance of the current programs. Specifically, effort is concentrated on sustaining appropriations at current levels in keeping with inflation. The general posture of Congress has been to maintain spending rather than to create new programs. This environment is coupled with little time or money for the limited staff to pursue new programs. On the other hand, the increased interest in nutrition by the general public has contributed to on-going oversight of the quality of the diet and nutrition education. In the area of quality of the diet are the issues of food safety, nutrition labeling and diet related to disease. Under safety, questions surround use of additives such as saccharin and nitrites, and whether the food safety laws need overhaul after twenty-five years. To date nutrition labeling has been voluntary under federal regulations established by FDA and attempts at legislative mandate have failed. However, two bills on nutrition labeling were about to be introduced at the time of this investigation, at least in part due to the result of the GAO report on the RDA (147) in which consumers indicated interest in more
labeling information on cholesterol, fat and sodium. The desire expressed for more labeling information is also related to the interest in the diet and health controversy. Not unrelated is the emphasis on nutrition education included in federal food programs and nutrition training for health professionals.

Relations with the House Subcommittee on Nutrition

With respect to the question on influence and interaction between the House Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition and the Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition answers varied from responses of 'a great deal' to virtually 'no interaction'. In part this was attributed to the inexperience of both subcommittees, the House Subcommittee established in 1977 and the Senate Subcommittee established in 1978. Included in the response was the identification of Congressman Richmond as lacking the experience and credibility to be a strong chairman. The House Subcommittee on Nutrition lacks the prominence enjoyed by SCN. Added to this is the extremely conservative nature of the full House Agriculture Committee chaired by Representative Foley and the House Agriculture Appropriations Committee chaired by Representative Whitten. It bears repeating at this point that in 1968 when the Senate established the SCN the same effort to appoint a select committee in the House was defeated. While the SCN specialized in general issues and the Senate Subcommittee has retained the original emphasis and momentum on diet related to health, the House Subcommittee to date has been oriented toward specific issues of nutrition education, food safety and pricing.
Several staff indicated the willingness and potential for staff cooperation and partnership between the two chambers, depending on the issue. Similar to the Senate counterparts all nutrition issues are not under the jurisdiction of one committee. There is a House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment chaired by Representative Waxman, the House Consumer Subcommittee chaired by Representative Scheuer and the House Committee on Education and Labor chaired by Representative Perkins. These three committees have jurisdiction over food labeling and safety, nutrition oversight and child nutrition, respectively. Therefore, interaction between committee staff of the two chambers on a specific nutrition issue would vary with jurisdictional responsibility for that issue in the respective chambers of Congress.

Subgovernments

The question most difficult for interviewees to understand and answer was the one concerning the theoretical notion of subgovernments and their effect on nutrition policy making (Appendix B). Those who did respond to the question appeared to be defensive in their answers. The responses from staff were that there were no iron-clad alliances among the groups and that participation in the work of the SCN was limited only by the lack of input by those interest groups or individuals who might have an interest in involvement. The limited involvement of academia and industry was concluded to be due to their lack of research in certain issue areas, their knowledge of entry to the system and finally the staff's limited background in approaching
appropriate experts to testify. One criticism of the SCN's work was the bias identified as only one side of an issue was represented in testimony at hearings. One staff member indicated that no one had ever been excluded from questioning or testimony. Another former staff member suggested that the pattern of activity resembled that of a basic political science course: the interest groups who participated were those with a concern for a social issue, specifically the consumer advocate and hunger reform groups, not a scientific or professional interest. In addition to the lack of input by nutrition and health groups, the position of the Department of Agriculture was perceived as nonsupportive and that the Administration was still not supportive of most nutrition policy decisions.

One staff member indicated that if a tripartite alliance had existed at all it was primarily the result of the personalities of the individuals who interacted and that as those individuals moved into different positions they continued to interact from their new positions. The actors and partnerships have changed to the extent that those individuals who have left the nutrition policy scene have not been replaced by individuals with equal enthusiasm for the work, especially in the advocacy groups. Three respondents listed the individuals who were in what they termed the "intercircle" and identified as interacting sometimes as frequently as every day. The list included the following persons and their affiliations:

Matz (SCN, Subcommittee on Nutrition)
Hitt (SCN, Subcommittee on Nutrition)
Pollack (FRAC)
Bode (Children's Foundation)
Foreman (Consumer Federation, USDA)
The findings collected from documents, interviews and the literature are presented in this chapter. The data answer the initial questions concerning key actors, legislative activities and conditions, the policy process and organizational structure that were identified prior to the investigation. Additional information obtained which was not specific to the initial questions, but pertinent to nutrition policy decisions in the U.S. Senate are presented in the discussion of Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

An interrelationship exists between nutrition policy decisions made in the Congress and those which occur elsewhere in the government and private sector. In this chapter discussion will center on information obtained during the data collection on the influence of organizational structure and the process of decision making beyond the specific questions concerning the Congressional committees examined in this investigation. Delineation of the events of the past provides a starting point for public policy involvement of health professionals in the future.

Politics of Undernutrition and Overnutrition

In a broad sense, the legislative activity as described in Chapter IV that has surrounded nutrition policy formulation since 1966 can be split into two major phases with distinctly different characteristics: the politics of undernutrition and the politics of overnutrition. In the case of the politics of undernutrition, the interest and support for the elimination of hunger and malnutrition developed from the belief that in the land of plenty every citizen had a right to an adequate diet. The recognition that hunger existed in the United States surfaced at a time when the 1964 war on poverty was floundering and needed a clear-cut rallying point around
which supporters could gather. The recognition that hunger existed occurred at a point in history when the country was flush financially. Bipartisan endorsement for nutrition legislation was possible because labor, agriculture, food industry and the general voting public supported the elimination of hunger.

The elimination of hunger was perceived to be possible through improvement of the federal feeding programs and major increases occurred annually in funding to expand these programs. While the Nixon Administration took a progressive position on the issue of hunger, support was not as liberal as that in the SCN. Those individuals in the Congress who actively opposed liberal expansion and greater benefits agreed there was a problem requiring limited program reform and expansion. Hunger became linked to the issue of welfare and the elimination of hunger, the criterion by which welfare program success was judged. The premise on which program reform and expansion seemed to be based was that if people had enough money they could be well fed.

The second phase of legislative activity was the politics of overnutrition. The work in this aspect of nutrition began in about 1973-74 when the SCN shifted its focus from the quantity to quality of the food supply. The release of Dietary Goals for the United States precipitated dissension among the agricultural commodity interests, food processors and partisan lines. The very nature of the issue of overnutrition was less clearcut than that of hunger. This issue lacked the moral conflict of hunger and affluence, it lacked scientific consensus on etiology and resolution, and it
lacked political support because of conflicts among the interest
groups which had supported the hunger issue. The split among the
forces hurt the former solidarity of SAC and raised some questions
with regard to the future of the SCN's work and existence.

