**Abstract**

This document opens with a statement from President Nixon's Health Message to Congress on February 15, 1971, acknowledgements, a letter of transmittal, the charge to the committee and activities of the committee. The report itself consists of information on the changing needs for health education, purposes and challenges of health education, and two sections of findings and recommendations—those concerned with national activities in support of health education, and those regarding a proposed National Center for Health Education. Supplementary statements of support and dissent, listings of the states represented at regional hearings, planning councils for regional hearings, neighborhood health center directors who attended special meetings on December 687, 1971, governmental agencies represented at subcommittee discussions of their possible role in health education, organizations which responded to questionnaires, governmental agencies which responded to the chairman's request for information, and persons who gave testimony at regional hearings are appended. (KP)
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In the final analysis, each individual bears the major responsibility for his own health. Unfortunately, too many of us fail to meet that responsibility. Too many Americans eat too much, drink too much, work too hard and exercise too little. Too many are careless drivers.

These are personal questions, to be sure; but they are also public questions. For the whole society has a stake in the health of the individual. Ultimately, everyone shares in the cost of his illnesses or accidents. Through tax payments and through insurance premiums, the careful subsidize the careless; the non-smokers subsidize those who smoke; the physically fit subsidize the rundown and the overweight; the knowledgeable subsidize the ignorant and the vulnerable.

It is in the interest of our entire country to educate and encourage each of our citizens to adopt healthier practices. Yet we have given remarkably little attention to the health education of our people.

Most of our current efforts in this area are haphazard—a public service advertisement, a magazine article, another, a short lecture now and then. There is no national instrument, no computerized system to educate and coordinate a comprehensive health education program.

Richard N. Nixon

Health message to the Congress
February 15, 1971
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Dedication

TO JOSEPH C. WILSON

When I was asked to undertake the chairmanship of the Committee following the untimely death of Joseph C. Wilson, I was aware that while this truly remarkable and dedicated man could be substituted for, he could never be replaced.

I can only hope that in preparing this report, we have been as dispassionate in our findings and as compassionate in our conclusions as he would have wanted.

R. Heath Larry
Chairman

In Memoriam

To set high goals
To have almost unattainable aspirations
To imbue people with the belief that they can be achieved
These are as important as the balance sheet
Perhaps more so

Joseph C. Wilson
1909-1971
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Letter Of Transmittal

Dear Mr. President:

Your Committee on Health Education has completed the assignment you gave it September 14, 1971. On behalf of the Committee, I thank you for making it possible for those of us on the Committee to discover for ourselves—and hopefully, through this report, for the benefit of the nation—how deplorably this country is neglecting a vast opportunity to help people help themselves to have better health.

The recent and continuing debate over national health insurance has uncovered a great deal of concern about the delivery and financing of health care. That concern is felt by the public as well as by government and private institutions both inside and outside of the health field.

However, after more than a year of intensive study and research, we are convinced that results of any changes or improvements in the delivery and financing of health care will be virtually nullified unless there is, at the same time, an improvement in health education—which means not just supplying information about health to people, but motivating them to accept the information and put it to work in their daily lives.

Unfortunately, the important, and often crucial role the individual can play in maintaining his own health has rarely been clearly explained or adequately dramatized.

Our findings regarding the ignorance or apathy—or both—of American institutions and organizations, indeed, the public at large, toward health education are chronicled in the body of our report. A few of the major findings can, however, be summarized in a few paragraphs:

—While the need and demand for health care services have been rising, health education has been neglected. Many, perhaps most major causes of sickness and death can be affected—and some prevented—by individual behavior, yet the whole field of health education is fragmented, uneven in effectiveness and lacks any base of operations. No agency inside or outside of government is either responsible for, or even assists in setting goals, maintaining criteria of performance or measuring results.

—School health education in most primary and secondary schools is either not provided at all or is tacked onto other subject matter such as physical education or biology, assigned to teachers whose main interests and qualifications lie elsewhere.

—in many states, legislation actually impedes the implementation of effective school health programs. Some states have laws so restrictive as to make it impossible even to teach the most basic information.

—The U.S. Office of Education (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) report prepared for the Committee, could not find any program of research or evaluation it is supporting in the area of school health education.

—What is taught to children is not made meaningful by the teachers to stay with them. Nutrition studies show that especially girls—often damage their health through poor eating habits. Other studies show that youngsters who once used to smoke have themselves become cigarette smokers.

—For all age groups, health education has been too often stereotyped. Its programs have not been—buttered to reflect the cultural mores of each group or situation being approached. There is vital need for innovation in the implementation with new kinds of educational programs.

—The vast majority of people—88 per cent of the American public—survey—look to their physicians or TV commercials for information about health. Yet evidence presented to the Committee indicates that physicians are often too busy to do research and too many TV messages are primarily concerned with consumer promotion rather than with true consumer education.

—Providers of care, such as hospitals, do little to help. Neither voluntary health organizations nor many insurance carriers (private or non-profit) have explored new opportunities.

—Of $75-billion spent last year for medical care—more than $200-million a day—almost $30-billion is spent for treatment after illness occurs. Of this $30-billion, more than half is spent for biomedical research and less than 10 per cent is spent for prevention, and health education share the short end.

—Of $18.2-billion allocated in 1973 for medical care activities of the Department of HEW, only $14-million was allocated for specific programs in health education; $14-million for general programs. That amounts to less than 10 per cent. Of $7.3-billion allocated for health pu
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The Committee on Health Education has completed its work. On behalf of the Committee, I want to thank you for making it possible for those of us to discover for ourselves—and hopefully, for the benefit of the nation—how deplorably we are neglecting a vast opportunity to help people help themselves to better health.

And continuing debate over national health care coverage has created great concern about the quality of health care. That concern is felt by the public, by government and private institutions both inside and outside of the health field.

More than a year of intensive study and conviction that results of any changes or improvements in delivery and financing of health care will be achieved, at the same time, an improvement—which means not just supplying information to people, but motivating them to accept the information and put it to work in their daily lives.

In many states, legislation actually impedes development of effective school health programs. Some state laws regarding what can be taught have not been changed since the late 1800s.

The U.S. Office of Education (Department of HEW), in a report prepared for the Committee, could not cite a single program of research or evaluation it is supporting in the area of school health education.

What is taught to children is not made meaningful enough to stay with them. Nutrition studies show that teenagers—especially girls—often damage their health through poor eating habits. Other studies show that youngsters who once urged their parents not to smoke have themselves become cigarette smokers as teenagers.

For all age groups, health education has generally been stereotyped. Its programs have not been but must be structured to reflect the cultural mores of each population group being approached. There is vital need for innovation and experimentation with new kinds of educational programs.

The vast majority of people—88 per cent in one population survey—look to their physicians or TV commercials for information about health. Yet evidence presented to the Committee indicates that physicians are often too busy to do an effective job, and too many TV messages are primarily concerned with product promotion rather than with true consumer health education. Providers of care, such as hospitals, do little to overcome deficiencies. Neither voluntary health organizations nor insurance carriers (private or non-profit) have exploited fully their opportunities.

Of $75-billion spent last year for medical, hospital and health care—more than $200-million a day—about 92 per cent is spent for treatment after illness occurs. Of the remaining amount, more than half is spent for biomedical research. Prevention of illness and health education share the balance, with health education receiving the short end.

Of $18.2-billion allocated in 1973 for medical and health activities of the Department of HEW, only $30-million is for specific programs in health education; $14-million more for general programs. That amounts to less than one-fourth of one per cent. Of $7.3-billion allocated for health purposes to all other
federal agencies, even a smaller fraction is spent on health education.

—On the state level, health departments spend less than half of one per cent of their budgets for health education.

—A considerable number of employers have become concerned with acute, dramatic, work-related problems such as alcohol and drug abuse. But business, industry and labor are not significantly involved in over-all programs that could contribute to sound off-job safety and health practices that could also benefit on-job attendance and productivity.

As you will see in the report, it is evident from our inquiry that the needs, problems and opportunities in health education are so large, so urgent and so complex that progress will depend upon a major long-term commitment to it by the nation’s leaders.

It is equally evident that the responsibility, the challenge and the burden of providing for the widespread need, solving the problems and meeting the opportunities must be shared by all concerned and capable parties in both the public and private sectors of society.

To bring public and private efforts together, and to provide a focal point for the nation’s multiple health education activities, the Committee has recommended establishment of a “National Center for Health Education” to be authorized by the Congress and sustained by both public and private support.

In addition, we have developed a list of additional recommendations—for governmental and private activities—to develop, strengthen, unify and evaluate health education in this nation. Details will be found in the four sections of the report:

1. “Changing Needs for Health Education,” describing changes in health problems and the methods of health care in the last few decades and pointing out their implications for health education.

2. “Purposes and Challenges of Health Education,” showing what health education is and what it can hope to do.


4. “National Center for Health Education” establishment of a central organization to coordinate effective programs in health education.

It is important to note that while in the education, we have tried to stress throughout the report the substantial improvement in the health of a major factor outside of the medical structure. Certainly there is a need to work with the care delivery system to assure that every person who enters the system gets the highest extent possible. But at the same time, we recognize that good health also is affected by opportunities for good jobs, a reduction in job-related poverty, more adequate housing, education and an upgrading of the physical environment.

I particularly appreciate the degree to which the Committee’s deliberation was separated from the Committee’s deliberation—a separ- ated ground of experience—which led almost to distinct views concerning what should be done. As is inevitable, some view with less emphasis than some members. Hence, this document may share some of which so often must characterize the process. Nevertheless, we are hopeful that what we have done as our consensus—will contribute emphasis upon health education—upon the report. As a final thought, on my behalf, I want special appreciation to the agencies, organizations whose executives, staff or faculty we support to serve on the Committee. The Committee member, and the time each gave to the Committee, are the ultimate assets that made this report possible. Notwithstanding each member’s views concerning what should be done, the process of the report. As is inevitable, some view with less emphasis than some members. Hence, this document may share some of which so often must characterize the process. Nevertheless, we are hopeful that what we have done as our consensus—will contribute emphasis upon health education—upon the report. As a final thought, on my behalf, I want special appreciation to the agencies, organizations whose executives, staff or faculty we support to serve on the Committee. The Committee member, and the time each gave to the Committee, are the ultimate assets that made this report possible.
ancies, even a smaller fraction is spent on health

the state level, health departments spend less than

per cent of their budgets for health education.

considerable number of employers have become con-

nute, dramatic, work-related problems such as

ug abuse. But business, industry and labor are

y involved in over-all programs that could con-

ound off-job safety and health practices that could

on-job attendance and productivity.

will see in the report, it is evident from our inquiry

eds, problems and opportunities in health education

so urgent and so complex that progress will depend

long-term commitment to it by the nation's leaders.

ually evident that the responsibility, the challenge

den of providing for the widespread need, solving the

meeting the opportunities must be shared by all

and capable parties in both the public and private

ociety.

public and private efforts together, and to provide

it for the nation's multiple health education activities, it

recommend establishment of a "National

Education" to be authorized by the Congress

ed by both public and private support.

ion, we have developed a list of additional recom-

-for governmental and private activities -to develop,

ity and evaluate health education in this nation.

be found in the four sections of the report:

anging Needs for Health Education," describing

health problems and the methods of health care in

decades and pointing out their implications for

poses and Challenges of Health Education," show-

health education is and what it can hope to do.

ional Activities in Support of Health Education,"

telling how virtually every element of society can play a role in

making health education a reality.

4. "National Center for Health Education," proposing the

establishment of a central organization to stimulate and coordi-
nate effective programs in health education.

It is important to note that while our subject is health

education, we have tried to stress throughout the report that

stabilization in the health of Americans depends on

any factors outside of the medical structure as well as on those

side it. Certainly there is a need to work with the whole health

care delivery system to assure that every person has access to

and that every person who enters the system benefits from it

to the highest extent possible. But at the same time we must

recognize that good health also is affected by broader oppor-
tunities for good jobs, a reduction in joblessness and its con-

sequent poverty, more adequate housing, a higher level of

education and an upgrading of the physical environment.

I particularly appreciate the degree to which consensus

became possible— notwithstanding that each individual brought

to the Committee's deliberation a separate and distinct back-
ground of experience—which led almost to as many separate

and distinct views concerning what should become the major empha-
sis of the report. As is inevitable, some viewpoints are expressed

with less emphasis than some members would feel appropriate.

Hence, this document may share some of the shortcomings

which so often must characterize the product of committees.

Nevertheless, we are hopeful that what has emerged—for the

most part as our consensus—will contribute to the ongoing

emphasis upon health education—upon the importance of

which we are totally unanimous.

As a final thought, on my behalf, I would like to express my

special appreciation to the agencies, organizations and institu-
tions whose executives, staff or faculty were given the time and

support to serve on the Committee. The dedication of each

Committee member, and the time each gave to the work of the

Committee, are the ultimate assets that made this report possible.

Sincerely yours,
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Charge to The Committee

1. TO DESCRIBE the "state of the art" in health education of the public in the United States today by means of broad-sweep inquiries that would—
   (a) Identify the principal areas of activity; the institutions, agencies, programs involved; the characteristics of programs and on-going activities; the interrelationships and interdependencies of the activities; and
   (b) Assess effectiveness and levels of participation in terms of the principal component function of health education of the public, with particular reference to behavioral change and community action.

2. TO DEFINE the nation's need for health education programs, and their basic characteristics, in terms of major groupings of health consumers, including the well and the non-well; mothers, children, and youths; the working population; residents of the inner cities and rural areas; the aged and the disabled.

3. TO ESTABLISH goals, priorities, and immediate and long-range objectives of a comprehensive, nation-wide effort to raise the level of "health consumer citizenship."

4. TO PROPOSE the most appropriate scope, function, structure, organization, and financing of such an effort, possibly in the form of a "National Health Education Foundation," giving particular attention to constructive activities now performed by private, professional, and governmental groups.

5. TO DEVELOP a plan for the implementation of its recommendations.

The Scope of Health Education of the Public

The term "health education of the public"—consumer health education—embraces those processes of communication and education which help each individual to learn how to achieve and maintain a reasonable level of health appropriate to his particular needs and interests, and to be motivated to follow personal and community health's practices with his state of health and well-being—a positive beyond the mere absence of disease or infirmity.

