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This commentary addresses a little explored aspect of prevention, namely, how public health practitioners conceptualize the roles of industries whose business interests may be at odds with physical activity and eating nutrient-rich foods. Taking their cues from successful campaigns in tobacco control, many public health advocates have framed obesity as a battle with the food industry. Such framing presents problems when it exacerbates existing tensions between practitioners in nutrition and physical activity, and alienates potential fitness industry partners. Creating healthy environments requires reframing expectations of all industries that influence physical activity and inactivity. A broader view of the influence of corporate practices on physical and social environments will help both physical activity and nutrition advocates identify what they can do together, and in partnership with the business sector, to create environments that promote activity and nutritious eating.
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Introduction

Good nutrition and regular physical activity are both necessary for preventing chronic disease. Policy analysts have proposed that the public health campaign to control tobacco can inform efforts to prevent chronic disease (Davey, 2004, Dorfman et al., 2005, Mercer et al., 2003). One aspect of this perspective frames the battle against obesity as public health versus the food industry (Kersh and Morone, 2002, Mello et al., 2003). Such framing presents problems when it: 1) exacerbates existing tensions between nutrition and physical activity; 2) reinforces individually-focused, rather than environmentally-focused, prevention approaches; 3) casts private industry culpability too narrowly; and (4) alienates potential fitness industry partners that may be reluctant to be associated with controversy. A more comprehensive view of the influence of corporate practices on physical and social environments will help both physical activity and nutrition advocates identify what they can do together, and in partnership with business, to create environments that support activity and nutritious eating.

Tensions exist between nutrition and physical activity

There is an historical imbalance in public health toward nutrition and away from physical activity. While nutrition has been part of the public health infrastructure since its inception in the mid-1800s (Yancey et al., 2007), exercise science is a newcomer. Physical activity promotion did not explicitly appear among the core functions of public health until 1993, and few schools of public health or local health departments have physical activity programs (Novick, 2001). The California Department of Health Services, for example, only recently increased the number of positions available to address physical activity among more than 36 million residents. Consequently, attention to physical activity has often been assigned by default to nutrition staff who may have little interest or training in the subject. Additionally, the cultures of nutrition and exercise science sometimes clash. Disinterest in competitive sports may be normative among nutrition professionals, mostly women. Desire for nutrient-rich foods is not uncommon in activity promotion circles populated mostly by male former athletes. For example, an ESPN radio ad bragged, “We're the prime rib on a dial full of tofu!” (2006). Especially in tight economic times, nutrition staff in public health departments and community organizations may view physical activity promotion as competition for scarce resources.

Food industry tactics can exacerbate tensions between nutrition and physical activity

Many food companies have responded to attacks on their marketing by publicizing their efforts to promote physical activity (Berkeley Media Studies Group, 2007). Companies like McDonalds highlight physical activity by featuring snowboarding or beach volleyball in advertisements for hamburgers and French fries. This, in turn, has created a competitive backlash by some public health nutrition advocacy groups, which argue that healthy eating is more important than physical...
activity in stemming obesity (Public Health Institute, 2004). Adopting
tobacco control tactics that demonize the food industry, some nutrition
groups discount food industry physical activity promotion efforts as
disingenuous public relations ploys designed to avoid scrutiny and
regulation or taxation (Rigby et al., 2004).

Taking the opposite view, physical activity proponents, already a
minority in public health circles and hungry for resources, are likely to
welcome any effort to promote physical activity, despite the public
relations benefits disproportionate to corporate investment that are
assailed by some nutrition advocates. These opposing viewpoints of
food industry behavior can exacerbate pre-existing tension between
the fields of nutrition and physical activity.

Food industry’s physical activity promotions reinforce the least
effective approaches to prevention

Food industry support for physical activity is focused at the
individual level (Mayer, 2005), as opposed to the policy or environ-
mental level which would be more effective and sustainable. Food
industry campaigns do this by making modest contributions to local
physical activity programs and by over-emphasizing the contribution
of physical activity to obesity and chronic disease in ways that
reinforce individualized versions of disease etiology.

Overall, company spokespeople do this by talking about “choice”
and “balance.” The emphasis on choice both absolves companies of
responsibility for the accessibility of those choices and reinforces the
inherently American belief that individuals are solely responsible for
and in control of their own health, obfuscating the context in which
the choices are made. Food companies’ promotion of physical activity
in their marketing, sponsorships, and philanthropy focuses on
individual behavior rather than changing environments. Typical are
playground equipment purchases and public education campaigns
encouraging active recreation and admonishing families to make
good choices without regard to the physical and social circumstances
that limit those choices. The emphasis on such individualized
approaches is further complicated by the fact that the communities
most at risk have the fewest opportunities for physical activity
(Powell et al. 2009).

Many industries are implicated in chronic disease etiology

The focus on the food industry is the reasonable consequence of
embracing lessons from tobacco control and of chronic disease
prevention’s roots in nutrition. However, if public health advocates
stop there, they will miss the larger picture of how environments are
shaped to either promote or compromise health. Many other
corporate interests have contributed to the escalation of chronic
disease, such as those promoting automobile-centered transportation
(e.g., highway construction companies; oil, tire, and automobile
manufacturers and retailers) and sedentary entertainment (television
and film industries, video game manufacturers, video/DVD rental
companies, and spectator sports). Yet little attention to date has been
paid to scrutinizing or implicating these industries.

These companies may, like their food industry counterparts, also
contribute to chronic disease disparities. Vancey et al. (2009) found
that lower income black and Latino communities besieged by
outdoor sugary beverage and nutrient-poor fast food advertising
are also beset by television, film and automobile ads. Narrowly
focusing on the food industry may truncate investigation into the
potential policy approaches for ameliorating harmful health effects of
other industries.

A 2005 Institute of Medicine invitation to an industry roundtable
on childhood obesity shows how few inroads public health
advocates have made in drawing attention to sedentary behavior-
promoting industries’ culpability. These companies were not among
the food, beverage, restaurant, leisure, recreation, and entertainment
industries represented, in stark contrast to the high profile of soda
manufacturers and fast food retailers who promoted their product
reformulations to cut calories, fat, and portion sizes. The only physical activity-related industries in attendance were sports
apparel manufacturing and physical videogaming (Institute of Medicine, 2006).

Private industry can support environmental changes that would
increase physical activity at the population level. But large-scale
expansion of locations to engage in physical activity such as bike
lanes, parks, and playgrounds will require substantial public funding.
Food companies spent more than $23 million lobbying in 2008 and
their marketing budgets are in the billions (Center for Responsive
Politics, 2008). Advocates could reconsider their criticism of the food
industry, for example, if companies stopped their harmful marketing
practices and used their heft in Washington DC to encourage broad
scale environmentally-focused physical activity promotion such as
supporting public transit, physical education and structural integra-
tion of physical activity into workplace routines (Besser and
Dannenberg, 2005; Yancey et al., 2007).

Conclusion: reframe industry relationships to physical activity
and public health

Creating healthy environments requires participation from all
sectors of society, including private industry. Reframing attitudes
toward and expectations of all the industries that influence physical
activity will take time and require multiple leverage points.
Furthermore, the profits of sports and fitness industries, unlike
food, will likely increase with population activity participation. A
broader conceptualization of the role of industry could foster
prevention efforts that would address both nutrition and physical
activity. Public health advocates should work to expose the harmful
practices of all industries and to direct the contributions of
corporations endeavoring to be “part of the solution” in ways that
benefit the broadest population.
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