Underlying nutrition policy making was the fervor over health
in the United States which originated in the early 1960's when
President John Kennedy promoted his physical fitness program.
Nutrition was linked intimately to the concept of physical fitness.
While physical fitness has also been promoted in other countries,
the United States had carried the nutrition concept to the extreme.
Many groups involved with nutrition frequently followed exotic dietary
regimen detrimental to health, especially to the health of children.
The consumer movement included a spectrum of activists from the
rational advocates seeking accurate information to the "practitioners
of fear" who seek personal power and wealth. The atmosphere has
become so emotionally and politically charged that nutrition policy
decisions have been made in an environment of hysteria with limited
scientific consideration. A number of the consumer advocates have
moved into high level government jobs, infiltrating posts formerly
held by professionals with credentials which prepared them to hold
the positions. Because many of the activist groups have been highly
vocal and know how to use the press effectively they have gained
visibility and credibility which in turn has given them legitimacy
in the political arena since they have become known as forces which
could not be ignored.
Continued Senate Attention to Nutrition

With all the attention given nutrition in the past decade the question arises of what, if any, changes have occurred since 1966. In this investigation the changes and interrelationship of the Senate Committees has been discussed in Chapter IV (Figure II).

Figure II
Interrelationship of the Senate Committees with Nutrition Jurisdiction: 1966 to present

Within the Senate, the institutionalization of nutrition occurred in the 1977 reorganization of Senate committee structure in which the SAC was renamed the SAC Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and
Forestry. Since the last committee reorganization occurred in 1946, nutrition policy concerns will probably exist at least in name for a number of years to come. Whether interest will result in actual legislative output from within the Congress is yet to be determined.

During the interviews little mention was made of the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research under the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. The Subcommittee on Nutrition was reported to have assumed the responsibility for nutrition policy since the SCN was disbanded. In fact, the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research has jurisdiction over such issues as food safety, health research and health manpower and to date has examined such issues as the safety of saccharin, food labeling authority for FDA and quality of the diet. In addition, the staffs of the Subcommittee on Health and the Subcommittee on Nutrition have attempted to coordinate their activities in those areas where they share responsibility for nutrition issues. When the SCN was established it brought together agriculture and welfare interests to address nutrition concerns. Since SCN was disbanded it would appear that nutrition concerns have returned to their previous locations. However, the nutrition consciousness of officials has been raised so that greater attention can be expected to surround nutrition than it received prior to 1966.

The moral commitment and scientific consensus enjoyed by SCN on the question of malnutrition and health in a period of affluence is not evident for the issues currently on the agenda, such as food safety, nutrition labeling and diet related to health. The Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition is reduced in the size of its membership,
staff, funding and prestige, all of which contributed to the SCN's success. In part this change is a reflection of the change in political, social and economic environment since the late 1960's.

The interviewees in this investigation viewed SCN staff members as influential in determining the course of nutrition policy making during the period under study. The impression was gained that the staff members, especially staff directors, orchestrated the SCN's agenda, not the key Senators who served as members of the SCN. The influence of professional staff in legislative decision making has been addressed in several studies and one current investigation (68, 98, 112). In each of these investigations support is provided for the notion that professional staff play a major role and have significant impact on policy outcome. This influence appears to be particularly true in the Senate where one hundred Senators handle the same work load divided among 435 members of the House, and, therefore, require larger personal and professional staff (68). Congressional staff can be expected to continue to have a significant influence on nutrition policy in the future.

The question can be raised as to whether structure or leadership roles were more significant in terms of nutrition policy. While the leadership of Senator McGovern was crucial to the SCN's work and its longevity, the flow of the SCN's work appears to have proceeded when he was not in attendance. A number of other Senators who served as SCN members took over temporary leadership of the committee when Senator McGovern was a presidential candidate. In addition, numerous field hearings were held across the country which
were chaired by Senators from those localities. In fact, the SCN record shows that as much, if not more, activity went on in the committee when Senator McGovern was a presidential candidate and not in attendance as when he was. Other Senators are now introducing legislation and chairing hearings on nutrition issues both within the Subcommittee on Nutrition and the Subcommittee on Health & Scientific Research. The structure appears to be more important than the person in regards to the Subcommittee on Nutrition. Both of these committees are in contrast to the SAC prior to 1967, where Senators Ellender and Holland appear to have had total control. If the present status holds, the future of nutrition policy may not rest on Senator McGovern's leadership alone.

**Nutrition Policy in Government Agencies**

Within the Executive branch of the government a number of activities have occurred during the 12 year period. Obviously, the implementation of the federal feeding programs was a major activity. Modification of those programs resulted from increased funding and legislative directives which mandated major administrative changes. In addition to the program changes, there was a directive in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (128) designating USDA as the lead Federal agency dealing with matters in food and agricultural research. As the legal agency designee, a number of organizational changes have occurred in USDA.

A number of reorganization changes related to nutrition activities were recommended in the President's Reorganization Project, Food and Nutrition Study (150). While a number of interdepartmental
and intradepartmental changes in location of certain nutrition activities were suggested, the only ones that appear to have occurred were selected intradepartmental changes within USDA. The Science and Education Administration (SEA) was created with jurisdiction over Extension, Cooperative Research, Federal Research, Library and Information Systems as well as the newly created Human Nutrition Center (140). In addition a nutrition coordinating committee was established within the office of the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate nutrition activities both within and outside of USDA. The Human Nutrition Center, under the leadership of Mark Hegsted, has four main responsibilities: 1) to administer human nutrition research programs in USDA, 2) to coordinate nutrition research activities within the Department, 3) to cooperate with other Federal agencies on human nutrition research and 4) to translate and interpret research for dietary guidance of the public (14). The creation of the Office of Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services combined responsibility for the federal food assistance programs established in 1977 is directed from this office.

A great deal of nutrition related activity appears to be in progress at USDA. Several efforts have been directed to the updating of publications on dietary information for the public. It is too early to determine whether it is truly an effort to advance nutrition or merely action to maximize jurisdictional authority over nutrition.
In DHEW nutrition has been one of the cornerstones in the strategies for preventive health. The role of this department is to direct the nutrition research conducted primarily at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Traditionally, however, NIH has concentrated on research at the biochemical level of disease. The DHEW and particularly NIH have long considered research into the role of diet in the prevention of disease as part of its preview. In 1975 NIH organized a nutrition coordinating committee to strengthen cooperation among the eleven institutes of NIH (18). In 1977 the Secretary of DHEW established the Office of Nutrition Coordinator and the Nutrition Coordinating Committee (17). This committee was charged with planning, coordinating and implementing nutrition-related activities within the Department. The Nutrition Coordinating Committee serves as a focal point of contact with other federal agencies and the private sector. Subcommittees of the Nutrition Coordinating Committee were established in four major areas: nutritional status monitoring system, nutrition education, dietary guidelines and international nutrition (17).