The Health Consumer Education which is asked to facilitate for the nation is a process dynamically involve the entire citizenry, and toward individual and community action. This is on the whole person in his natural community hydrocalm to individual's needs and responsibilities...

First, to know himself, and to shape his life his personal options for living fully.

Second, to utilize health resources and s environmental support, with optimal efficiency.

Third, to participate constructively in community environmental planning, in priority-setting, the system making.

Consequently, the deliberation of this encompass the full range of elements which concept of health consumer citizenship. The inquiries would probe into such factors as disease accident prevention..., the health care in maintenance organizations, and other health systems..., public health, and environmental health ecological consideration..., exercise, diet, rehabilitation..., mental health..., educational aspects of health services in some...facilities, in industries, and on farms—and their with other community health activities..., and career development of health personnel, for health consumer education services and with delivery of health care..., techniques including the mass media, electronics and audio-visual health museums..., research and development in behavioral fields, technology, and community...
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A plan for the implementation of its recom-

Health Education of the Public

health education of the public"—consumer health—facilitates those processes of communication and

help each individual to learn how to achieve reasonable level of health appropriate to his personal and community health practices which contribute to his state of health and well-being—a positive concept going well beyond the mere absence of disease or infirmity.

The Health Consumer Education which this committee is asked to facilitate for the nation is a process which could dynamically involve the entire citizenry, and should be oriented toward individual and community action. The focus should be on the whole person in his natural community, and on the individual’s needs and responsibilities...

First, to know himself; and to shape his life style to maximize his personal options for living fully.

Second, to utilize health resources and services and environmental support, with optimal efficiency and economy.

Third, to participate constructively in community health and environmental planning, in priority-setting, and in decision-making.

Consequently, the deliberation of this committee should encompass the full range of elements which go into this broad concept of health consumer citizenship. The committee's inquiries would probe into such factors as disease, disability, and accident prevention... the health care in hospitals, health maintenance organizations, and other health facilities and systems... public health, and environmental health, and human ecological consideration... exercise, diet and nutrition... rehabilitation... mental health... educational programs and educational aspects of health services in schools, in day-care facilities, in industries, and on farms—and their interrelationships with other community health activities... recruiting, training, and career development of health personnel, both those needed for health consumer education services and those concerned with delivery of health care... techniques of communication, including the mass media, electronics and audio-visual systems, health museums... research and development in social and behavioral fields, technology, and community organization.
Activities of the Committee

To do its job, the Committee:

1. Held eight public hearings in major cities, at which 71 hours of testimony were taken from almost 300 persons from 47 states and Puerto Rico. Witnesses represented groups and organizations in both the private and public sectors that were doing effective health education work, or who had knowledge of the region's health education needs.

2. Met with directors of 22 neighborhood health centers from various parts of the country to learn what they had found out about health education through their work with low-income families and individuals.

3. Asked 600 producers of health education materials and programs to list on a questionnaire their most effective programs as well as their greatest disappointments; plus their view of priorities in health education.

4. Appointed special subcommittees to work directly with business and labor groups, prepaid plans and private insurance companies, professional associations, voluntary health agencies, philanthropic foundations, school health agencies, government and mass media.

5. Commissioned papers from authorities on such subjects as motivation and behavior; school health; educational opportunities in group practice units; health education programs in hospitals; and cost effectiveness of health education programs in industry.

6. Met with 27 federal agencies to determine the potential health education role of government as a major.

7. Examined the experience of the British Foundation and met with representatives of various countries through the World Health Organization to determine what they were doing that would benefit this study.

8. Convened special conferences of experts on school health education, motivation and behavior; school health; educational opportunities in group practice units; health education programs in hospitals; and cost effectiveness of health education programs in industry.

9. Solicited and received written statements from scores of informed individuals and organizations which would assist the work.

10. Distributed more than 15,000 copies of the report describing the mission of the Committee and knowledge which would assist the work.

11. Through the auspices of the National Committee, met with the approximately 600 members of the American Medical Association, American Public Health Association, American Nurses Association, etc., describing the work of the Committee and seeking information which would be useful to it in its work.

12. Committee members and staff met with a variety of professional organizations and societies, and with representatives of various countries through the World Health Organization, to discuss key issues in health education.
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3. Kept 600 producers of health education materials and to list on a questionnaire their most effective programs their greatest disappointments; plus their view of health education.

4. Pointed special subcommittees to work directly with labor groups, prepayment plans and private insurpanies, professional associations, voluntary health philantrropic foundations, school health agencies, nt and mass media.

5. Commissioned papers from authorities on such subjects ion and behavior; school health; educational oppor-group practice units; health education programs in and cost effectiveness of health education programs.

6. Convened special conferences of experts in such fields health education role of government as a major employer.

7. Examined the experience of the British Health Education Foundation and met with representatives of more than 20 countries through the World Health Organization to find out what they were doing that would benefit this study.

8. Convened special conferences of experts in such fields as school health education, motivation and behavior, and mass media to discuss key issues in health education.

9. Solicited and received written statements and reports from scores of informed individuals and organizations setting forth their views of health education problems and priorities.

10. Distributed more than 15,000 copies of a brochure describing the mission of the Committee and soliciting information and knowledge which would assist the Committee in its work.

11. Through the auspices of the National Health Council which devoted its 1972 National Health Forum to the work of the Committee, met with the approximately 600 participants over two days to explore their points of view as to directions the Committee should take in its work.

12. Committee members and staff met and spoke to a variety of professional organizations and societies, among them the American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American Public Health Association, American Hospital Association, etc., describing the work of the Committee and soliciting information which would be useful to it in its deliberations.
Section I
Changing Needs for Health Education

Until fairly recent times, mankind's most threatening foes were famine and contagion. The first killed millions by starvation; the second by infection. Only since the middle of the 19th century has man been able to fight with reasonable success against those natural enemies. And even in the enlightened last century, the fight has been really successful only in the industrially advanced nations of the world.

While economic and agricultural progress have eradicated famine in most lands, public health physicians have played a major role in controlling infectious diseases by discovering the benefits of purifying water, disposing of sewage, keeping food clean and providing plumbing and sanitation.

Largely because of the reduction in infectious diseases, the average life expectancy of Americans has risen from 47 to 70 years since 1900, while the death rate has been more than cut in half.

Epidemics in the United States once featured such diseases as cholera and smallpox, tuberculosis and influenza, ill-defined fevers and gastro-intestinal disorders. Many children died of scarlet fever, diphtheria and other childhood diseases. Patients by the hundreds languished in hospitals for long periods, for medicine could neither cure the individual nor prevent the epidemics.

Today, communicable disease has almost disappeared from the list of the most common causes of death. In its place, physicians and health educators are faced with new antagonists: diseases caused not by famine or contagion, but by aging, by our sedentary way of life, by nutritional excesses and dietary fads, by urbanization, by changes in the physical environment and by a mobile population whose movements have reduced traditional ties to the community and have compromised the traditional personal acquaintance between patient and physician.

The very success of public health and medical advances, by increasing the life-span, has compounded the problems of chronic and degenerative diseases that are associated with aging. Those diseases now cause more than deaths in the country and as more Americans problem will grow.

In addition, during the last half-century changed from a rural to a predominantly urban society. More than 70 per cent of all Americans now live in cities or urban areas, and 80 per cent of us live on little more than 40 per cent of the land.

Population density poses many problems for action and health care. It imposes new tasks, duties and strains on all of the resources of public agencies.

As cities grow, complexities in the health system present new problems. Moreover, the complexities tend to penalize the economically underprivileged and the aged.

The needs of ethnic and minority groups for equal and cheaper access to the total health care system are also a challenge. The dual challenge of (1) educating people to follow desirable personal health practices and (2) making health information available to them. Moreover, the complexities tend to penalize the economically underprivileged and the aged.

The needs of ethnic and minority groups for equal and cheaper access to the total health care system are also a challenge. The dual challenge of (1) educating people to follow desirable personal health practices and (2) making health information available to them. Moreover, the complexities tend to penalize the economically underprivileged and the aged.

Health information is dispensed today by government and private agencies. But there is little coordination of efforts or evaluation of results. No one agency knows what all of the others are doing, making it impossible to look at results and tell which approach is successful.

Approximately $75-billion is spent each year in the United States on health care. Four and a half million persons—professionals and support personnel—work in the field, making health care the largest single industry in terms of manpower. Health care services are available in tens of thousands of locations. Yet with all these resources and all the efforts of all the people involved, the...
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Recent times, mankind's most threatening foes have been famine and contagion. The first killed millions by starvation and the second by infection. Only since the middle of the 19th century have we been able to fight with reasonable success these natural enemies. And even in the enlightened last half of the 19th century has been really successful only in the industrialized nations of the world.

Economic and agricultural progress have eradicated famine and lands, public health physicians have played a controlling role in infectious diseases by discovering the source of water, disposing of sewage, keeping food and living plumbing and sanitation.

As a result of this reduction in infectious diseases, the expectancy of Americans has risen from 47 to 70 years, while the death rate has been more than cut in the United States once featured such diseases as smallpox, tuberculosis, and influenza, ill-defined gastro-intestinal disorders. Many children died of diphtheria and other childhood diseases. Patients languished in hospitals for long periods, for neither an individual nor prevent the communicable disease has almost disappeared from most common causes of death. In its place, health educators are faced with new antagonists: not by famine or contagion, but by aging, by way of life, by nutritional excesses and dietary zation, by changes in the physical environment of the population whose movements have reduced to the community and have compromised the personal acquaintance between patient and physician.

Health information is dispensed today by many different government and private agencies. But there is little or no coordination of efforts or evaluation of results. No one agency or organization knows what all of the others are doing, and nobody is able to look at results and tell which approach, if any, was successful.

Approximately $75-billion is spent each year on health care. Four and a half million persons—professionals and support personnel—work in the field, making health care the third largest industry in terms of manpower. Health care services are provided in tens of thousands of locations. Yet with all the expenditures and all the efforts of all the people involved, the nation has not
seen the desired and expected gains in over-all health.

Rates of maternal death and infant mortality, while steadily declining, are still high. The continuing disparity between whites and non-whites in sickness and death rates raises questions about both the quality and the equality of treatment and of access to care.

Helping to keep our morbidity and mortality rates stubbornly higher than they should be are such things as the annual death toll of 50,000 or more from automobile accidents. Dental and visual defects that are routinely reported as among the most common health problems among school children continue to plague individuals of all ages. Some heart disease and circulatory problems can be traced to poor eating habits and lack of exercise. Other factors that contribute to medical problems include drug addiction, air pollution, the effects of crowded and substandard housing, emotional disorders and additional conditions that were either absent or less pervasive in rural America of 50 years ago.

Those and other problems result, at least in part, from failure to involve the individual—and society—in health education. The degree to which each person can play an active and sometimes crucial role in his own health maintenance has not been sufficiently stressed or adequately dramatized.

Controlling the controllable problems and preventing the preventable ones have received relatively little concerted attention. The health care system traditionally has been geared to short-term treatment of acute illness. The average American suffers two episodes of acute illness a year, causing him to seek medical attention and/or resulting in one or more days of restricted activity. But more than 70 per cent of visits to physicians are by the half of the American people who have one or more chronic ailments—heart disease, arthritis, mental or nervous conditions or other long-term impairments that are the most common causes of medical care, disability and death.

Many causes of disease and death can at least be influenced, and some prevented altogether, by good health practices by the individual. The fact is, however, that good health practices are not uniformly followed or even considered by persons never think about their health until symptoms propel them to clinics or hospital emergency treatment.

Fortunately, there are continuing efforts to improve and more effective health care systems in the future.

The Committee believes, however, that the future will find—and continues to flounder—in spite of careful attention to questions of personal attitudes toward health.

![ Causes of Death](source: American Heart Association)
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**Causes of Death**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over age 65</th>
<th>Under age 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figures in thousands**

- Heart Attacks: 700,000
- Cancer: 500,000
- Stroke: 400,000
- Accidents: 300,000

**SOURCE:** American Heart Association
Section II
Purposes and Challenges
Of Health Education

Changing personal attitudes requires educating people both individually and collectively—not only in terms of personal habits but, just as importantly, in terms of community-wide health "citizenship." Developing health education programs—where virtually none exist now—in schools, offices, factories and homes; forming active neighborhood groups; involving people in the health care process—all are vital parts of good health citizenship.

Efforts to change health behavior must be seen in the same light as efforts to change any other form of human behavior: resistance to change exists; apathy is remarkably strong. That is evidenced by weaknesses in past programs designed to improve behavior with respect to smoking, exercise, weight reduction, drug abuse, use of intoxicants and use of safety devices. Some success has been achieved, but there is a great deal of room for improvement—in large part because where any of those programs have been at least partially effective, the ingredients of success and/or failure have not been sufficiently researched—and even where they have been, the means for making the results widely known have not seemed to exist.

While health education is not a panacea that will solve all health problems, it is undeniably a fundamental part of any logical attack on the problems.

However, in the past, while demand for health care services has been rising, health education has been neglected. The whole field of health education has been fragmented and largely unevaluated. There is no agency inside or outside of government that is either responsible for, or simply assists in, setting goals or maintaining criteria of performance.

One result has been a health care system overburdened with patients who know too little about themselves and the things they could do to prevent illness.

Basic to further discussion of health education at this time is a definition. People tend to confuse health "information" with health "education."

"Health information" is simply facts. And facts are widely available. A national survey by the Louis Harris organization found that the most common sources of information about health are the person's physician, TV advertising, umns in newspapers, medicine sections in magazines, ads on TV, newspaper and magazine advertising of health organizations and guidance from the family.

"Health education" is a process that bridges between health information and health practices. Motivation motivates the person to take the information and do something with it—to keep himself healthier by avoiding habits that are harmful and by forming habits that are beneficial.

It is a frustrating paradox, given their relative in effecting change, that while health information year by year in volume and in excellence, health education has developed much more slowly.

The public must be made clearly aware of the difference between health information (disseminating facts) and health education (persuading people to change their behavior). They must also be encouraged to accept the fact that education is a longer, costlier, broader, deeper and more complicated process.

The health care delivery system can do a great job in solving health problems. But it cannot do everything. It must meet it at least half way.