The nutrition activity in both Departments appears in large part to be a "turf battle" for jurisdiction and funds (19). Almost two years ago, Congress named USDA the lead agency in human nutrition research, yet DHEW still considers itself the leader in this area. In the Public Health Service Act of 1978, an amendment was added which gives DHEW a special mandate to conduct human nutrition studies (130). Since passage of the 1977 Food and Agriculture Act, there has been a surge in the number of dollars spent on human
nutrition research by both departments. USDA has adopted the nutrition philosophy evidenced in Dietary Goals for the United States. By this action the Department has exchanged its former commitment to the producer for commitment to the consumer. USDA seems intent upon assuming responsibility for all nutrition activities related to the American diet. Criticism has been leveled at NIH for not conveying current knowledge about food and health to the American public.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 specifies that the Secretary of Agriculture coordinate nutrition research activities with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The USDA-DHEW Joint Nutrition Coordinating Committee was created to fulfill this mandate. The joint committee is currently working on two projects. The first project is development of a specific plan to implement the nutritional status monitoring system (NSMS) which has been proposed to Congress. The NSMS will represent a permanent system within the government to monitor all aspects of food consumption and nutritional health of the American people. The second project was to develop a specific set of dietary guidelines to aid the American people in selecting food for health. The recently released Dietary Guidelines for Americans (139) is the official statement by the federal government concerning dietary modifications that have been recommended in a number of previous reports such as Dietary Goals for the United States (132), ASCN subcommittee report (7), Surgeon General's Report: Healthy People (145), and National Cancer Institute (149).
Whether true coordination can be accomplished between or even within each department is pure conjecture at this point. Some sources report that the reason that output from the joint nutrition coordinating committee is so slow is due to a fundamental difference in philosophy between the two departments (19). For example, officials at USDA have pushed hard for dietary guidelines bearing the government's official approval. The representatives of DHEW claim they lacked enough evidence to cast presumptions into federal policy. The lack of consensus between the two departments inhibits coordination and confusion exists about actions to be taken. In the research area three reports were released by three different agencies, Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), General Accounting Office (GAO), and Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) in 1977-78 with three different views for Congress on how to modify nutrition research and coordination provisions of the 1977 Food and Agriculture Act (127, 144, 146). Each study addressed itself to specific areas of research; however, only the OTA report offered a plan for overall coordination of nutrition research throughout the government (52, 163).

The existing structure by which administrative officials are involved in policy decisions was recognized by interviewees, but not identified in the interviews. Administrative officials are involved in most oversight and legislative activities of the Congress. They will continue to have input into these activities and in some cases present to Congress their own version of a bill. The Congress is currently considering two nutrition labeling bills, revision of the food safety law, reauthorization of appropriations for federal
feeding programs and nutrition research funding. The fact that a number of individuals having decision making responsibilities in administrative agencies are former advocates from hunger and consumer organizations will probably result in some change from former conservative policy positions from the executive branch on these issues.

Influences from Outside the Government

The role of the hunger and consumer advocates in influencing policy was evident from the comments of the interviewees. The visibility of these groups and the support they could muster for an issue promoted their credibility. The contribution of the hunger lobby and consumer groups should not be underestimated. They had close ties to the staff of the SCN and continue to be actively involved with the Subcommittee's work. Because of the limited input by health professionals in nutrition policy, the staff indicated that they had relied on the available groups as experts on nutrition information.

It would be inappropriate to condemn the hunger lobby and consumer groups for the role they have played in policy decisions. The hunger lobby spoke and continues to speak for that segment of the population which is poor, poorly nourished and without the financial or legal knowledge to resolve this plight. This lobby has pushed for reforms in the food programs which have resolved some of the administrative barriers to participation of the poor. The consumer groups have sought to provide more and better nutrition information and nutritious products for the consumer in the market place. While some of these groups have appeared extreme in their demands, in fact an
increased amount of attention is now directed to the provision of information for the consumer (142, 143). Ironically, a number of these groups are supported at least in part by industry. Issues raised concerning quality and safety of the food supply, and suggested legislation and regulations may not be in the interest of the industry.

There was limited evidence of the involvement of the food industry during the early years of the SCN. As long as federal feeding programs used company products as they were currently formulated, there was little change in company attention. Even with the advent of the School Breakfast Program in 1972, a number of companies merely developed or modified items in their product line to satisfy the nutrition standards of the program. While in the beginning food companies rebelled against the nutrition labeling program and asked for a delay in its starting date, once implemented many companies learned it was to their advantage to declare the nutritional value of their products.

The relative change in the attention of the food industry to SCN began with the publication of Dietary Goals for the United States. Up to this point there had been support for the SCN and its work. This publication, however, was interpreted as essentially anti-industry since it called for Americans to reduce their consumption of meat, fat, cholesterol, sugar, salt and to eat more fruits, vegetables, unsaturated fats and cereal products. In most cases, the inclusion of the same recommendations in the Dietary Guidelines for Americans (139) recently released from the USDA-DHEW joint nutrition coordinating committee could mean significant changes will be required.
in product formulation and development as well as possible discontinuation of some products currently on the market. Some of the changes have already occurred voluntarily with respect to sodium, fat, cholesterol and nutrition labeling as change in the amount of these constituents in food products have been promoted by the consumer groups.

Another force in the nutrition policy making arena has been the communications media. At the beginning of the period under investigation, the media were actively involved in recording the "discovery" of hunger. Once the SCN was established, the SCN staff developed good rapport with the media and made effective use of the media in promoting issues. Throughout its decade of work, the SCN staff generally included at least one individual whose background was in journalism. This orientation provided the Committee with a number of major contacts that continue today for the Subcommittee on Nutrition. Those media specifically mentioned by interviewees were the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the National Broadcasting Company (NBC). In addition to the committee staff, the consumer advocacy and hunger lobby groups have been effective in gaining visibility for their concerns in the media. The key to media coverage has been the recognition that controversy and conflict are newsworthy. By dramatizing the issues of hunger, food quality and safety and the relationship of diet to disease, the groups seeking support for these issues have been able to convey the message to the general public and exert pressure on politicians for action. The opinion that nutrition has become too political
to be dealt with in a rational manner has been expressed by inter-
viewees in this study and a number of scientists in the literature
(36, 41, 46, 51, 97).

The role of health professionals in nutrition policy making
appears to have been minimal for the period under study. The
general opinion of the interviewees was that Congress had acted
in a vacuum because of the inability of health professional organi-
zations to organize politically. Congressional staff have not relied
on the expertise of nutritionists for several reasons. One reason
is their lack of responsiveness to issues in a timely manner. There
has been a lack of legislative liaisons with designated authority
to represent the nutrition professionals' view on issues. Profes-
sionals who have become involved as individuals have risked the
ridicule and even disdain of their colleagues.

Another reason that nutrition professionals have not been asked
for their opinions on nutrition policy issues is that they have
given the impression of wanting their input to be the sole basis
on which a decision is made (156). This attitude ignores the politi-
cal, economic and social implications involved in all policy decisions.
When a decision has been made which is not in keeping with their views,
the disdain for the decision and the "not gonna play" attitude has
often been observed. There has also been a failure among nutrition
professionals to recognize that policy decisions are not final.
Government should be perceived as an on-going experiment in which
ideas are tried, evaluated and modified as new conditions affect
decision making. Regulations are modified and legislation comes
up for reauthorization and reappropriation over time. This cycle provides an opportunity to evaluate programs and have input for changes. The feasibility of certain provisions of legislation vary over a number of years. Nutrition professionals have not recognized that working in stages toward their legislative goals will be most effective if they wish to influence nutrition policy making in the long run. Professional nutrition organizations have failed to establish annual legislative priorities, working toward those goals by appropriate activities. Decisions have been made concerning nutrition whether nutrition professionals had input into the decision making process or not. This situation will continue unless nutrition professionals make an effort to communicate their concerns to policymakers. With input, the views of nutrition professionals will at least be known, even if not included in a pending decision. Without input, professionals can not expect to have their views known, much less considered.