It is the individual whose daily living habits about illness. It is the individual who eats too much, rests too little, exercises too little, drives too fast, ignores warning signs that tell him he should seek attention.

Once he seeks care, it is the individual who must cooperate during or after treatment may blunt the greatest of medical skills.

Health habits, attitudes and practices important the ability of any present or future health care sys- its mission. As a 1969 report for the Manpower Administra the Department of Labor put it, the individual's "fail-stand, to act or to act wisely can make a mockery to improve other segments of the health system."
Section II
Purposes and Challenges
Of Health Education

Personal attitudes require educating people both collectively—not only in terms of personal habits prominently, in terms of community-wide health—developing health education programs—where exist now—in schools, offices, factories and active neighborhood groups; involving people in process—all are vital parts of good health.
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Education is not a panacea that will solve all it is undeniably a fundamental part of any the problems.

The past, while demand for health care services a health education has been neglected. The health education has been fragmented and largely re is no agency inside or outside of government possible for, or simply assists in, setting goals criteria of performance.

As been a health care system overburdened with too much about themselves and the things prevent illness.

Her discussion of health education at this time people tend to confuse health “information” with...

“Information” is simply facts. And facts are widely found that the most common sources of information about health are the person's physician, TV advertising, medical columns in newspapers, medicine sections in magazines, medical news on TV, newspaper and magazine advertising, publications of health organizations and guidance from the family.

“Health education” is a process that bridges the gap between health information and health practices. Health education motivates the person to take the information and do something with it—to keep himself healthier by avoiding actions that are harmful and by forming habits that are beneficial.

It is a frustrating paradox, given their relative effectiveness in effecting change, that while health information has grown year by year in volume and in excellence, health education has developed much more slowly.

The public must be made clearly aware of the profound difference between health information (disseminating facts) and health education (persuading people to change their lifestyles). They must also be encouraged to accept the fact that health education is a longer, costlier, broader, deeper and more complicated process.

The health care delivery system can do a great deal to help solve health problems. But it cannot do everything. People must meet it at least half way.

It is the individual whose daily living habits often bring about illness. It is the individual who eats too much, drinks too much, rests too little, exercises too little, drives too fast and ignores warning signs that tell him he should seek medical attention.

Once he seeks care, it is the individual whose lack of cooperation during or after treatment may blunt the impact of even the greatest of medical skills.

Health habits, attitudes and practices importantly influence the ability of any present or future health care system to fulfill its mission. As a 1969 report for the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor put it, the individual’s “failure to understand, to act or to act wisely can make a mockery of attempts to improve other segments of the health system.”
In essence, making a total health care system work means joint acceptance of responsibility by both the providers of health care and the people they hope to serve. If either group fails to live up to its share of the obligation, total benefits to society will be reduced to that degree.

Health education can play a tremendous role in making that total system work, for it can at the same time stimulate and be stimulated by both parties: health care providers and health care consumers.

An important part of the health education effort is the nation’s 25,000 professional health educators—persons with degrees (bachelor’s to doctoral) in either school or community health education. But they cannot do the job alone. Good results will require the cooperation of all facets of government, industry, business, health, education, voluntary health and social agencies and other important elements of society.

Their combined activities must be positive. For many years, it was too often assumed that if people were told what was good for them they would take correct action. Some such activity has worked well, as was the response to the voluntary mass immunization against infantile paralysis. Unfortunately, many more programs did not work. Most people who had access to the information continued to behave in the usual manner in spite of the potential threat to their health.

Consequently, the learner—the person to be educated—can no longer be considered merely a recipient of information. He must become actively involved.

Although the problems are huge and diverse, the opportunities for health education have never been greater. One encouraging factor is the continuing rise in the standard of living and level of education of Americans, although neither means better health or better health education automatically.

Generally speaking, however, the more affluent, the better educated, the more sophisticated and the better informed enjoy better health and get better health care. If a person knows what is good and what is bad for him; if he knows how to protect himself and his family; and if he is in a position to take advantage of the best health care available, his chances of avoiding death or premature death are significantly less. Ignorant, the apathetic, the confused, the alienated or the alienated.

This is not to imply that health education is confined to the latter groups. The benefits of health education and sophistication favorably affect a person who not only knows what is helpful, but does well

With these thoughts in mind, the Co major opportunities in health education lie in the overlapping areas:

1. Habit and Attitude Changes

This area includes such obvious violators as cigarette smoking, faulty diet, lack of exercise, abuse, excessive use of intoxicants and other measures.

They represent a major weakness in the health education efforts. In the face of protracted exhortations, appeals, warnings and even imprisonment, results have not come close to reflecting the time and money spent.

In this area, ways must be found to help themselves. Without question, it is the health education.

Here we see the collision between information. There is every indication that smokers know the dangers of tobacco than people who have never tried it. Information doesn’t make them stop. Many people know more about the problems of obesity than thin people; knowledge does not strengthen their determination. Drug abusers know vastly more about its dangers than those who have never tried it—but they continue to use what they know.

All of those people have knowledge; they need is motivation to change their ways.
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This is not to imply that health education should be
fined to the latter groups. The benefits of affluence, education
and sophistication favorably affect a person's health only if he
only knows what is helpful, but does what is helpful.

With those thoughts in mind, the Committee believes the
major opportunities in health education lie in the following over-
lapping areas:

1. Habit and Attitude Changes

This area includes such obvious violations of medical advice
as cigarette smoking, faulty diet, lack of regular exercise, drug
use, excessive use of intoxicants and indifference to safety
measures.

They represent a major weakness in the nation's past health
education efforts. In the face of programs and campaigns,
exhortations, appeals, warnings and even punitive legislation,
results have not come close to reflecting the amount of money
spent.

In this area, ways must be found to persuade people to
help themselves. Without question, it is the most difficult job of
health education.

Here we see the collision between information and educa-
tion. There is every indication that smokers know more about the
dangers of tobacco than people who don't smoke—but the
information doesn't make them stop. Many fat people know more
about the problems of obesity than thin people—but their knowl-
edge does not strengthen their determination to lose weight.
Drug abusers know vastly more about its deterrents than people
who have never tried it—but they continue their abuse in spite of
what they know.

All of those people have knowledge; information. What they
need is motivation to change their ways.
2. Communicable Disease Control

By contrast, this is one of the more tractable areas of health education. These are measures to protect individuals and communities against microbiological agents of disease; and such actions as water purification, sanitary disposal of human waste, rat control, mosquito control and immunization.

Fortunately, such measures enjoy a high level of acceptability in most areas of the nation. Their lack in some areas is due more to ignorance than to opposition.

These are the measures, in fact, that largely conquered yesterday's communicable diseases, only to see them largely replaced by today's major causes of illness and death which are attributable at least in part to individual behavior.

3. Environmental Protection

Just as the individual bears some responsibility for many of the medical problems that beset him, so society must accept responsibility for pollution of the air and water, fluoridation or lack of it, noise pollution, radiation, pesticide exposure, fabric flammability, hazardous toys and games and vulnerability to diseases through occupations.

A clean, healthy environment does not come easily, nor does it come free. But where collective action has been taken, and where industry and the public at large have been willing to accept their share of the solution and to bear their share of the cost, polluted rivers are getting fresher, uneasy noise is being reduced, goods and materials are being redesigned for safe use and factories are installing smoke-abatement mechanisms.

4. Seeking Medical Help and Following Medical Advice

To maintain reasonably good health, all persons should be informed about the early signs of serious disease, and about action to take when they occur or persist. This requires initiatives by physicians and other elements of the health care system.

As important as knowing when to seek medical help is knowing how to manage certain diseases that require special regimens. Such management includes the frequency with which
Disease Control

This is one of the more tractable areas of health are measures to protect individuals and combat microbiological agents of disease; and such purification, sanitary disposal of human waste, mosquito control and immunization.

Such measures enjoy a high level of acceptability of the nation. Their lack in some areas is due more than to opposition.

The measures, in fact, that largely conquered communicable diseases, only to see them largely day's major causes of illness and death which at least in part to individual behavior.

Protection

Individual bears some responsibility for many of the problems that beset him, so society must accept or pollution of the air and water, fluoridation or pollution, radiation, pesticide exposure, fabric hazardous toys and games and vulnerability to disoccupations.

Healthy environment does not come easily, nor free. But where collective action has been taken, thusly and the public at large have both been pt their share of the solution and to bear their st, polluted rivers are getting fresher, undue noise ed, goods and materials are being redesigned and factories are installing smoke-abatement.

Help and Following Medical Advice

In reasonably good health, all persons should be the early signs of serious disease, and about when they occur or persist. This requires initiations and other elements of the health care system.

As knowing when to seek medical help is to manage certain diseases that require special management includes the frequency with which

Three Major Coronary Risk Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOLESTROL LEVELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMOKING HABITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Smoked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: National Heart and Lung Institute
medications are taken, rules about diet and/or exercise and the whole problem of the patient's social and emotional adaptation to his condition. For example, a patient's personal management of such chronic conditions as diabetes, hypertension, asthma, etc., is of crucial importance to recovery or livable maintenance.

A well-motivated and educated patient, equipped to help in the solution of his own medical and psychological problems, will most likely not become a delinquent—and more seriously ill—patient.

5. Education Through Planning and Participation

The final element in a multi-level approach is the need to encourage and support the planning and development of health facilities—and health education programs—with the active participation of people who will be their ultimate users. Such participation is perhaps the most effective way for people to learn. Low-income families who have helped to plan neighborhood health centers, for example, have not only become more knowledgeable themselves, but have proved adept at getting good health information to their neighbors.

* * *

In addition to approaching those areas, it is also important that health education be custom-designed to reach special audiences with special messages.

There are large groups which have unique needs in health education which differ from the normal needs of the general public.

1. Low-Income Families

The ill health of the poor requires widespread relief. Too many do not know how to care for themselves, or do not have the wherewithal, even if they have the knowledge. Some do not always know the benefits to which they are entitled now, such as Medicaid or clinical prenatal care for pregnancy. A significant number do not know how to deal with the complexities of clinics, outpatient departments, hospitals and physician specialists.

The community has an obligation to teach them how to get the care they need, as well as how to avoid often.

Many of their health problems, of course, outside their control and outside the range of housing, bad sanitation, poor nutrition, poverty, lack of employment, etc.

Their problems are social as well as health solutions lie in all of society as well as in the health care field.

With all of those factors at work, the problems caused by malnutrition; they have infant mortality; they experience a higher rate of emotional, nervous and mental disorders; and many more accidents involving burns or poorly designed bad housing and overcrowded and unsanitary conditions contribute to greater incidence of rheumatic fever, disease, common respiratory diseases and as middle-ear infection and meningitis.

Poverty might be likened to a hereditary condition among children of the poor die earlier and in greater numbers, more easily to childhood ailments; and not permanently incapacitated for school or employment, to the pool of poverty and unemployment price not only from its victims, but from all of society.

2. Mothers

Mothers are a primary audience for education because from pregnancy through her child's youth a mother's knowledge and attitude about health influence on the physical well-being of her offspring.

Her roles as manager, nurse and dietitian influence the family's health patterns more than any other factors.

However, even with the best of intentions and a solicitous attitude toward the welfare of her children, a mother's lack of basic knowledge, especially in dietary matters—may have consequences injurious to her family.
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final element in a multi-level approach is the need to support and plan the planning and development of health and health education programs—with the active participation of people who will be their ultimate users. Such participation is perhaps the most effective way for people to plan neighborhood health centers, for example, have not only become more knowledgeable about themselves, but have proved adept at getting health information to their neighbors.

In addition to approaching those areas, it is also important that education be custom-designed to reach special audiences with special messages.

There are large groups which have unique needs in health which differ from the normal needs of the general population. These groups require special attention and special educational efforts.

Income Families

Ill health of the poor requires widespread relief. Too often, people do not know how to care for themselves, or do not have the knowledge, even if they have the knowledge. Some do not know how to access the benefits to which they are entitled now, such as public or clinical prenatal care for pregnancy. A significant number do not know how to deal with the complexities of the health care system such as, outpatient departments, hospitals and physicians. The community has an obligation to teach them how to get the care they need, as well as how to avoid needing care as often.

Many of their health problems, of course, stem from sources outside their control and outside the range of medicine—bad housing, bad sanitation, poor nutrition, poverty, lack of education, lack of employment, etc.

Their problems are social as well as medical, and the solutions lie in all of society as well as in the medical and health care field.

With all of these factors at work, the poor suffer medical problems caused by malnutrition; they have a higher rate of infant mortality; they experience a higher proportion of emotional, nervous and mental disorders; and their children have many more accidents involving burns or poisoning. In addition, bad housing and overcrowded and unsanitary conditions contribute to greater incidence of rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, common respiratory diseases and complications such as middle-ear infection and meningitis.

Poverty might be likened to a hereditary disease in that children of the poor die earlier and in greater numbers; succumb more easily to childhood ailments; and more often become permanently incapacitated for school or employment—thus adding to the pool of poverty and unemployment that exacts a high price not only from its victims, but from all citizens.

2. Mothers

Mothers are a primary audience for effective health education because from pregnancy through her children’s adolescence, a mother’s knowledge and attitude about health are the greatest influence on the physical well-being of her entire family.

Her roles as manager, nurse and dietician shape and direct the family’s health patterns more than any other combination of factors.

However, even with the best of intentions and the most solicitous attitude toward the welfare of her husband and children, a mother’s lack of basic knowledge or of intent—especially in dietary matters—may have consequences that are injurious to her family.
3. School Children and Teenagers

The quality—even the existence—of health education in the classroom varies greatly throughout the country. Antiquated laws, indifferent parents, unaggressive school boards, teachers poorly equipped to handle the subject, lack of leadership from government or the public, lack of funds, lack of research, lack of evaluation—all of those hobble a comprehensive program that could provide the nation's 55-million school children (one-fourth of the entire population) with adequate health education of an interesting, pertinent and objective nature.

While large amounts of so-called health information materials find their way into the schools, because they are free or inexpensive, such materials are rarely evaluated in terms of real value to the children. Often their use is based on their easy availability to the teacher—who sees that many are sponsored by reputable firms and assumes that they are effective.

Testimony before this Committee showed that the quality of much health information material is questionable. Many materials are not pre-tested for intended audiences or evaluated by qualified experts. And much of it is outdated.

Our findings are that school health education in most primary and secondary schools either is not provided at all, or loses its proper emphasis because of the way it is tacked onto another subject such as physical education or biology, assigned to teachers whose interests and qualifications lie elsewhere.

Evidence abounds that health education in schools is not effective, even when it is attempted. Nutrition studies show that teenagers, especially girls, often damage their own health and deprive themselves of vitality because of poor eating habits. Youngsters who once urged their parents not to smoke have become cigarette smokers as teenagers. And, of course, the high and rising incidence of venereal disease and the spread of drug abuse among teenagers are two other of the most urgent reasons for assigning a special priority to health education among school children.

4. Middle-Aged Middle Class

Obesity, smoking, sedentary lifestyle and lack of sufficient exercise, excessive consumption of alcohol and sugar, high-cholesterol food all take a large toll on the health and quality of life of many people.

A report to the White House Conference on Health, Education, and Welfare found that while middle-income families spend $4 billion on food each year, 37 per cent are poorly nourished and too thin.

Nutrition surveys confirm the paradox of middle-income affluence.

5. Chronically Ill and Aged

These people have a variety of special needs and require palliative measures, rather than curative ones, for most of their problems.

While relatively little can be done by health professionals to relieve their plight, special programs should be established to offer the most compassionate counseling, both physical and psychological, and the ways in which they can be helped to live more comfortably and hopefully.
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smoking, sedentary lifestyle and lack of sufficient
exercise, excessive consumption of alcohol and too much high-
sugar, high-cholesterol food all take a large toll from this cate-
gory of people.

A report to the White House Conference on Nutrition pointed
out that while middle-income families spend $2,500 or more on
food each year, 37 per cent are poorly nourished—too fat or
thin.

Nutrition surveys confirm the paradox of malnutrition amidst
affluence:

5. Chronically Ill and Aged

These people have a variety of special needs in that only
palliative measures, rather than curative ones, are available for
most of their problems.

While relatively little can be done by health education alone
to relieve their plight, special programs should be devised to
offer the most compassionate counseling, both in terms of their
comfort and of the ways in which they can best cope with the
problems they have.

One in five high school students will get V.D.
before they receive their diploma, but most
school health textbooks do not mention the
subject, and some State legislatures do not
permit the subject to be taught in school.

SOURCE: Testimony, Los Angeles Regional
Hearings.
Medical advancements coupled with broad-based achievements in health education have the potential of creating a standard of well-being higher than the nation has ever known.

Three factors now exist which lead to optimism regarding the attainment of that potential: (1) recognition by the President of the need to focus attention on the role of health education; (2) findings of the Committee which indicate a growing awareness among the nation's people of the importance of health education; and (3) the organization is prepared or equipped to push for the coalescence of public and private forces, public and private, in support of it.

Section III
Findings and Recommendations:
National Activities in Support Of Health Education

In view of the potentially vast benefits to come from improved and widespread health education, the Committee's principal recommendation is that a new organization be established: the "National Center for Health Education."

The Center would be a private, nonprofit organization having a mandate from the government (authorized by the Congress), financed by both the federal government and private sources.

The form, functions, financing and management of the Center will be described in detail in Section IV of this report.

First, however, it is necessary to establish a foundation upon which the Center would be based; a foundation of facts and findings that justify its need.

This digression, based on testimony and other inputs described earlier, is included because the Committee wishes to point out that the activities about to be described could and should be carried out even if the Center were not established. Health education programs in this nation cannot all come from one source, no matter what it might be.

However, the activities listed in this Section would be carried out better and more effectively by a national Center to stimulate and to encourage other organizations and institutions to move the nation into action, and to observe the education scene in order to monitor, evaluate, and use the multiple efforts being undertaken.

The Committee sees a compelling need in relation to all of the following areas:
- Health problems
- Age groups
- Health care delivery system
- Schools and colleges
- Employment

In addition, we shall have some thing else to do with health education services and leadership.
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The Committee sees a compelling need for health education
in relation to all of the following areas:

Health problems.
Age groups.
Health care delivery system.
Schools and colleges.
Employment.

In addition, we shall have some things to say about health
education services and leadership.
Health Problems and Health Education

FINDINGS

Although many of the major causes of illness and death can be affected by individual behavior, health education is a neglected, under-financed, fragmented activity with no agency inside or outside of government responsible for establishing short- or long-term goals.

Virtually no component of society makes full use of health education. That includes the health care delivery system, the educational system, voluntary health agencies, business and labor, prepayment plans and the insurance industry, mass media and others. It is obvious from testimony and other information furnished to the Committee that each one could contribute substantially to the nation's health education.

A strong catalytic force—to keep the fires burning under the problems—such as the Center, might well provide the effort needed to help each part of the system get programs going, or to get better results from what it is already doing.

The need was repeatedly cited to find and try new kinds of health education programs tailored to specific kinds of health problems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That health problems based on behavior—or which can be worsened or bettered primarily through behavior—be identified and made the basic content of health education programs. And that guidelines be developed for each that can be followed by a person alone or with the help of a health adviser.

That extended and intensified health education programs be developed for appropriate groups in every community to focus on health problems which apparently can be prevented, detected early or controlled through individual action.

That cost analysis studies be made to determine the long-term effectiveness of health education programs in reducing personal health care costs for persons with specific types of health problems.

Age Groups and Health Education

FINDINGS

Witnesses and consultants repeatedly told the Committee the importance of providing health education to people of all ages. However, a number of witnesses stressed the crucial importance of the first 10 years of life, when the nation's children are critical in laying the foundation for future effectiveness of the nation's people. Without vigorous people concerned with the maintenance of good health, no nation can thrive.

Through school as well as other sources, from head-start programs and the like—young children must be taught to become responsible citizens who care for themselves to care also about others. Such programs could determine, are almost entirely excluded from elementary school curricula today.

Other age groups, in various situations, need special attention. Aside from what they might be learning in school, children in cities might not know about recreational opportunities in their neighborhoods; teenagers in urban areas might not know how to prevent venereal disease; unwed pregnant girls in any situation might not know where help is available; older people, conditioned to believe that they are eligible for any kind of assistance.

The evidence of a large amount of health information with the need to motivate people toward positive health habits paints a less than favorable picture of the nation's health education.

No age segment can be ignored by health education programs, because no segment is immune to hazards and interference with good health.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That information services be made available in each community to help people locate the source of what health services they need.
FINDINGS

Witnesses and consultants repeatedly expressed to the Committee the importance of providing health education for all people of all ages. However, a number of witnesses emphasized the crucial importance of the first 10 years of life. The early years are critical in laying the foundation for future productivity and effectiveness of the nation's people. Without a population of vigorous people concerned with the maintenance of their health, no nation can thrive.

Through school as well as other sources—nursery school, head-start programs and the like—young children must be helped to become responsible citizens who care enough about themselves to care also about others. Such programs, so far as the Committee could determine, are almost entirely missing from elementary school curricula today.

Other age groups, in various situations, also need special attention. Aside from what they might be learning in school, children in cities might not know about recreational opportunities in their neighborhoods; teenagers in urban or rural areas might not know how to prevent venereal disease, or where to get treatment; unwed pregnant girls in any location might not know where help is available; older people, as already mentioned, might not know what their health benefits are or whether they are eligible for any kind of assistance.

The evidence of a large health information gap, coupled with the need to motivate people toward positive health behavior, paints a less than favorable picture of the existing state of health education.

No age segment can be ignored by health education programs, because no segment is immune to hazards which might interfere with good health.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That information services be made available in every community to help people locate the source of whatever health care services they need.
That people of all ages have opportunities to participate in comprehensive health education programs.

That priority be given to research into human motivation as it relates to influencing the quality of health habits and practices.

That special attention be given to motivational factors which influence the health behavior of children during their first 10 years.

That people of the community be invited to play a larger role in setting policy and planning health education programs affecting their own welfare. Experiences shared with the Committee indicated strongly that a person's motivation and behavior with respect to health is favorably influenced by involvement in the planning of programs for himself and for others.

It is equally important that health education programs be designed to address the cultural mores and intellectual level of each group being approached. Health education efforts so far have generally been stereotyped. There is need for innovation and experimentation with new kinds of educational approaches and programs for various kinds of people. Among people of recent foreign extraction, or of poverty, or of poor education, simplistic approaches will not only be ineffective and meaningless, but may also be counter-productive.

The Health Care Delivery System and Health Education FINDINGS

The nation appears to be on the eve of major new legislation covering the delivery and financing of health care. With or without a federal program of protection, health education should be interwoven into the very fabric of health care.

The Committee heard from many people that providing health education would be largely futile unless at the same time the health care system is modified to permit easier access. Conversely, however, providing health care would be largely futile unless at the same time health education is provided on a nationwide basis.

At the present time, health education is hardly a brush-stroke on the total picture of health care industry.

Of $75-billion spent last year for medical care—more than $200-million a day—spent for treatment after illness occurs. Of half is spent for biomedical research. Previous programs of health education split the education getting the short end.

Federal and state government commitment is hardly visible. Of $18.2-billion a year spent for medical and health activities in the Department of Health, $30-million is spent for specific programs and $14-million more for general programs—less than one-fourth of one percent for health education.

An additional $7.3-billion allocated to all other federal agencies, even a small share for health education.

On a state and territorial level health education is less than one-half of one percent of the budget.

Legislation exists which actually impedes the implementation of effective school health programs. Some books regarding what can be taught have been available since the late 1800s. In other states, needed legislation exists which actually impedes the development of effective school health programs.

Attitude surveys reveal that most Americans are more informed than they realize about health matters. Over 88 percent in one study—say they look to television commercials for information about health, testimony and other information indicate that television commercials are more convincing, more meaningful, and more persuasive than with true consumer health education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That a focal point be established with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to work with all federal agencies to make government’s involvement in health education more efficient.
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priority be given to research into human motivation es to influencing the quality of health habits and special attention be given to motivational factors which the health behavior of children during their first people of the community be invited to play a larger tting policy and planning health education programs heir own welfare. Experiences shared with the Com-flicated strongly that a person’s motivation and be- respect to health is favorably influenced by involve- planning of programs for himself and for others. qually important that health education programs be to address the cultural mores and intellectual level of p being approached. Health education efforts so far rally been stereotyped. There is need for innovation imentation with new kinds of educational approaches ams for various kinds of people. Among people of sign. extraction, or of poverty, or of poor education, approaches will not only be ineffective and meaning-may also be counter-productive.

Care Delivery System and Health Education

ation appears to be on the eve of major new legislation he delivery and financing of health care. With or federal program of protection, health education should ven into the very fabric of health care.

Committee heard from many people that providing cation would be largely futile unless at the same time care system is modified to permit easier access. However, providing health care would be largely is at the same time health education is provided on a basis.

present time, health education is hardly a brush-

stroke on the total picture of health care and the health care industry.

Of $75-billion spent last year for medical, hospital and health care—more than $200-million a day—about 92 per cent is spent for treatment after illness occurs. Of the rest, more than half is spent for biomedical research. Prevention of illness and programs of health education split the balance, with health education getting the short end.

Federal and state government commitment to health edu-caction is hardly visible. Of $18.2-billion allocated in 1973 for medical and health activities in the Department of HEW, only $30-million is spent for specific programs in health education; and $14-million more for general programs. That amounts to less than one-fourth of one per cent for health education.

Of an additional $7.3-billion allocated for health purposes to all other federal agencies, even a smaller fraction is spent for health education.

On a state and territorial level health departments spend less than one-half of one per cent of their budgets for health education.

Legislation exists which actually impedes the development of effective school health programs. Some of the laws on the books regarding what can be taught have not been changed since the late 1800s. In other states, needed legislation is lacking.

Attitude surveys reveal that most Americans are less in-formed than they realize about health matters. The vast majority —88 per cent in one study—say they look to their physicians or to television commercials for information about health. However, testimony and other information indicate that most physicians are too busy to do an effective job of health education and television commercials are more concerned with product pro-motion than with true consumer health education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That a focal point be established within the Department of HEW to work with all federal agencies to help make the federal government’s involvement in health education more effective and more efficient.
That consumers be more adequately informed about the real health value of products and services; and that more rigid protection be given to consumers against harmful or worthless products that are presented as having positive health values.

That when it is demonstrated that individual behavior will not assure that people follow good health practices—which risks the health or safety of others—the Congress and/or industry and others mandate such practices. An example would be requiring inoculation against contagious disease before allowing a person to enter school or go to work.

That the government, prepayment plans and insurance companies, which pay for health care services for others, be willing to adjust premium rates to include in their payments the cost of health education for the patients involved.

That the nation's hospitals be strongly encouraged to offer health education programs to patients and families—both on an inpatient and outpatient basis. Similarly, that more extensive health education—focused on the needs of the patient—be provided by physicians and allied professionals in their personal contacts with patients. The lack of health educational programs in hospitals and physicians' offices is tragically prominent at the present time.

That a major educational program be undertaken among medical and health professionals and administrators to prepare them psychologically and professionally to accept and respond creatively to increasingly expressed concerns for consumer participation in the design of health education programs and even of health care facilities.

That skill in providing health education be an essential part in the training and continuing education of all health workers.

That systematic research and evaluation be a part of all health education programs within the health care delivery system.

That various health educational approaches among patients be tested to determine the ones which appear to bring about the best results in patient improvement and in reduction of need for health services.
It is demonstrated that individual behavior will it people follow good health practices—which risks safety of others—the Congress and/or industry and e such practices. An example would be requiring against contagious disease before allowing a person al or go to ,work.
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That health educators work with consumers and the community, with health care administrators and planning agencies to help determine the location of new health care facilities; in scheduling service hours; and in developing procedures for use of services that will reflect the health care needs and living conditions of the people to be served.

Of more than $75-billion now being spent annually for medical, hospital and health care, about 92 to 93 percent is spent for treatment after illness occurs. Of the remainder, 4 to 5 percent is spent for bio-medical re search; 2 to 2½ percent for preventive health measures, and ½ percent for health education.

$75-BILLION
Schools and Colleges and Health Education

FINDINGS

A cherished American ideal is that each child will have the chance to develop his potential to the fullest. If the future well-being of the nation rests on the realization of that ideal, it follows that education for personal health and health citizenship among today's children and youth should have high priority.