Outcome of Dietary Goals for the United States

The far-reaching effect of nutrition activity in the political arena may be seen in the wake of Dietary Goals for the United States. Reverberation from this staff document have been felt in many quarters (Figure III). Pressure placed on Senators, particularly those from agricultural states, precipitated a series of hearings, and a revision of the document. Hearings on the issues addressed in the goals and the need for research funding continue in both the House and the Senate.
Figure III
Subsequent Events Influenced by Dietary Goals for the United States

NAS report: Toward a Healthful Diet*

NAS report: Research Needs (148)

Symposium on Public Policy: AIN (4) IFT (42) ASPEN (6) AAAS (122)

NCI Statement: Prudent Principles (149)

ASCN report (7)

Conferences:
  a) Armed Forces (90)
  b) CNI-FMI-FC (71)
  c) Columbia University
  d) American Health Foundation

Dietary Goals for the United States (132)

SCN hearings (135)

SCN solicited comments (134)

USDA-DHEW Dietary Guidelines (139) companion Meal Patterns*

USDA diets to meet dietary goals (102)

Surgeon General Report: Healthy People (145) follow-up conference

FDA-FSQS-FTC Food Labeling proposal (143)

document revision (133)

additional hearings:
  Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition (5/79 + 10/79)
  Senate Subcommittee on Health & Scientific Research (2/80)
  House Subcommittee on Health & the Environment (11/79)

*To be released Spring of 1980
Within the executive branch of the government several activities are evident. One agency in USDA, Consumer and Food Economics Institute developed diets that met the goals following the release of the document (102). The 1979 Surgeon General's Report: Healthy People (145) addresses how Americans should eat by suggesting more or less of certain foods in the diet. This report was followed by a public conference convened by DHEW to draft measurable national objectives to be attained by 1980. The NCI has released its version of a preventive health plan and included in the Prudent Principles were diet recommendations (149). The FDA along with the Food Safety and Quality Division of USDA and the staff of FTC's Bureau of Consumer Protection has drafted a document that will be the strategy for food labeling which will be a comprehensive blueprint for all future action in the area of food labeling (143). Labeling will include fat, cholesterol, sugar and salt for the first time. The USDA-DHEW joint nutrition coordinating committee has recently released a document entitled Dietary Guidelines for Americans (139), the agencies' version of Dietary Goals for the United States. This document is to be followed by a set of diet plans in keeping with the guidelines.

One organization of nutrition professionals formed a nine-member subcommittee to look at the scientific data on the extent to which diseases of overconsumption can be prevented by dietary changes. This panel critiqued the evidence and wrote consensus statements on dietary cholesterol, fats, carbohydrates, calories and obesity, alcohol and dietary sodium. A symposium was presented when the
report was completed (7). The Food and Nutrition Board (FNB) of the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council (NAS/NRC) released a report on research needed to be done before establishing dietary recommendations for the U.S. population (148). In the spring of 1980 FNB is expected to release its own version of dietary guidelines for the general public.

Finally a number of conferences have been held which related directly to the goals. Community Nutrition Institute, Food Marketing Institute and Family Circle Magazine have held three annual conferences addressing the subject of the goals as they have progressed (71). The American Health Foundation held a conference and presented the results at a Senate hearing. Columbia University held a two-day conference on Nutrition and the Killer Diseases, especially addressing coronary artery disease, diabetes and hypertension. The Armed Services also held a meeting in which they addressed what course the Armed Services should pursue in possible diet changes in military feeding programs (90).

While not all these activities cited were necessarily initiated as a result of Dietary Goals for the United States, the attention the document received at the time it was released certainly has had some effect on the outcome of the events cited. One must not lose sight of the fact that Dietary Goals for the United States was a staff report developed by an attorney and a journalist who came up with the idea between sessions of the 94th and 95th Congress.
Several observations can be made concerning the events that have been influences by the release of Dietary Goals for the United States. It appears that once news of this document reached the headlines every nutrition and some health organizations as well as government agencies decided to address the issues. As a result so many different views have been expressed that more confusion has resulted than has helpful information been provided to the American people.

At the same time, however, some of the reactions especially those within the nutrition professional community have resulted from the working together of groups. These groups are addressing the issues from the standpoint of where consensus exists and what recommendations can be made based on that consensus. In these scientific status reports on the evidence linking diet and disease, comment is provided on the limitations in the research evidence available to making more definitive recommendations. There has been visible working together of individuals with opinions that are diametrically opposed on what dietary recommendations can and should be provided for the general public at the present time.

In addition a number of symposium and reports have been organized for nutrition and other science professionals to address the issue of translating knowledge into policy (46, 29, 42, 81, 122, 156, 161, 164). The attention to this concern is motivated by the need to put scientists in touch with the working of the political arena and how to effectively get input into the system. The type of consensus reports discussed above provide useful information which assist
policymakers on scientific issues. The perceived approachability of Congressional staff and administrative officials and the attitude with which concerns are expressed will determine the future interaction of policymakers and nutrition professionals.

In summary, it is apparent from an examination of the organizational structure and process of nutrition policy making both in the legislative and executive branches of the government that the nutrition professionals can influence the formulation of nutrition policy decisions. Effective influence into policy decision will require the nutrition scientist interested in nutrition input to study the interrelationship within and among the different agencies and Congressional committees concerned with nutrition policy, and identify the critical actors and environmental factors of the political arena influencing decisions on a given issue. Nutrition professionals will need to provide concrete, valid information for nutrition policy making. The lack of consensus on issues was the most disturbing problem identified by interviewees concerning the use of input from nutrition professionals in policy planning.
 CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose in this descriptive study was to examine the in­fluence and effect of the organizational structure and process of decision making on policy decisions related to nutrition legislation in the U.S. Senate from 1966 to 1978. The objectives were to de­scribe, explain and compare the activities of the Senate committees charged with nutrition jurisdiction from 1966 to 1978; to identify the significant actors, events and conditions that influence policy decisions related to nutrition legislation; and to describe and explain any changes in the process of nutrition policy making due to the changes in legislative subsystem responsible for nutrition policy.

The case study centered around the activities of three Senate committees, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (SAC), the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs (SCN), and the Sub­committee on Nutrition. Several sources were employed in the data collection. A review of the popular literature and documents of the three committees was used to identify critical actors, events and con­ditions. Thirty-one interviews were conducted during a two-month period in Washington, D.C. with significant actors who were selected based on their observed involvement. A critique was made of comments by professionals in the literature on the work and policy decisions related to nutrition policy for the period.

116
Prior to 1967 the key actors identified in the Senate were chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator Ellender and Appropriations Committee, Senator Holland. In 1967 Senators Clark and Kennedy brought hunger to the attention of the nation. Civil rights, religious and consumer groups were identified as significant actors for their focus on poverty and hunger. Individuals associated with the hunger reform groups were Richard Boone, Leslie Dunbar, Robert Choate, John Kramer, Jean Mayer, Marian Edelman, Walter Reuther and Benjamin Mays. Following the establishment of the SCN in 1968, Senators McGovern, chairman, and Humphrey were reported to be particularly committed to the work of the SCN. Other Senators involved to a lesser extent were Dole, Bellman, Percy, Schweiker and Kennedy. However, more than the Senators, the SCN staff, especially staff directors were identified for having a significant influence on the course and impact of the SCN's work. Specifically mentioned were Kenneth Schlossberg, Gerald Cassidy, Alan Stone and Marshall Matz. The hunger lobby and consumer groups were reported to be the primary groups effective in influencing policy decisions in the work of the SCN. Nutrition professional organizations and individuals were reported to have little influence on nutrition policy decision making. For the Subcommittee on Nutrition Senator McGovern was identified for his continued leadership and attention. While the Subcommittee staff is limited in number and new initiatives, the staff was reported to continue to be a major influence on policy decisions, partly due to their previous SCN experience. In the brief period since its establishment, the Subcommittee has had some interaction with food
industry and health professional groups, but most policy decisions continue to be influenced primarily by the hunger lobby and consumer groups.

Throughout the period examined there appears to be a shift in the role of certain actors. Prior to 1967, nutrition policy where it did exist was under the exclusive control of the Senators who chaired the committees with jurisdiction over nutrition. During the existence of the SCN, the SCN staff emerged as more significant actors than the Senators who served on the committee. In part the influence of the SCN staff is due to its size and talents of individual staff members, and the willingness of Senator McGovern to allow the staff major responsible for directing the course of the SCN work. The SCN could afford to have liberal thinkers on its staff for two reasons; it was a select committee, primarily functioning in an advisory capacity for the rest of the Senate; and it was established initially to address an issue for which there was general consensus on need to solve the problem, requiring only creative minds to find a solution. With the advent of the Subcommittee on Nutrition, the role of the Subcommittee staff is somewhat more conservative than under the SCN. Compared to the SCN, the Subcommittee staff is reduced in size and a more conservative posture has been adopted by the Subcommittee in part due to the legislative authority which it enjoys and the general trend in the Congress to avoid expensive new program initiatives. In addition, the issues currently being addressed do not enjoy clearcut consensus on either the problem or the solution.
Senator McGovern continues as a strong leader for the Subcommittee and in the SAC as a whole.

Since 1966 there has also been a change in the number of interest groups concerned with nutrition policy. Until the mid-70's the involvement of interest groups was limited to those groups concerned primarily with hunger. Since then attention has been focused on quality and safety of the diet. The food industry and professional groups have become increasingly involved. The hunger lobby and consumer groups, while continuing their primary focus on the feeding programs for the poor, have also become involved with the concerns surrounding the quality and safety of the diet of the entire population.

In reviewing legislative activity the SAC was reported to have given little attention to nutrition issues until the actors identified reported that hunger and malnutrition existed in the United States. The SCN was then established and throughout its decade of work the primary issue it addressed was the elimination of hunger. Action occurred through authorization of the federal feeding programs. The SCN also addressed the issue of quality of the American diet through the authorization of funding for human nutrition research and the formulation of the controversial staff report Dietary Goals for the United States. The Subcommittee on Nutrition has focused on maintenance of the federal feeding programs, quality of the diet, nutrition education, nutrition labeling and food safety.
Throughout the 12 year period the number of issues that concerned the committees with nutrition jurisdiction seem to have increased. Prior to 1967 the SAC gave little, if any, attention to nutrition issues. If hunger can be considered an issue, during the years prior to 1967, the problem was "solved" by providing surplus commodities for the hungry which alleviated the problem of surpluses, more than the problem of hunger. Initially, the SCN focused almost exclusively on hunger and malnutrition, establishing or improving programs for the different groups in the population needing nutrition services such as families, children, and the elderly. However, once attention turned to the quality and safety of the diet, a whole variety of new issues began to be addressed such as the relationship of diet to disease, nutrition education, dietary recommendations for the public, nutrition research, appropriateness of safety controls over food additives and food labeling. The Subcommittee on Nutrition has continued attention to most of the issues related to quality of the diet which are within its jurisdiction. Any new initiatives have primarily been concerned with related aspects of the same issues listed above.

Among the three committees studied, only the SCN can be credited with being assertive in terms of new nutrition issues. The SCN staff were the 'think tank' for new ideas and initiatives to which the Senators subsequently gave attention. The staff resources and the independent nature of the committee's work made it possible for new ideas to be developed and explored. Since 1978, the Subcommittee on Nutrition has had limited resources with which to pursue new
ideas. As a subcommittee under the SAC, it is also required to take a subordinate role to its parent committee.

Certain conditions have influenced the course of nutrition policy making. The irony of hunger amid affluence occurred at a time when it was believed that every individual had the right to an adequate diet. Politically the war on poverty was floundering and needed a clearcut rallying point which the elimination of hunger provided. These conditions led to the establishment for SCN. During the decade of the SCN's work, support for the elimination of hunger continued while the country experienced a period of spiraling inflation with rising food prices, followed by recession and unemployment. These circumstances reinforced the need for expansion of the federal feeding programs. The presidential candidacy of Senator McGovern gave visibility to the work of the SCN and provided the Senator a forum from which to gain visibility. Since the establishment of the Subcommittee, concern about the economy has moved the Congress and the country in general toward attempts to balance the federal budget.

The structural changes in nutrition jurisdiction and type of committee responsible for nutrition policy would appear to have had an effect on legislative policy decisions. Prior to 1968, SAC addressed nutrition as a peripheral concern in relation to its jurisdictional mandate, agriculture policy. Given this status, there was no real nutrition policy "process". When it was established, the SCN was not granted legislative authority. Reports and investigatory hearings of the SCN were used by SAC for legislative
purposes. Senator McGovern, who was SCN chairman, was a member of SAC where he was called upon to use his nutrition expertise from the work of the SCN. The efficacy of the SCN was based on the close policy making relationship between the work of the SCN and SAC. When the Subcommittee on Nutrition was established under SAC, the Subcommittee was given legislative authority. Nutrition policy making decisions proceed from the Subcommittee to SAC, under the leadership and guidance of Senator McGovern as chairman of the Subcommittee and second ranking majority member of SAC.

The most controversial event to occur in nutrition policy since the recognition that hunger existed in the United States in 1968 was the release of the report Dietary Goals for the United States. This document prepared as a staff report was developed to provide guidance for the American public on how to eat. Opinions of interviewees varied on whether the report was designed to be truly useful to the general public or promote discussion of the relationship of diet and disease.

Reactions to the dietary goals document reported by the interviewees and in the literature varied. The food industry and livestock producers registered concern on the economic impact of the report. Some of the nutrition and health community responded to concerns about the premature interpretation of research findings, possible loss of research monies, dictation of the American diet and the appropriateness of a general diet regimen for the entire population. Others viewed the document as compatible with currently available information on the relationship of diet and disease and long overdue
in providing information for the public. Beyond the intense feeling concerning the dietary goals document, there appeared to be general support for the SCN’s work and regret that it was disbanded due to the reorganization of committees in the Senate.

The value of Dietary Goals for the United States in the long run appeared to interviewees to be in the amount of nutrition activity that has occurred in government agencies and the private sector since 1977. The nutrition consciousness of government officials appears to have been raised through attempts to reorganize and coordinate nutrition activities within and among government departments. In addition, an emphasis has been placed on providing more and improved nutrition information for the general public. In the private sector, the food industry has begun to meet consumer needs through product formulation and nutrition information. The health professional community appears to be moving slowly toward making a more effective contribution to nutrition policy decisions by preparation of scientific documents concerned with policy issues that can be used by policymakers and becoming more knowledgeable about the policy making process. The focus and influence of the hunger lobby, consumer advocates and communications media on nutrition policy issues remains as intense as it has been for a decade.