Although the educational system is predominantly for the young, it provides learning for all ages. Currently, 75-million Americans are enrolled in preschool, school, college and continuing education programs.

The trend is toward greater enrollment in preschool programs, and schools are taking younger children. At the same time, Head-Start, nursery school, day care and a host of other programs are being established. Of the 11-million children between the ages of three and five, an estimated four million are enrolled in such programs. That points up opportunities for health education. However, there has been little effort to bring together the fields of health education, parent education and early childhood education for planning and evaluation.

The largest portion of those enrolled in educational programs—almost 59 million—are in elementary and secondary schools (grades K through 12). The Committee found that while some children have an opportunity to participate in comprehensive school health education programs, most do not. In the latter case, health education either is not provided at all or is fragmented—lacking in planning, scope, sequence and evaluation; and lacking in commitments of time, money, administrative support and legal sanction.

Despite the fact that the Committee found that school health education programs are grossly inadequate, the U.S. Office of Education (Department of HEW), in a report prepared for the Committee, could not cite a single program of research or evaluation which it is supporting in the area of school health education.

Almost nine-million students are enrolled in colleges. If appropriate health education can be provided during such a significant period of growth, dividends can result for society in terms of personal, family and community health.

Many college students, for the first time, are assuming nearly total responsibility for preparing for their future roles as family members.

More than 10-million adults are enrolled in education programs. That important and growing part of the educational system is virtually untouched.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That a series of national and regional meetings be held to (1) identify leadership in the health education and early childhood education fields and future health education needs and directions for legislation, program development, and evaluation; (2) more fully describe existing programs for preschool children; and (3) explore directions for legislation, program development, and expansion of health education programs.

That adoption of model state laws for the education of preschool children, and teacher preparation, evaluation of programs be encouraged in every state.

That the feasibility of matching state funds be explored to support school health education programs.

That periodic surveys determine the interests and needs of pupils and students in school, for use in planning and developing programs.

That the Department of HEW and/or other agencies be urged to initiate systems of research in school health education.

Employment and Health Education

FINDINGS

For health education purposes, a good place to start with the population is working. Employees who are motivated to learn about health and who are motivated to
Colleges and Health Education

The American ideal is that each child will have the opportunity to develop his potential to the fullest. If the future well-being of a nation rests on the realization of that ideal, it follows that personal health and health citizenship among children and youth should have high priority.

The educational system is predominantly for the learning of all ages. Currently, 75-million children are enrolled in preschool, school, college and continuing programs. The trend is toward greater enrollment in preschool programs, and schools are taking younger children. At the same time, nursery school, day care and a host of other early childhood programs are being established. Of the 11-million children aged three and five, an estimated four million are enrolled in such programs. That points up opportunities for education. However, there has been little effort to bring the fields of health education, parent education and early childhood education programs closer together.

The largest portion of those enrolled in educational programs—1.5-billion—are in elementary and secondary schools (grades K through 12). The Committee found that while children have an opportunity to participate in comprehensive health education programs, most do not. In the latter health education either is not provided at all or is fragmenting in planning, scope, sequence and evaluation; in commitments of time, money, administrative support and legal sanction.

The fact that the Committee found that school health education programs are grossly inadequate, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), in a report prepared for the Committee, could not cite a single program of research on which it is supporting in the area of school health education projects.

Many college students, for the first time, are faced with the task of assuming nearly total responsibility for their own health and with preparing for their future roles as parents and citizens.

More than 10-million adults are enrolled in continuing education programs. That important and growing segment of the educational system is virtually untouched by health education.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That a series of national and regional conferences be held to (1) identify leadership in the health education, parent education and early childhood education fields; (2) determine present and future health education needs and interests of preschool children; (3) more fully describe existing health education programs for preschool children; and (4) explore ways to chart new directions for legislation, program development and research to assure that preschool children and their parents are involved in expanding health education programs.

That adoption of model state laws for school health education be encouraged in every state, covering the programs themselves, teacher preparation, evaluation of results, reporting, etc.

That the feasibility of matching state funds with federal funds be explored to support school health education programs.

That periodic surveys determine the health education needs and interests among pupils and students from preschool through college, for use in planning and developing health education programs.

That the Department of HEW and/or its Office of Education be urged to initiate systems of research and evaluation of projects in school health education.

**Employment and Health Education**

**FINDINGS**

For health education purposes, a good place to reach many adults is through their place of employment since 40 per cent of the population is working. Employees who are knowledgeable about health and who are motivated to prevent illnesses and
accidents are an asset to themselves; their employers, their families and the nation.

The health of employees directly affects the employer's insurance and medical costs, which have been rising. Business costs go up when there are absences because of extra training expense and productivity losses. Evidence presented to the Committee indicates that employed Americans lose an average of seven and a half days of work per year because of reported illnesses and accidents, many of which are preventable. That amounts to 600-million man-days per year. Any reduction in that figure through health education could have a significant impact not only on productivity, wages and profits but, more important, on a healthier life for many families.

While health education is not a total answer, it does have the potential of favorably influencing the morale and productivity of employees.

Employers and labor organizations have long been concerned about industrial safety and occupational health hazards and have developed effective programs in those areas. In addition, more and more employers have become concerned with acute, work-related problems such as alcohol and drug abuse.

Involvement of business, industry and labor in school and community health affairs as well as in plant programs, can contribute to sound off-job safety and health practices that can also benefit on-job attendance and productivity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the federal government, as the nation's largest employer, serve as a model for industry by building health education into existing programs and by allocating funds for health education specialists.

That all business, industry and labor organizations be encouraged through tax incentives and other means to plan, undertake and evaluate comprehensive health education programs for their employees, members and families.

That business, industry and labor encourage and support basic research to determine the effectiveness of health education in (1) increasing the quality of life; (2) reducing from work; and (3) increasing productivity at work. 

Health Education Services

FINDINGS

In the United States today, there are approximately 120,000 professional health educators—persons with some education in either school or community health education. These educators are inadequate in view of the nation's growing health concerns. Inadequate health education manpower will require training and retraining or redirection.

The report of the Subcommittee on School Health Education indicated that accreditation systems for health education programs at undergraduate and graduate levels need reform.

And with the advent of increasing numbers of personnel who are performing health education functions.

Of the $18.2 billion allocated for health purposes, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, estimates that it spends $44 million on health education, about 1/5 of one percent of the total budget.

SOURCE: Testimony, H. 41, p. 204.
An asset to themselves, their employers, their nation.

Employment costs directly affect the employer's medical costs, which have been rising. Business then there are absences because of extra training productivity losses. Evidence presented to the indicates that employed Americans lose an average 4.5 million man-days per year. Any reduction in that health education could have a significant impact on productivity, wages and profits but, more important, life for many families.

With education is not a total answer, it does have favorably influencing the morale and productivity of business, industry and labor organizations have long been concerned about the industrial safety and occupational health hazards developed effective programs in those areas. In addition, more employers have become concerned with related problems such as alcohol and drug abuse. Perhaps, businesses can sound off-job safety and health practices that can in-job attendance and productivity.

Recommendations

The federal government, as the nation's largest employer, needs to be a model for industry by building health education programs and by allocating funds for health education. Business, industry and labor organizations also need to encourage and support policies that will make job attendance and productivity.

Health Education Services

FINDINGS

In the United States today, there are approximately 25,000 professional health educators—persons with specialized training in either school or community health education. The total is inadequate in view of the nation's growing efforts to mount a comprehensive nationwide health education program. Additional health education manpower will require training while existing manpower will need retraining or redirection.

The report of the Subcommittee on School Health Education indicated that accreditation systems for health education programs at undergraduate and graduate levels need to be extended. And with the advent of increasing numbers of allied personnel who are performing health education tasks, it is essential to determine the effectiveness of health education in (1) increasing the quality of life; (2) reducing absenteeism from work; and (3) increasing productivity at work.
to re-examine the roles of both health educators and allied personnel.

The value of parents—the first "health educators"—and of neighborhood health workers and volunteers must not be overlooked or minimized. It is obvious that health educators at all levels of training and experience need to be mobilized.

As mentioned earlier in this report, the Committee uncovered a great need for more skilled health education programs and leaders; preschool and school classes, and in hospitals and physicians' offices.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That schools of medicine, health science and public health cooperate with schools of education to qualify administrators and teachers to perform and administer health education programs. Since every health education program obviously cannot be run by a professional health educator, serious consideration should be given to preparing selected persons as "paramedics," in effect, in the field of health education.

That the nation's voluntary health agencies consider special programs to convert their loyal and efficient volunteers into effective health educators as well. That would require special commitment and training, and would likely result in a more effective volunteer force that would do a vitally needed job.

Because access to health services is limited for persons by social, economic or geographic control of the health care system, that system itself should encourage even more voluntary health education to make possible a fuller utilization of existing persons who need them. In other words, that health education be to give people basic information about their rights to health care services and how to get them.

**Leadership for Health Education**

**FINDINGS**

One principal weakness in health education is the still-evolving status of the health education program, lack of a focal point for health education in each locality, and at state and national levels.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That a focal point for health education be established in each locality through "Community Health Education" to coordinate and help improve health education in the area.

That each state consider the feasibility of establishing a "Council on Health Education" to consider the scope, functions, organization and financing of a focus on health education.

**Section IV**

**Findings and Recommendations:**

**National Center for Health Education**

As our primary finding, we believe very strongly that the nation needs a National Center for Health Education to stimulate, coordinate and evaluate health education programs. At the present time, there is no organization or agency in or outside of government even approaching it. Nor does anything on the horizon to indicate that the need for a Center in some other way.
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RECOMMENDATIONS
That a focal point for health education be established in
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Section IV
Findings and Recommendations:
National Center for
Health Education

For primary finding, we believe very strongly that the
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The over-all objective of the National Center would be to
improve the health of the American people through health education. It would approach that goal by continuing and vastly expanding the work of the Committee in determining exactly what is being done now in health education; how well it is being done; how more can be done; and how what is done can be made to deliver results.

The Committee considered a number of other ways to provide the same central prodding and monitoring of health education—broadening the activities of the National Health Council; reviving the American National Council for Health Education of the Public; creating an organization similar to the National Science Foundation; establishing a Council of Health Advisors to the President; and lodging the entire responsibility with the Department of HEW. All of those were rejected in favor of a National Center.

As stated in the previous section, the Center would be a private, nonprofit organization authorized by the Congress and financed by both the federal government and private sources.

It is important to note, too, that while the Center would be a source of information and expertise for lawmakers, as well as for the rest of society, it would not conduct lobbying at either state or national levels.

Its operations, management and methods of financing are explained in the rest of this section.

Functions of the Center would be carried out by five operating divisions:

**Division for Research in Health Education**

The division would support research and encourage others to support research in health education. Its primary functions would be to:

1. Determine what health education research is now being done.
2. Determine the needs of health education research that ought to be done to find ways to overcome existing problems.
3. Rank the needed research projects in order of priority; initiate or stimulate studies that are not being made; and help support those that are already under way.
4. Provide consultation to persons who are preparing research proposals or in actually conducting research.

Medical and social scientists are continually making new information, much of which is useful in some capacity. However, what to do with it. Health education research is one way to help fill gaps of understanding that often exist between educators, and between educators and the public.

The most important research of the entire Center is likely to be in ways to persuade people of varying lifestyles to adopt healthful behaviors in order to enhance the quality of their lives.

**Division for Demonstration Programs in Health Education**

The division would seek to enhance the quality of health education by supporting and encouraging new approaches to health education. Its objectives would be to:

1. Survey the needs, interests, attitudes and behavior of the American public regarding health education. This survey would be made on a continuing basis.
2. Use the findings of the surveys to help shape the programs of the National Center, of other national health organizations and of community organizations.
3. Support demonstration programs in schools that represent broad cross sections of people of all ages, that have measurable objectives that are measurable; and that demonstrate effectiveness in reducing or moderating illness or accidents. The demonstrations would be to motivate individual communities to accept responsibility for meeting education needs.
4. Provide consultation to organizations in planning or evaluating health education programs.

**Clearing House for Health Information and Education Programs**

The division would be a clearing house for the exchange of information and education programs, including data on successful programs and new ideas.
health of the American people through health education could approach that goal by continuing and vastly expanding the work of the Committee in determining exactly what can be done now in health education; how well it is being done; and how what is done can be measured. The Committee considered a number of other ways to pro-
central prodding and monitoring of health education: the activities of the National Health Council; the American National Council for Health Education; creating an organization similar to the National Health Education Board; establishing a Council of Health Advisors; and lodging the entire responsibility with the HEW. All of those were rejected in favor of a center.

In the previous section, the Center would be a nonprofit organization authorized by the Congress and funded by both the federal government and private sources. It would be noted, too, that while the Center would be a source of information and expertise for lawmakers, as well as for society, it would not conduct lobbying at either national or local levels.

The most important research of the entire program is to find ways to persuade people of varying lifestyles to modify those lifestyles so as to enhance the quality of their lives.

Division for Demonstration Programs in Health Education

The division would seek to enhance the results of health education by supporting and encouraging new and imaginative programs of health education. Its objectives would be:

1. Survey the needs, interests, attitudes, knowledge and behavior of the American public regarding health. Surveys would be made on a continuing basis.
2. Use the findings of the surveys to help plan programs of the National Center, of other national health education organizations, and of community organizations.
3. Support demonstration programs in health education that represent broad cross sections of people; which focus on objectives that are measurable; and that emphasize the prevention or moderation of illness or accidents which appear controllable through individual behavior. The purpose of the demonstrations would be to motivate individuals and whole communities to accept responsibility for meeting their own health education needs.
4. Provide consultation to organizations that request help in planning or evaluating health education programs.

Clearing House for Health Information and Education

The division would be a clearing house for health information and education programs, including data on existing pro-

support those that are already under way.

4. Provide consultation to persons who need help in preparing research proposals or in actually conducting research.

Medical and social scientists are continually discovering new information, much of which is useful in daily living if it is made known to the public and if the public is clearly shown what to do with it. Health education research must help fill the gaps of understanding that often exist between scientists and educators, and between educators and the public.

The most important research of the entire program is to find ways to persuade people of varying lifestyles to modify those lifestyles so as to enhance the quality of their lives.
grams regarded as effective, as well as printed materials, graphics, audio-visuals and others. It would:

1. Survey existing health information data systems and tie into them wherever possible; encourage further development of existing data systems; support the development of new ones, where needed; and work to coordinate the efforts of all major groups involved in health information data systems.

2. Make health information available to the public and to organizations involved in health education.

3. Continually evaluate the effectiveness of existing health information and health education services to enhance their scope and quality.

4. Encourage pre-testing and expert evaluation of health information materials produced by others. An efficiently run Center would become a source to which companies and organizations producing health information material would turn voluntarily for evaluation and expert help.

Division for Communications in Health Education

The division's purpose would be to develop two-way communications (a) between the Center and providers of health education services, and (b) between the Center and the nation's mass media. It would:

1. Hold regular working conferences to bring together the major national health education organizations. Included would be the professional health educators plus other organizations with health education programs. Purposes of the conferences would be to share ideas; identify gaps and overlaps in health education programs and research; and find ways in which the organizations could cooperate to make everyone's efforts more effective.

2. Find ways in which the mass media—newspapers, magazines, radio, television and motion pictures—and the Center can cooperate to provide the best possible public service programing in health education.

3. Establish the National Center as a source of information and expertise which can be used in planning and creating both commercial and noncommercial material—magazine articles, newspaper stories, radio programs and motion picture features.*

Division for Community Health Education

The division would encourage the community centers for health education. Locally assisted by the National Center, Community Centers set up in response to interest and need. (Planning committees which arose for the Committee might become the nucleus organized to establish community centers.

It is obvious from the brief description that the success of the Center lies closely with both the providers and the public. It cannot function in a vacuum if those who are providing health information and the same time reach out to people to understand and the education.

Management of the Center

The Committee recommends a board of eleven members, appointed by the President and board. They should represent major groups in the field—representatives of the public, government, industry, health and health education programs, voluntary health organizations, insurance carriers and others.

Persons appointed should be convinced of the value of health education and willing to cooperate in directions in educating the nation's people to desirable health habits.

The staff of the Center should be headed by an executive officer who would act as the link between the center and its constituents.

*See Supplementary Statement by C. Wrede Petersen,
regarded as effective, as well as printed materials, audio-visuals and others. It would:

- survey existing health information data systems and tie wherever possible; encourage further development of data systems; support the development of new ones, as needed; and work to coordinate the efforts of all major involved in health information data systems.
- make health information available to the public and to all major involved in health education.
- continually evaluate the effectiveness of existing health information and health education services to enhance their quality.
- encourage pre-testing and expert evaluation of health information materials produced by others. An efficiently run center would become a source to which companies and organizations producing health information material would turn voluntarily for evaluation and expert help.

**Division for Community Health Education**

The division's purpose would be to develop two-way communications (a) between the Center and providers of health education services, and (b) between the Center and the nation's media. It would:

- hold regular working conferences to bring together the professional health educators plus other organizations involved in education programs. Purposes of the conferences would be to share ideas; identify gaps and overlaps in health education programs and research; and find ways in which the conferences could cooperate to make everyone's efforts more effective.
- find ways in which the mass media—newspapers, magazines, television and motion pictures—and the Center can provide the best possible public service programs in health education.
- establish the National Center as a source of information which can be used in planning and creating both commercial and noncommercial material in health education—magazine articles, newspaper stories, radio and television programs and motion picture features.*

**Division for Community Health Education Centers**

The division would encourage the establishment of community centers for health education. Local centers would be assisted by the National Center. Community centers would be set up in response to interest and need expressed by local groups. (Planning committees which arranged public hearings for the Committee might become the nuclei of local groups organized to establish community centers.)

... it is obvious from the brief descriptions of the operating divisions that the success of the Center lies in its ability to work closely with both the providers and the recipients of health education. It cannot function in a vacuum. It must reach out to those who are providing health information or health education; and at the same time reach out to people who need the information and education.

**Management of the Center**

The Committee recommends a board of directors of 25 persons, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They should represent major groups concerned with health—representatives of the public, government, labor, commerce and industry, health and health education professions and associations, voluntary health organizations, insurance and prepayment carriers and others.

Persons appointed should be convinced of the potential value of health education and willing to explore entirely new directions in educating the nation's people about health and desirable health habits.

The staff of the Center should be headed by a chief executive officer who would act as the link between the board (to

*See Supplementary Statement by C. Wrede Petersmeyer.*
which he would be responsible) and the Center's staff, which he would manage.

His professional staff should include at least these categories of professional personnel: business manager, physician, behavioral scientist, public information specialist, health educator, senior computer specialist and statistician.

State and territorial Health Departments allocate less than 1/2 of one percent of their budget for health education.

SOURCE: October, 1971 Survey

Financing the Center

The Committee considered whether the Center should be private and privately financed; totally within the federal mandate, federally financed; or a mixture of the two. It led us to recommend the combination—a private or federal mandate, jointly financed by private and public sources.

Excessive federal intervention in health education could lead to the appearance of excessive federal intervention in the vitality of professionals and institutions instead of stimulating them. On the other hand, an organization made up of private interests would lack the degree of influence and the public support that a combined private-governmental one would have.

There are additional reasons for the choice:

1. An all-private entity could suffer from insufficient management and decision-making.

2. If the Center were all-governmental, the funds available from year to year could be somewhat uncertain because of other priorities that command governmental support.

3. An all-governmental organization could lack political influence. In areas of health education, particularly highly personal and often sensitive issues, the government could less successfully promote health programs.

4. Both governmental and private sectors involved in health education programs to some degree. It was important to the Committee that both continue their work and that neither appear to usurp leadership.

Both must work together in partnership—never before if real results are to be seen. Through the private-governmental partnership could be the best of voluntary cooperation from all types of sources as well as from government at all levels.

Projected Expenditures

The Committee projects that the operating costs of the Center for its first five years would be $12-millic
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Financing the Center

The Committee considered whether the Center should be private and privately financed; totally within government and federally financed; or a mixture of the two. Deliberations led us to recommend the combination—a private organization with a federal mandate, jointly financed by private and public funds.

Excessive federal intervention in health education (or even the appearance of excessive federal intervention) could sap the vitality of professionals and institutions instead of energizing them. On the other hand, an organization made up only of private interests would lack the degree of influence and effectiveness that a combined private-governmental one would have.

There are additional reasons for the choice:

1. An all-private entity could suffer from insufficient funding.

2. If the Center were all-governmental, the amount of money available from year to year could be somewhat unpredictable because of other priorities that command government’s attention.

3. An all-governmental organization could be vulnerable to political influence. In areas of health education which deal with highly personal and often sensitive issues, the Committee felt the government could less successfully promote positive, innovative programs.

4. Both governmental and private sectors are already involved in health education programs to some degree. It seemed important to the Committee that both continue their significant work and that neither appear to usurp leadership from the other.

Both must work together in partnership—more closely than ever before if real results are to be seen. Through the Center, the private-governmental partnership could bring together the best of voluntary cooperation from all types of private interests as well as from government at all levels.

Projected Expenditures

The Committee projects that the operating budget of the Center for its first five years would be $12-million to $15-million.
The program budget would be substantially higher than that, its size depending upon the Center’s ability to develop programs of high quality and to find both personnel and organizations competent to participate in their design and execution. All such programs would be capable of being measured and evaluated against stated goals and objectives.

7½ days per year are lost by American workers because of sickness and accidents . . . many of them preventable. This amounts to 600-million days per year.
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National Center
For
Health Education

Division For Research
In Health Education

FUNCTION:
Initiate Research Into Methods of Health Education.
Determine Most Effective Ways of Researching Various
Target Groups and Determine Methods for
Effective Health Education.
Basic Research In Communications, Attitudes
and Behavior.
Motivation.
Board Of Directors

Executive Committee

Committees
- Program Planning
- Finance
- Personnel
- Government Relations
- Consumer Relations

Board Committees
- Major Consumer Organizations
- Business, Industry and Labor
- Public Health Organizations
- Medical Care Providers
- Voluntary Health Agencies
- Media
- Behavioral and Social Sciences Researchers
- Other Professional Organizations

Clearinghouse Of Health Education Programs and Materials
**FUNCTION:**
A Central Monitoring Source of Information Regarding Health Education Materials and Programs, including Pamphlets, Films, Filmstrips, TV, Radio Spots and Newspaper Articles, Books and Manuscripts. Job Placement.

Division For Communications In Health Education
**FUNCTION:**

Health Education Regional Centers (when feasible)
**FUNCTION:**
Assessment of Regional and Local Needs. Demonstration Program Coordination. Dissemination of Information and Program Materials. Involvement of Region in Determination of Local and Regional Priorities. Consultation.

Development, In Health Education
- Provide Staff and Funds
- Local, State and Regional Community Level, Foreign Level
- in the Health Interest, of Individuals, Target Groups, Organizational Organizations.
M. ALFRED HAYNES, M.D.
Chairman
Department of Community Medicine
Charles R. Drew Post Graduate Medical School

I cannot endorse the recommendation of an operating budget of $12- to $15-million for the National Center even over a period of five years without at the same time insisting on accountability to the public. The expenditure of this amount may not be enough to do the job that has to be done, but it may be too much for what the Center may actually accomplish. One way of determining this is to hold the Center firmly responsible to the public. The Committee, as a whole, has been timid about making this recommendation because it does not know a perfect way to do so. Even an imperfect method of insuring accountability may be better than none at all if that method carries with it the flexibility to permit change. Furthermore, the element of public accountability could prove to be one of the most effective health education techniques that the Center could devise.

I propose that the Center be made accountable to a number of provider organizations such as the National Health Council and the Coalition of Health Educators and also to a number of consumer organizations such as the National Consumer Health Organization and the National Chicano Health Organization. After a reasonable period of time, such as three years, and periodically thereafter, the Center would be under obligation to report to these organizations exactly what it has done and with what results. It is possible that the Center could generate so little interest that no organization could care whether it really existed. In that case, it should die a quiet and natural death or be painlessly defunded. If, on the other hand, its accomplishments were such as to justify additional expenditure of funds these organizations should not only endorse but contribute financially to its support.

Inherent in this approach is the risk that the Center may not survive but then no organization should survive if its performance does not merit survival.

RICHARD P. McGRA
Deputy Executive Vice Pres.
American Cancer Soc.

1. I think the definition of health strengthened. It might read somewhat as follows:

Health Education is a planned process for the teaching of both health worker and consumer in a manner that is understandable and effective. Learning and behavior are influenced by the process of communication.

2. We may be somewhat prejudiced. It is given very light treatment as a problem, but it has been listed as one of the major health problems in the recent report.

C. WREDE PETERSMEY
Chairman and Presider
Corinthian Broadcasting Co.

I believe that the Center should carry on the work of preparing creative, persuasive health information spots for television and radio; advertisements in newspapers, magazines, outdoor and transportation display; and for distribution through health agencies, community offices, and other channels. The Center should then be responsible to stations to carry such spots and with the public to carry such advertisements in the public interest. In order to carry out this responsibility, the staff should include as a key executive a professionally trained communicator. To assist him in mobilizing the services, on a volunteer basis, the best creative talent in the private sector should be recruited.

IRVING S. SHAPIRO, Ph.D.
Director, Health Education Div.
Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York

I am in full accord with the bulk of the recommendations with the major recommendation that a National Education of the Public be established. I do not
M. ALFRED HAYNES, M.D.
Chairman
Department of Community Medicine
Charles R. Drew Post Grad. Medical School

I do not endorse the recommendation of an operating budget of $2-$15-million for the National Center even over a five-year period without the same time insisting on the Center's accountability to the public. The expenditure of this amount is enough to do the job that has to be done, but it may be too much for what the Center may actually accomplish. One determining factor in this recommendation is the Center's intrinsic responsibility. The Committee, as a whole, has been timid about this recommendation because it does not know a perfect method. Even an imperfect method of insuring accountability is better than none at all if that method carries with it the possibility to permit change. Furthermore, the element of accountability could prove to be one of the most effective education techniques that the Center could devise.

I propose that the Center be made accountable to a number of organizations such as the National Health Council Coalition of Health Educators and also a number of organizations such as the National Consumer Health Coalition and the National Chicano Health Organization. A reasonable period of time, such as three years, and thereafter, the Center would be subject to the accountability of these organizations exactly what it has done and with what results. It is possible that the Center could generate so much of its accountability that no organization could care whether it really happened, that it should die a quiet and natural death or be defunded. If, on the other hand, its accomplishments are convincing enough to justify additional expenditure of funds, organizations should not only endorse but contribute to its support.

The inherent in this approach is the risk that the Center may not exist then no organization should survive if its performance is not considered meritorious. C. WREDE PETERSMEYER
Chairman and President
Corinthian Broadcasting Corp.

I believe that the Center should carry the responsibility for preparing creative, persuasive health information promotional spots for television and radio; advertisements for newspapers, magazines, outdoor and transportation displays; and literature for distribution through health agencies, companies and government offices. The Center should then be able to arrange with stations to carry such spots and with the print and display media to carry such advertisements in the public interest and without charge. In order to carry out this responsibility, the Center's staff should include as a key executive a professional, experienced communicator. To assist him in his duties, he could mobilize the services, on a volunteer basis, of a task force of the best creative talent in the private and public sector.

RICHARD P. McGRAIL
Deputy Executive Vice President
American Cancer Society

1. I think the definition of health education could be strengthened. It might read somewhat as follows:

Health Education is a planned process focusing on involvement of both health worker and consumer in its planning and implementation. Learning and behavior are facilitated through the two-way communication of information, knowledge, values and attitudes.

2. We may be somewhat prejudiced, but cigarette smoking is given very light treatment as a problem; we believe it should have been listed as one of the major health problems in the report.

IRVING S. SHAPIRO, Ph.D.
Director, Health Education Division
Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York

I am in full accord with the bulk of the report and particularly with the major recommendation that a National Center for Health Education of the Public be established. I do dissent from several
important statements and views in the report, as follows:

1. In Section II, "Purposes and Challenges of Health Education," the fact that health education has been fragmented and largely unevaluated is cited as resulting in a health care system overburdened with patients because of their lack of knowledge. If indeed our health care "system" is "overburdened," to blame it on patients who presumably would not be patients if only they had learned to behave more wisely is unacceptable and astonishing. It is far more likely that there is inefficiency because the system itself is fragmented and unevaluated.