In regard to whether a tripartite relationship had existed among the Congressional committees, administrative agencies and interest groups concerned with nutrition policy, the interviewees reported that no iron-clad alliance had existed. Participation in policy decisions was identified to have been related to interest
in the social issue of hunger. Interviewees suggested that if an alliance had existed, it was related to the personalities of individuals involved, not exclusion of others. A dozen individuals were identified as belonging to an "intercircle" intimately involved in most of the nutrition policy decisions made by the Senate committees.

In the development stages of the investigation the distributive domestic type of subgovernment described by Ripley and Franklin (108) was viewed as indicative of nutrition policy making. During the period in which the primary activity was the elimination of hunger through improvement of the federal feeding programs, interest groups, primarily the hunger lobby and consumer organizations, administrative officials from the bureaus and committee members and staff appeared to make policy decisions with little outside interference. However, as the focus of the committee broadened to include the range of programs concerned with the issue of quality and safety of the American diet, there seems to have been a change in the level of decision making. For example, Carol Tucker Foreman as Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services, USDA, and Julius Richmond, Assistant Secretary for Health, DHEW, have each been actively involved in the policy making process with interest group leaders and the Congressional committees in concerns about diet quality and safety. The issues have changed to ones which affect the entire population, not just certain disadvantaged groups. Food safety, nutrition labeling, dietary recommendations for the general public and nutrition education are concerns that bear on the well-being
of all American. Those interest groups which stand to gain or lose by a change in policy tend to become involved. In the case of the issues identified, the food industry in particular would be regulated by policies established on these issues. The general public would stand to gain by becoming more knowledgeable about the food supply. Ripley and Franklin (108) have termed this type of decision making regulatory domestic policy (Figure IV). This type of policy process involves high level administration officials, the regulated interests of the private sector and the full Congress. Conflict is more frequent in this area than in distributive policy. A great deal of visibility and competition surround a decision which confers benefits on some, excluding others. A high degree of competition goes on for a favorable decision. An example of this competition exists between the food companies and consumer
groups over the proposed nutrition labeling legislation and regulations. It is too early to determine whether this trend toward regulatory domestic policy will continue in the area of nutrition policy.

Finally, interrelationship between the effect of decisions made by the legislative and administrative branches in the area of nutrition policy was revealed in the discussion with interviewees. Activities concerned with nutrition coordination, research and provision of public information have been the result of decisions made in both branches of the government. At the same time, problems of jurisdictional responsibility have arisen between USDA and DHEW. Some of the current administrative personnel of these departments are former members of advocacy groups which has changed the attention given to nutrition issues within the agencies.

Recommendations

From the preceding discussion some recommendations can be made for practical application and future research. The first recommendation is in the area of training of nutrition professionals. The new graduate of an academic program must have basic understanding of the fundamentals of nutrition and related sciences. In addition, the graduate must be able to translate basic knowledge into recommendations for action.

With the number of professionals headed for either government jobs or positions where their work is affected by government policy, some course work in the area of social and psychological aspects (91, 114) of nutrition should be included. These courses may be
available through departments of social work, political science, public administration, public health, agriculture or community nutrition depending on a given college or university. Most universities have one or more of these departments. The need for experts in these areas was supported in the reports on nutrition research prepared by OTA, OSTP and GAO (127, 144, 146). These three studies suggested that funding was needed for research in the behavioral area of nutrition as well as training programs for professionals. To date, research in the area has had little funding and remained primarily descriptive leaving it less than a legitimate area to pursue.

The inclusion of policy courses in undergraduate as well as graduate programs is desirable. Courses should provide opportunity to glean the background of current policy and programs. In addition, students should have the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of current issues, critical actors in the debate and be able to effectively support their own stand on the issues. Course work might be further expanded to include actual field experiences in the political arena. New curricula and career paths which are inter- or trans-disciplinary may develop which may lead eventually to new professions that have new blends of knowledge and skills underlying them. Under guided leadership and encouragement while students, professionals can be expected to be more politically astute and likely to make an effective contribution to nutrition policy issues during their careers. One of the perceived reasons why professionals have had
little input into the policy making in the past is their lack of understanding of the political arena and how to approach policymakers.

Nutrition professional organizations need to hire legislative liaisons to represent them in the political arena. The legislative liaison needs to be given a specific idea of what his role is to be in representing that organization and must be given the authority and resources to have an effect on policy activities. In the political arena the individual representing the organization should have a nutrition background to provide not only visibility, but credibility for the organization. This individual must be allowed to use all possible means within his power to carry out the job. Working in cooperation with the organization's public affairs council, the liaison's responsibilities should include:

1) information gathering
2) focusing and highlighting issues of interest to the membership
3) disseminating information
4) advising government based on the organization's positions and experts in various areas: this requires maintaining contacts in both government and member organizations
5) leadership in policy development: this requires insight and anticipation of policy issues that will be forthcoming and developing policy positions in anticipation of the future
6) various types of assistance and interaction such as nominating persons to federal advisory bodies

One way in which nutrition professional organizations are making a positive impact on policy decisions is through an organization such as the National Nutrition Consortium (NNC). The NNC established in 1972 is the umbrella organization for the ten major food and nutrition organizations in this country. As such the NNC
consolidates and coordinates the monitoring and reporting of nutrition policy activities at the federal level for the member organization. In addition, the NNC serves in the capacity of liaison between nutrition scientists and policymakers, facilitating interaction in such ways as NNC Board policy statements on pending policy decisions and identification of experts from among the member organizations to communicate with policymakers on an issue.

Nutrition professional organizations also need to take opportunities to form coalitions with other groups with common goals. Such a coalition may include cooperation and coordination of efforts with such groups as agriculture, hunger lobby, consumer, religious and other health professional organizations. While the professional organization will not agree with the general philosophy of the groups with which they may form a coalition, the temporary or occasional alliance will frequently work to the advantage of all parties involved to attain a legislative or administrative policy. The partnership may be dissolved once a decision has been made on the issue.

Because it is unlikely that professional organizations can develop more than general consensus statements on most issues, individuals will continue to have the primary impact on policy. The nutrition professional needs to monitor activities through publications on public affairs which report nutrition activities which are of concern to his professional work. The individual is able to react rapidly to an event that concerns him once aware of the event. The nutrition scientist needs to be knowledgeable about the policy arena and an orientation to the political process could be provided.
through continuing education conferences, coursework and profes-
sional meetings. Many of the mechanisms for political involvement
are readily available to the health professional as a consumer,
a tax-payer and a constituent of local, state and nationally
elected representative. It is vital for nutrition professionals
to get involved while nutrition is a viable issue. One politician
has suggested four points for scientists to remember in the process
of effecting policy (4):

1) know how the legislature works
2) try to develop a personal relationship with
the policymaker
3) get to know key staff people
4) beware the image of special interest pleader

Nutrition professionals will not in most cases be the policy
decisionmakers. For that reason they should seek roles and posi-
tions where they can provide the scientific expertise in the policy
decision process. Scientists must learn to disseminate relevant
knowledge which is pertinent to a specific issue (16). Policy-
makers usually try to collect relevant facts either personally or
through their staffs before making decisions. Scientists frequently
differ in the facts they emphasize and, hence, in their conclusions.
A scientist's first responsibility is to tell the truth, without
compromise (122). The role of the politician, or his staff, is to
pursue interest in selected facts and to ask questions calculated
to get the answers they want. Their choice of an authoratative
source is often determined by their prior knowledge of the sort of
information the source will provide (4). The scientist who commands
expertise in a given area needs to present his position on the
issue. At the same time scientists need to appreciate that applying science and technology in the political decision making process requires the Congress to:

1) identify and delimit the scientific content and aspects of political issues;

2) devise intellectual bridges to enable the scientific and political worlds to communicate effectively with each other;

3) establish practical political techniques for assessing and validating scientific evidence;

4) formalize the process of weighing and balancing quantitative cost-effective concepts of science and technology with qualitative values of politics and society (156).