The same unacceptable attitude is expressed in the statement shortly thereafter that people must meet the health care delivery system "at least half way." The presumption here is that they are equally, if not more, to blame for the failures in our "system."

The final expression of this unacceptable view is contained in the report statement that those served by the "providers of health care" share an obligation with them for "making a total health care system work." No reference is made to the role the consumer or citizen should play in determining the nature and shape of the "system" itself. Perhaps his responsibility is not to make the available "system" work, but to change it first!

2. In the section "Habit and Attitude Changes," it is stated that violations of common sense such as cigarette smoking, faulty diet, and drug abuse "represent a major weakness in the nation's past health education efforts." Since the burden of the report, correctly, is that health education in contradistinction to factual exhortations, appeals, and warnings, has not been adequately supported and tested, it may appear disingenuous to fault health education for the weakness inherent in the sole or major reliance on information packaging and delivery which characterizes the very situation we seek to change.

3. In the section "Environmental Protection," responsibility for pollution is assigned to "all of society." Yet only, the public and industry are specified for the task of sharing in the costs and solution efforts. This, I feel, is a distortion of particular importance in view of the overwhelming threats to health that environmental pollution poses. The major force for a healthy environment in this country is governmental, at national, state, and local levels, and in both the executive branches.

This section as it stands, in a report on health clearly implies that if the public is educated to 
undue noise, redesign goods and materials, and abatement mechanisms. As experience demonstrates the regional nature of the major pollution problems, governmental standards, controls, enforcement participation can truly begin to protect public health from the hazards.

CHARLES A. SIEGFRIED
Vice Chairman of the Board
Metropolitan Life Insurance Compa
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CHARLES A. SIEGFRIED

Vice Chairman of the Board

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company

A number of aspects of the report cause me to wish to

indicate certain of my concerns and reservations. On the one

hand, the report appears to minimize both the volume and

quality of what has been done and is being done in the way of

health education. On the other hand, it tends to minimize the

enormous complexities in the way of making significant changes.

Numerous recommendations are made for extensive new activi-

ties without any clear indication of just what they might accom-

plish, what they would likely cost, or whether the hoped-for

improvements would be commensurate with the costs.

A major recommendation is that there be created a National

Center for Health Education. Not only do I think it desirable to

have more information than we currently have available as to the

sources of funds and the operational relationships of the pro-

posed organization, but I think more thought should be given to

the nature and significance of the research which is envisaged

as an important function and which would be designed "to find

ways to persuade people of different lifestyles to modify those

styles in order to contribute to the quality of their lives."

Despite the great amount of commendable effort which has
gone into the Report, the vastness of the material and the importance of the subject strongly indicate the need for more deliberation before action programs can appropriately be recommended or new institutions be established.

SCOTT K. SIMONDS, DR. P.H.
Professor of Health Education
School of Public Health
University of Michigan

The opportunity to make a statement of dissent is appreciated, however, I prefer to write a “statement of conscience” rather than a statement of dissent to be included in the report. With the exception of the specific recommendation mentioned below, I can accept most of the report. I know that this tenth and final draft represents a synthesis of a great deal of information and a compromise of many opinions from members of the Committee and from the many people throughout the country who participated in our work. In consolidating information in the several drafts of the report, however, some of the most interesting and significant ideas have been lost that described ways in which health education could be advanced in this country. I think this is to be regretted.

As Chairman of the Committee on Education which focused its attention on health education of preschool and school age children, and college youths, I feel strongly that a wealth of testimony and expert opinion which we obtained in our Committee has surfaced only as the tip of an iceberg in the final report. Some of the substantive contributions have been lost entirely. Although much information must be condensed in a report of this kind, I do hope that the really important material brought together for the Committee can be utilized to support the work of the many community leaders and professionals in health education who have labored long and hard to achieve a higher quality of health education for the children and youth of this country, to whom we are ultimately accountable; and to set the stage for changes in social policy at the national level.

I am forced to dissent from the recommendation at the bottom of page 28 of the present copy primarily wording and hence its implications. It reads, "that schools of medicine, health science, cooperate with schools of education to qualify and teachers to perform and administer programs. Since every health education program by a professional health educator, serious can be given to preparing selected persons as effect, in the field of health education."

First of all, it is not at all clear who the people are referred to in this statement. Administrative health education programs are already pre of public health and other programs accredited Public Health Association. If school administrators which I believe is the intent, then the sentence "The phrase "to perform" implies "to perform programs," and the meaning is, therefore, not "since every health education program by a professional health educator" begins there is a need for adequate training funds and assurance that as many programs in the common schools as possible are indeed directed by professional health educators. There is also a need, however, much progress has already define their roles and functions and to employ in health education programs. Their tasks are as implied in this recommendation, however, "paramedics" in any sense of the word. In my "para-educs" if such a distinction is necessary.

In closing, I think it is regrettable that the proposed national center has been shortened in earlier versions to Center for Health Education designation that the public is to be the major focus. The problems that will arise through mis the functions of the organization will be consider assumed by many that the education of health the focus from the title alone when, indeed, it to direct attention to health education of the
To the Report, the vastness of the material and the scope of the subject strongly indicate the need for more time before action programs can appropriately be recom-
don new institutions be established.

SCOTT K. SIMONDS, DR. P.H.
Professor of Health Education
School of Public Health
University of Michigan

opportunity to make a statement of dissent is appre-
ciable, however, I prefer to write a “statement of conscience” as a statement of dissent to be included in the report. In the specific recommendation mentioned can accept most of the report. I know that this tenth draft represents a synthesis of a great deal of information and it is not compromise of many opinions from members of the committee and from the many people throughout the country who participated in our work. In consolidating information in the drafts of the report, however, some of the most interesting ideas have been lost that described ways health education could be advanced in this country. This is to be regretted.

Chairman of the Committee on Education which focused on health education of preschool and school age and college youths, I feel strongly that a wealth of and expert opinion which we obtained in our Com-
des surfaced only as the tip of an iceberg in the final some of the substantive contributions have been lost. Although much information must be condensed in a this kind, I do hope that the really important material together for the Committee can be utilized to support of the many community leaders and professionals in education who have labored long and hard to achieve a quality of health education for the children and youth in the country, to whom we are ultimately accountable, and to take for changes in social policy at the national level.

I’m forced to dissent from the recommendation at the bottom of page 28 of the present copy primarily because of its wording and hence its implications. It reads, “It is recommended that schools of medicine, health science, and public health cooperate with schools of education to qualify administrators and teachers to perform and administer health education programs. Since every health education program cannot be run by a professional health educator, serious consideration should be given to preparing selected persons as ‘paramedics,’ in effect, in the field of health education.”

First of all, it is not at all clear who the administrators are who are referred to in this statement. Administrators of community health education programs are already prepared in schools of public health and other programs accredited by the American Public Health Association. If school administrators are the focus, which I believe is the intent, then the sentence should be stated. The phrase “to perform” implies “to perform health education programs,” and the meaning is, therefore, not clear. I think the phrase “since every health education program cannot be run by a professional health educator” begs the question. There is a need for adequate training funds and funded positions to assure that as many programs in the community and in the schools as possible are indeed directed by professionally trained educators. There is also a need, however, for health education aides, and much progress has already been made to define their roles and functions and to employ them in community health education programs. Their tasks are not administrative as implied in this recommendation, however, nor are they “paramedics” in any sense of the word. In my opinion they are “para-edus” if such a distinction is necessary.

In closing, I think it is regrettable that the name of the proposed national center has been shortened in this report from earlier versions to Center for Health Education without the designation that the public is to be the major focus of its attention. The problems that will arise through misinterpretation of the functions of the organization will be considerable. It will be assumed by many that the education of health manpower is the focus from the title alone when, indeed, it was our intent to direct attention to health education of the public.
The basic theme of this Committee report is that health education of the public must be made more complete and effective if this nation is to achieve optimal improvement in its health status. That position seems unassailable. Furthermore, I agree that a broadly based "National Center," as a focal point of action and a catalyst, could effectively promote health education.

However, under the constraints of time and funding, the Committee was unable to deal in depth with the problems of health education and with the complexities and interrelationships involved in the concept of the "National Center." Consequently, I remain uneasy about this report in two respects.

First, there is a need for further clarification and development of the concept of the proposed Center. Certainly before it can be expressed in legislative form, there will have to be extensive development of such questions as to how the Center will relate to other agencies, institutions, and the government; how it will be financed in detail; and the process by which it will be held accountable to the American public.

Second, in an attempt to identify the realities of health education, this report makes a myriad of specific recommendations. While many of these are important and probably valid, again, within the constraints on the Committee, a number of the recommendations seem to me to be somewhat cursory. Some of them overlook the well documented warning of the report itself that the serious difficulties in health education include not only the dissemination of information but motivating people to use the information wisely. It would have been better, it seems to me, to have relegated the various problems to the proposed Center for attention. The Center, with careful study, experimentation and cooperative effort among the many groups concerned, should produce more valid and productive recommendations, and stimulate development of more effective programs, that our Committee was able to do in its life span.

ELLA L. STROTHE
Provident Comprehensive Neighborhood
Baltimore, Maryland

Having examined and deliberated at great length and detail the final report of the President's Committee on Health Education I find that I cannot support or approve the concept of the "National Center." Consequently, I support the report only with reservations. While I support much in the report which I do support, my reservations involve those parts which are inaccurate, or which are not supported during the Committee's deliberations.

(1) The implication that the entire Committee accepted the idea that the Departments of HEW-OEO could be eliminated or those that were made for the new foundation. I do not accept the notion that the Departments of HEW-OEO could be eliminated nor diluted. This same appeal has been made to poor and near poor people throughout the report has ignored this appeal and the harm, physical, to the poor and near poor, which has been done and which can be greatly increased by dilution of HEW-OEO.

While the report mentions manpower it does not mention the effective of low income and insufficient job training. It is my position that the position of the people is that of the people. People need to be informed of the health education of the people in the community.
The theme of this Committee report is that health education must be made more complete and effective to achieve optimal improvement in its health education seems unassailable. Furthermore, I agree that the concept of “National Center,” as a focal point of action could effectively promote health education.

Under the constraints of time and funding, the need to deal in depth with the problems of and with the complexities and interrelationships of the concept of the “National Center.” Consequently, I support this report in two respects.

(1) The implication that the entire Committee rejected the idea that the Departments of HEW-OEO could not do the work as proposed for the new foundation. I do not and have not concurred in that decision.

(2) The report mentions meeting with the directors of neighborhood health centers, but it does not state that these directors made a special plea that the government extend the life of OEO and that the funds and purposes of HEW-OEO would not be eliminated nor diluted. This same appeal has been made by the poor and near poor people throughout the country. Yet the report has ignored this appeal and the harm, both mentally and physically, to the poor and near poor, which is already being done and which can be greatly increased by diverting both funds and functions of HEW-OEO.

While the report mentions manpower it lacks substantial substance and direction. There was insufficient information on the effect of low income and insufficient jobs for people who want to work. It is my position that the position of the lady who stated in effect, before the Committee “that she did not need anyone to tell her how to cook or what to cook, what she needed was a good job so she could buy what she needed,” reflects the opinion and plea of many. Third, the Committee’s report does not do justice to the work and accomplishments of the Departments of HEW-OEO in elevating both the health and health education of the people in the community. The truth is
practically all of the recommendations made in the report are being executed in OEO and perhaps HEW funded health centers. The main weakness of HEW-OEO to date, is the lack of coordination. If any program is going to be accountable to the people rather than directed to the people, then the people, like institutions, must be given a reasonable time to organize.

The accountability of a national health center is lacking in the report. Many consumers have stated that federally funded health programs should be accountable to the people they propose to serve. I concur with that conclusion. If a national health center for health education is to serve the American public, it should be accountable to the American people and it should have more than token representation from the poor and near poor members of our society at every level of policy and decision making which affects them.

While some of the issues of “dissent” concerning the report of the President’s Committee on Health Education as expressed by Dr. Joy G. Cauffman may not be completely obvious in the report, it is my opinion that the items of “dissent” have validity and it is unfortunate that greater attention was not paid to them.
Dissents

JOSEPH A. BEIRNE
President
Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO

If the President's Committee on Health Education presents the proposed report to the President, I believe we will have missed, or at least delayed for a considerable time, an opportunity to change public attitudes toward health. It is with reluctance that I dissent from this report.

We already have lost five years. In late 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower made recommendations on the kind of consumer-oriented health education envisioned by President Nixon when he formed the present Committee. I do not believe we will be doing the President a service by proffering this report, since Mr. Nixon showed so great an interest in health education in his Health Message to the Congress of February 15, 1971, and in his subsequent charge to the Committee.

The report, as presented for final ratification by members of the Committee, also does an injustice to the nearly 300 citizens and health professionals who testified at the eight public hearings, in my view.

I strongly believe that the National Center for Health Education, if formed within the framework of this report, will not be effective. And thus, in the future, it will be doubly difficult to do a proper job, because of a need to undo what has been improperly entered upon. I do not agree with the first sentence of the letter of transmittal that the Committee has completed its work, and I will explain briefly below.

In the letter of transmittal, the Committee would note that only $30-million is allocated in Fiscal 1973 for specific programs in health education, plus $14-million for general programs, both within the budget of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. To that total of $44-million would be added up to $3-million a year, according to the final paragraph of Section IV, "Findings and Recommendations: National Center for Health Education." Thus, the letter of transmittal and Section IV tell the President that less than 25¢ per person per year for health education purposes. If we of the Committee have to tell the President that the proposed amendment will have no effect on health education, we will be doing a disservice to the nation. Other portions of the proposed report, Section III, describe a sizeable problem.

Section III proposes a private, nonprofit, Congressional mandate, financed jointly by public and private funds. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is mentioned in those lines, for nearly five years has proven that a sizeable problem can be attacked because of the tangled relationship between sources of funds.

The central entity, which would serve as a "billboard," is the only logical means of achieving a plan that is otherwise too timidly in this report—seen in Section IV. The achievement can be only if the needed funds and personal commitments are present.