Legislating scientific knowledge in nutrition into public policy requires the policymaker to have the ability to take highly objective and specific scientifically derived facts and translate them into legislation based on highly subjective, general and broadly perceived values. The government action proposed must conform to the perception held at the particular time of the roles of government at whatever level in carrying out a law or regulation. Nutrition professionals who wish to influence policy must understand and accept this aspect of the political arena. According to one legislator, scientists must get the attention of politicians and make them understand in spite of the frustrations of working in the political arena. To do so, scientists must strive to become as comfortable in the political work as they are in the laboratory (4).

Several mechanisms are available by which nutrition professionals can make a positive impact on policy decisions. One mechanism is to communicate on a personal basis with the policymaker. This interaction
may proceed by written, telephone or face-to-face communication. Professionals need to take action in nutrition policy issues, rather than always reaction. Continued communication on the issue is vital if the nutrition scientist wishes to be perceived as an expert that the policymaker can feel free to contact in the future on related issues.

Another mechanism is as a member of an ad hoc committee of nutrition professionals such as that established by ASCN (7). That particular committee's membership was made up of members from a single organization. An alternative group could be formed by representatives from each of the major food and nutrition professional organizations to comment on a single issue. This type of committee can be made up of recognized experts on the subject under discussion even though they may not represent the opinion of the general membership of any one or all nutrition professional groups.

Finally, nutrition researchers need to interpret their research results so that they are useful for policymakers. The researcher is in the best position to interpret how the work will be useful. Also in those cases where the results may have some far reaching effect on a nutrition program or policy, the scientist should communicate those results to policymakers. Attention needs to be given to research problems and funding in those areas which are advantageous to solving policy questions.

The challenge to the nutrition scientists, technologist, consumer, regulator and legislator is to apply our scientific knowledge in ways that will maximize the positive impact and minimize the
negative impact (156). Choice will always be a necessity in public policy and choices are most often dictated by the immediacy of the public concern. Likewise, issues and concerns will necessarily always require periodic reexamination as new data and concerns will occur. The need to provide greater certainty in the face of change complicates the planning and decision process and calls for more knowledgeable executive and legislative branches in the scientific arena and a science community more knowledgeable in the public policy process.

Several recommendations can be made for future research in the area of nutrition policy. One recommendation would be to do the same study, probably by survey method, with significant actors who currently are outside the Washington, D.C. area. This would provide the opportunity to strengthen the perspective of health professionals and others who were actively involved in the 1966-78 period.

Also a similar study might be designed to investigate the critical actors, events and conditions on a specific policy issue, such as one of the federal feeding programs or a food safety issue. This type of investigation could provide insight into a given program or policy course in the past and possible direction in the future.

Since health professionals have not been particularly visible in nutrition policy making at the federal level, it might be assumed that they may be concentrating their energies in policy making at the state level. A research investigation could be conducted at the state level to study this possibility.
An investigation of whether scientific inputs by nutritionists actually had an impact on policy would be useful. This type of study could provide insights to the type of information and its presentation which would be useful in future attempts to make an effective contribution by health professionals to nutrition policy decisions.

Finally, any policy investigation in the future might be studied as the policy process occurs. Such a case study could follow the actors, events, and conditions surrounding policy decisions more closely than a historical investigation can do.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations in this investigation. One limitation was the small number of interviewees. A longer period of time for contact and interviews would have made it possible to set appointments with some of those individuals with whom it was not possible to set up an appointment. Another limitation was the inability to gain access to certain actors. The investigator's inexperience in Washington, D.C. and lack of familiarity with the potential interviewees contributed to limited access. The interviewer's inexperience in the interview situation may have limited the probing of responses making it difficult to interpret the responses of interviewees.
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Questions to be Answered by the Investigation

1. What have been the characteristics of the legislative setting in which the Congress has made decisions on agriculture, food and nutrition?

2. What has been the traditional policy making process in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, especially with regards to nutrition?

3. Who have been the major actors and interest groups involved in the policy making of the Senate Committee?

4. What has been the position on legislation and what resources have been used to effect the outcome on legislation by the actors and interest(s) groups identified as interacting in policy making?

5. What is the historical context which led to the introduction of Senate Resolution 281? a) political, b) social, c) economic

6. What characteristics of the legislative setting changed once SCN was in operation: a) legislative setting, b) process, c) actors, d) interest groups, e) position on legislation?

7. What did the SCN hope to achieve by release of the document Dietary Goals for the United States?

8. What has been the response of various actors and interest groups to the policy statement?

9. Why was the SCN disbanded in favor of a subcommittee?

10. What realignments have occurred since the SCN was disbanded and the Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition established?

11. What influence has the House Agriculture Committee and the newly formed House Subcommittee on Nutrition had on the Senate Committees and nutrition policy making?
Appendix B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I. Personal Data

1. Name
2. Position currently held
3. Educational background
4. Position held at time of SCN participation

II. Nutrition Policy Involvement: General

1. When did you personally become involved with the work of nutrition policy making?
   a. Date
   b. How

III. Nutrition Policy Involvement: prior to 1968 -- Senate Agriculture Committee

1. What committees were responsible for nutrition legislation decisions?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 
2. Who were the key actors in the Congress at this time?
   a. Who were the most influential?
   b. Why?
3. What were the main issues at this time?
   a. Where/from whom did bills originate that had nutrition provisions?
4. What was the general attitude toward nutrition legislation?
   a. Was there a partisan position on nutrition policy?
5. What individuals & interest groups worked to influence nutrition legislation?
   a. Support
   b. Opposed

6. To what extent did each of these groups & individuals influence legislation?
   great deal moderate little
   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
   e.
   f.

7. How have interest groups interacted in policy making? (specific to each group)
   a. Testified at hearings
   b. Provided informative reports related to legislation
   c. Suggested repercussions
   d. Used resources to influence legislation
   e. Grass roots constituency campaign
   f. Organization contact with political leaders
   g. Other means

8. Are there any other groups who sought to influence?
   a. What was their position?
   b. What resources did they use?

9. Which groups were the most effective in influencing policy?
   Why?

10. In your opinion, were there any groups who were not represented?
IV. Nutrition Policy Involvement: 1968-1977 — SCN

1. What events led to the establishment of SCN?
   a. Political
   b. Social
   c. Economic
   d. Which events were the most significant? Why?

2. How did jurisdictional responsibility for nutrition change?

3. Did SCN facilitate or hinder nutrition legislation?
   a. How did SCN change the origin of bills?
   b. Did the SCN alter the general attitude toward nutrition legislation?

4. Did SCN affect the major actors interacting on nutrition legislation? If yes, why?
   a. Were different interest groups involved? If yes, who?

5. Did the policy issue change? If yes, why?

6. What were the techniques used to influence policy change?

7. Did the attitude/position of the respective interest groups change on nutrition legislation?

8. What outcome did SCN expect from the release of Dietary Goals?
   a. What has been the response to Dietary Goals? By whom?
   b. What will be the eventual outcome of Dietary Goals?

V. Nutrition Policy Involvement: 1978 to present — Subcommittee on Nutrition

1. Why did SCN become a subcommittee? Why was there not greater support for it to continue?

2. In your opinion will the subcommittee be as effective in nutrition policy making with the representation from the Committee on Labor & Public Welfare?
3. In the year and a half since the Subcommittee was established what, if any, changes have you observed in policy making?

   a. Actors

   b. Hearings since has reporting authority

   c. Partisan trends

   d. Issues considered

4. What influence has the House Agriculture Committee and the House Subcommittee on Nutrition exerted on the Senate Committees' work and nutrition policy making?

   a. To what extent is there interaction between the two Houses?

5. The literature in policy analysis has frequently suggested the notion that policy is made by 'subgovernments', that is, a tripartite alliance of 1) the major interest group(s), 2) the agencies within the bureaucracy that support and collaborate with the group, and 3) the congressional committees that have jurisdiction over and a membership allied with the interests of the interest groups and agencies. In your opinion, to what extent is this true?

   a. To what extent has the subgovernment functioned in the work of:

      1. Senate Agriculture Committee

      2. SCN

      3. Subcommittee on Nutrition

   b. Have the tripartite members remained the same in the past 12 years?
April 30, 1979

Dear

An increased amount of activity has surrounded the area of nutrition policy in the past ten years as a result of the work of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and the current Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition. A review of literature and government documents has revealed that you were one of the active participants during this period. As such, I seek your cooperation in adding to a body of knowledge related to policy analysis.

I am conducting my doctoral research under the direction of Dr. Virginia Vivian, Department of Human Nutrition & Food Management and Dr. Donald Van Meter, Department of Political Science at The Ohio State University. I would like to determine the people and events that have shaped the direction of nutrition policy making since 1967. My purpose is to describe from a historical standpoint the significant actors and events from the perspective of individuals who were actively involved.

I realize you are busy with the demands of your work. I would like to discuss your views on the subject in an interview that I anticipate will take from 30 to 45 minutes. Within the next week, I will be contacting you to set an appointment at your convenience.

We hope you are intrigued with the idea of anonymously adding to this body of knowledge. A copy of the final report of this investigation will be made available to government officials and others who participate as interviewees.

We are enthusiastic about this study and solicit your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Donna Porter
Graduate Student
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) a study entitled Nutrition Policy Making in the United States Congress

Donna Porter

(Investigator/Project Director or his/her authorized representative)

has explained the purpose of the study and procedures to be followed. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential and anonymous unless I specifically agree otherwise.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I have signed it freely and voluntarily and understand a copy is available upon request.

Date: ___________________________ Signed: ______________________

(Participant)

(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)
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Individuals Interviewed
(Alphabetical Order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Bode</td>
<td>Children's Foundation</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bray</td>
<td>DHEW-Office of Nutrition Coordinator</td>
<td>Nutrition Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Brown</td>
<td>Food and Nutrition Board NAS/NRC</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Choate</td>
<td>Robert Choate and Assoc.</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Crapa</td>
<td>House Subcommittee on Nutrition</td>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audry Cross</td>
<td>USDA-Office of Secretary</td>
<td>Nutrition Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Denlinger</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Agriculture</td>
<td>Chief Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Forbes</td>
<td>FDA-Bureau of Foods</td>
<td>Director of Nutrition &amp; Consumer Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Haas</td>
<td>Community Nutrition Institute</td>
<td>Director-Consumer Affairs Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hegsted</td>
<td>USDA-Human Nutrition Center</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hitt</td>
<td>Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition</td>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jacobson</td>
<td>Center for Science in the Public Interest</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Kotz</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Freelance Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kramer</td>
<td>House Agriculture Committee</td>
<td>Special Asst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Leonard</td>
<td>Exec.Office of Pres.-Office of Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luise Light</td>
<td>USDA-Human Nutrition Center</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Matz</td>
<td>Senate Subcommittee on Nutrition</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen McNutt</td>
<td>National Nutrition Consortium</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenora Morangue</td>
<td>DHEW–Office of the Coordinator</td>
<td>Deputy Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Mottern</td>
<td>General Accounting Office</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Omenn</td>
<td>Office of Science &amp; Technology Policy</td>
<td>Associate Director of Human Resources and Social and Economic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Ostenso</td>
<td>House Science &amp; Technology Committee</td>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Rabin</td>
<td>Exec. Office of Pres.—Ofc. of Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>General Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Rose</td>
<td>Senate Agriculture Committee</td>
<td>General Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Schlossberg</td>
<td>Schlossberg–Cassiday &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Seltzer</td>
<td>Exec. Office of Pres. — Ofc. of Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Wenger</td>
<td>Senate Subcom. on Health</td>
<td>Prof. Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wheat</td>
<td>Senator Dole's office</td>
<td>Personal Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Woods</td>
<td>Senator Bellmon's office</td>
<td>Personal Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reactions to the Dietary Goals Document: Listed According to Opinion Expressed in Comments

**Support Document:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banta</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankenhorn</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celender</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeShay</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotta</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegsted</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iber</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaqua</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannel</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neufeld</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizel</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrander</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scamu</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schonfeld</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shira</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shattery</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephensen</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toma</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winikoff</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualified Support:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biorck</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burness</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahill</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBakey</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwyer</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrickson</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gioletti</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyden</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kretchner</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lashof</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMichael</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riser</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simopoulos</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamler</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowell</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilversmit</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Opinion:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ederer</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineman</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finney</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNutt</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monier</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterkin</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollitt</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenfeld</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Itallie</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Soest</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oppose Document:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMA (134)</th>
<th>International Sugar Research Fdn. (134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahrens (135)</td>
<td>Ingelfinger (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergholt (75)</td>
<td>Jacobs (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookey (135)</td>
<td>Jarvis (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramlett (75)</td>
<td>Jukes (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderoni (75)</td>
<td>Kaunitz (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canham (90)</td>
<td>Kretchevsky (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corday (134)</td>
<td>Kummonerow (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (90)</td>
<td>Larson (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper (95)</td>
<td>Leveille (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dsyma (90)</td>
<td>Loomis (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubose (135)</td>
<td>Magee (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enloe (93)</td>
<td>Mann (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans (93)</td>
<td>Marrow (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harman (134)</td>
<td>Marshall (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartley (93)</td>
<td>Meiselma (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper (49)</td>
<td>Mendeloff (135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecht (135)</td>
<td>National Dairy Council (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilt (75)</td>
<td>National Cannass Assoc. (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olsen (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oster (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pellett (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pritchard (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Institute (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schmidt (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shuler (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speckman (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spritz (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stroud (135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stunkard (135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stare (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Werblow (75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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