In Section IV, I note that the Center would need to have information and expertise for lawmakers, but not on its own behalf for the necessary authorizations. Since the proposed report does not state that there will be no advocate in the legislative process, there is the commitment from the professional health organizations, the conclusion that that commitment is non-existent to find, anywhere in this draft report, to the chief professional health organizations: American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, American Public Health Association, and American Dental Association. For meaning, I believe we should be able to tell
President's Committee on Health Education presents a report to the President. I believe we will have least delayed for a considerable time, an opportunity to educate public attitudes toward health. It is with reluctance this report.

I have lost five years. In late 1967, the National Commission on Health Manpower made recommendations—kind of consumer-oriented health education. President Nixon when he formed the present Committee, believes we will be doing the President a service with this report, since Mr. Nixon showed so great an interest in health education in his Health Message to the Congress on January 15, 1971, and in his subsequent charge to the committee, also does an injustice to the nearly 300 citizens professionals who testified at the eight public hearings.

I believe that the National Center for Health Education within the framework of this report, will not be as difficult to do as, because of a need to undo what has been entered upon. I do not agree with the first sentence of transmittal that the Committee has completed its work explain briefly below.

In Section IV, I note that the Center would be a source of information and expertise for lawmakers, but it would not lobby on its own behalf for the necessary authorization and appropriations. Since the proposed report does not state who will be the advocate in the legislative process, there is the strong possibility that there will be no advocate. Anyone who has had any connection with the legislative process in Washington is aware that a socially useful program must have strong advocates to go beyond the mere idea stage. The lack of definitive information—which I have asked since May 1972—as to the degree of commitment from the professional health organizations leads me to the conclusion that that commitment is non-existent. It is impossible to find, anywhere in this draft report, the mere mention of the chief professional health organizations; nor is it possible to find definitive information as to what the special subcommittee was able to achieve with the professional groups. Four of these groups are key to success: American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, American Public Health Association, and American Dental Association. For our report to have meaning, I believe we should be able to tell the President that

the President that less than 25¢ per person per year is envisioned for health education purposes, if we of the Committee attempt to tell the President that the proposed amounts will have an effect on health education, we will be doing a disservice to the nation. Other portions of the proposed report, especially Section II, describe a sizeable problem.

Section III proposes a private, nonprofit organization with a Congressional mandate, financed jointly by Federal and private funds. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, established on those lines, for nearly five years has proven unable to function because of the tangled relationship between those two basic sources of funds.

The central entity, which would serve as catalyst and "gadfly," is the only logical means of achieving what we have altogether too timidly in this report—seen as necessary. It will achieve only if the needed funds and personal and organizational commitments are present.

In Section IV, I note that the Center would be a source of information and expertise for lawmakers, but it would not lobby on its own behalf for the necessary authorization and appropriations. Since the proposed report does not state who will be the advocate in the legislative process, there is the strong possibility that there will be no advocate. Anyone who has had any connection with the legislative process in Washington is aware that a socially useful program must have strong advocates to go beyond the mere idea stage. The lack of definitive information—which I have asked since May 1972—as to the degree of commitment from the professional health organizations leads me to the conclusion that that commitment is non-existent. It is impossible to find, anywhere in this draft report, the mere mention of the chief professional health organizations; nor is it possible to find definitive information as to what the special subcommittee was able to achieve with the professional groups. Four of these groups are key to success: American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, American Public Health Association, and American Dental Association. For our report to have meaning, I believe we should be able to tell the President that
these have joined in the efforts of the President's Committee on
Health Education.

When in May 1972 I forwarded preliminary views on the
Committee's work, I believed the Committee was not confronting
the issues head-on. I do not see that situation changed in the
final draft.

JOY G. CAUFFMAN, Ph.D.*
School of Medicine
University of Southern California

Having had such great faith and expectations in the work
of the President's Committee on Health Education, it is with keen
disappointment that I find it necessary to dissent from the Report
to the President. My professional ethics and integrity, however,
offer me no alternative. In preparing this dissent my goal has
been to state the facts as I see them, and when possible, to offer constructive suggestions which will prove useful to individu-
als and groups who are interested in improving the quality of life
and the health of the nation through health education.

Goals Left Unfulfilled

A careful analysis of the Report clearly demonstrates that

*On November 28, 1972, I prepared a first Dissent. It was based on the Report of the President's Committee on Health Education dated December 15, 1972 (ninth draft) which was distributed to the total Committee by the Chairman of the Editorial Subcommittee on November 22, 1972 for approval or dissent within ten days. Subsequently, the December 15, 1972 Report was altered but without repolling of the total Committee. (This altered draft was dated December 11, 1972.)

On December 29, 1972, I prepared a second Dissent which is basically the same as my first Dissent but which takes into account alterations appearing in the tenth draft. This second Dissent is based on the Report of the President's Committee on Health Education dated December 11, 1972 (tenth draft) which was distributed at some later date to some members of the Committee before it was submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare on December 14, 1972. (If the reader is confused by the dates given, please note that the Report dated December 15, 1972 preceded the Report dated December 11, 1972.)
JOY G. CAUFFMAN, Ph.D.*  
School of Medicine  
University of Southern California

In May 1972 I forwarded preliminary views on the President's work, I believed the Committee was not confronting head-on. I do not see that situation changed in the

Committee Procedures Irregular

The Report represents the end product of over a year's work by the Committee. Efforts leading to the Report were conducted under conditions in which staff was permitted to usurp Committee responsibility and in which Committee leadership was ineffective in pursuiting the President's assignment. Processes involved in producing the Report have not contributed to its credibility. For example, information submitted to the staff often either never reached or was censored before reaching the Full Committee. Committee leadership involved its members in meaningless exercises and failed to properly use their talents and resources.

The Nature and Meaning of Health Education Distorted

The substance of the Report becomes distorted because of its failure to clearly focus on the subject of health education. Obviously, health education should be the central issue since both the title of the Committee and the Charge to the Committee explicitly state this responsibility. However, the Report improperly emphasizes ancillary issues such as the history of medicine and public health, health problems, and health care. In the process of interweaving health education with other ancillary issues, essential distinctions are not always clearly delineated and viable linkages are not always provided between the ancillary issues and health education. Thus, the total conceptualization of the Report lacks rational thinking, continuity, suitable perspective, and integration. Because of these significant deficiencies in the Report, the nature and meaning of health education are heavily clouded and the Report becomes less than professional in its misdirected effort to interpret health education to the public.
Leadership Opportunities for Professional Health Educators Denied

The Report does not provide the leadership opportunities which professional health educators rightfully deserve and are capable of assuming. The chance to remove any prejudicial barrier which may stand between their professional capability and achievement is lost. For example, the Report should, but does not, specify that the National Center for Health Education will have both an administrator and a Health Education Director. The Director should be a professional health educator with background and experience in community and school health education and should hold a position in the Center which is analogous to a position held by a physician who is a Medical Director in a hospital. Further, the Report should, but does not, specify that professional community and school health educators should share leadership roles for health education at high policy making and administrative levels within Federal, State, and Local Government.

Support for Critical Health Educator Manpower Shortages Omitted

The Report reflects the need for increased health educator manpower in the United States, particularly in early childhood, school, and hospital settings. At the same time, the Report fails to recommend support of training programs for professional health educators, but conversely recommends support of training programs for non-professionals such as “paramedics” and volunteers who are to perform health education functions. Extending non-professional manpower in health education without proportionate expansions in already depleted professional health educator ranks places an unrealistic burden on existing manpower. Therefore, the Federal Government should, as a manpower priority, extend its present training programs for community health educators to include school health educators. The over 100 institutions of higher education in the United States that prepare professional health educators and that are capable of contributing a strong basic health science input should conduct these training programs.

The Unified Voice for the Health Education Profession Ignored

The Report discriminates against the Coalition of Health Education Organizations* representing the health education profession and consists of health education organizations in the United States. The Report should, but does not, specify that the National Center for Health Education will have both an administrator and a Health Education Director. The Director should be a professional health educator with background and experience in community and school health education and should hold a position in the Center which is analogous to a position held by a physician who is a Medical Director in a hospital. Further, the Report should, but does not, specify that professional community and school health educators should share leadership roles for health education at high policy making and administrative levels within Federal, State, and Local Government.

Value of Mass Media Not Fully Recognized

While no health education program can be fully implemented through only mass media, it is important for the Report to clearly specify the mass media’s involvement since media have favorably and unfavorably influencing the opinions of millions of Americans. The Report does pay partial subject to the subject of mass media in relation to the National Health Education, but otherwise neglects to establish linkages between health education practitioners and specialists within both large networks and local program.

*Member organizations of the Coalition include the American Public Health Association, Public Health Education Section; the American School Health Association, the Coalition of Territorial Directors of Public Health Education; the Society of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Soc Education, Inc.
Opportunities for Professional Leadership Denied

The Report does not provide the leadership opportunities that health educators rightfully deserve and are entitled to. The chance to remove any prejudicial barrier that stands between their professional capability and their position is lost. For example, the Report should, but does not, recommend that the National Center for Health Education be a professional health educator with experience in community and school health. It should hold a position in the Center which is equivalent to that held by a physician who is a Medical School administrator and a Health Education Director. Further, the Report should, but does not, recommend a position for health educators at high policy and administrative levels within Federal, State, and local governments.

Professional Health Educators Omitted

The Report discriminates against the Coalition of National Health Education Organizations† representing the unified voice of the health education profession and consisting of all national health education organizations in the United States with identifiable health educator memberships and on-going health education programs. This is apparent since only a single reference is made to the Coalition in the Table of Organization for the National Center for Health Education. This single reference clearly shows that the Coalition would have no direct role in establishing Center policy. In an effort which anticipates mounting a comprehensive nationwide health education program, it is inconceivable that the primary full time providers of health education services in this country are virtually ignored. Thwarting the profession dissipates valuable trained resources contributing to the nation’s health. As a result, the American people stand to lose.

Value of Mass Media Not Fully Recognized

While no health education program can be fully and effectively implemented through only mass media, it would have been important for the Report to clearly specify the dimensions of mass media’s involvement since media have potential for both favorably and unfavorably influencing the quality of life for millions of Americans. The Report does pay passing attention to the subject of mass media in relation to the National Center for Health Education, but otherwise neglects to encourage sound linkages between health education practitioners and mass media specialists within both large networks and local outlets.

†Member organizations of the Coalition include the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, School Health Division; the American College Health Association, Health Education Section; the American Public Health Association, Public Health Education Section and School Health Section; the American School Health Association, the Conference of State and Territorial Directors of Public Health Education; the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and the Society for Public Health Education, Inc.
National Center for Health Education
Unaccountable to the Nation

The Report projects, "the operating budget of the Center for the first five years would be $12 million to $15 million" and "the program budget would be somewhat higher. . . ." The budget projections however do not specify major categories of anticipated expenditures and do not relate expenditures to functions of the Center. Therefore, specification of functional priorities within the Center have not been delineated within the Report. In addition, the Report also fails to develop a plan of evaluation, including accountability for Center functions. Such an omission is particularly difficult to understand in light of the numerous findings and recommendations on the subject of evaluation within the Report, and in view of the role the Center will play in evaluating the health education efforts of others. If clearly described evaluation programs apply to all other health education programs, the Center should not be immune; to the contrary, the Center must play an exemplar role. Furthermore, since the Center is to serve the American public, it must be accountable to the people. To do otherwise is hypocrisy.

American People Victims of False Promises

All who wished to testify at the Regional Hearings held in major cities across the nation during January, 1972 were given an opportunity to be heard. Many speakers waited endless hours to testify and were promised that their presentations would be given careful attention. It is a grievous fault that the Full Committee never reviewed the total input in recorded form or through a carefully prepared summary. This casual treatment of information by the Committee demonstrates its failure to utilize the full range of information received in selecting major ideas for the Report.

Following the National Health Forum which was held in New Orleans in March, 1972, Medical World News reported that the Committee did not keep its promise to participants by providing preliminary findings at the Forum. This was true. Participants at the Forum, however, were assured by Committee leadership that their input would be careful Full Committee. This was not done. Even more fact that the body of the Report does not contain the National Health Forum.

Implementation and Follow-up Disregarded

The Report includes over 30 recommendations of "National Activities in Support of Health Education" which should be cooperation with state and local leadership. The fact is that many of the recommendations readily feasible is missing from the Plan of the Report recommends that model health education programs be encouraged, but fails to include in such laws and the Report that the Nation's hospitals provide health education but fails to suggest the nature and scope of the Report should contain guidelines for implementation.

COMMENTS BY VICTOR WEINGART

Dr. Cauffman's prime concern seems to be like to have a larger role assigned to the "Health Organizations" which she currently her complaints, the Coalition is recognized but not the professional organizational role in implementing the Committee's prima Another prime concern of Dr. Cauffman relates to the belief that the report ought to be more forceful to support the injection of professional health virtually every walk of life wherein health ed Most of the Committee were unable to support the scope of these recommendations, albeit re
Center for Health Education
Role to the Nation

Report projects, "the operating budget of the Center five years would be $12 million to $15 million" and that budget would be somewhat higher. . . . The sections however do not specify major categories of expenditures and do not relate expenditures to the Center. Therefore, specification of functional thin the Center have not been delineated within the addition, the Report also fails to develop a plan of including accountability for Center functions. Such is particularly difficult to understand in light of the findings and recommendations on the subject of evaluation in the Report, and in view of the role the Center will play in the health education efforts of others. If clearly evaluation programs apply to all other health education programs, the Center should not be immune; to the contrary, must play an exemplar role. Furthermore, since the serve the American public, it must be accountable. To do otherwise is hypocrisy.

People Victims of False Promises

Dr. Cauffman's prime concern seems to be that she would like to have a larger role assigned to the "Coalition of National Health Organizations" which she currently heads. Contrary to her complaints, the Coalition is recognized as one of the major—but not the sole—professional organization which can play a role in implementing the Committee's primary recommendation.

Another prime concern of Dr. Cauffman relates to her apparent belief that the report ought to be more forceful in attempting to support the injection of professional health educators into virtually every walk of life wherein health education is important. Most of the Committee were unable to support the extent and scope of these recommendations, albeit recognizing the impor-
tance of professional health educators as the report does. It seems apparent that professional health educators have important work to do in inducing enlarged public support for their activities.

We regret the misunderstanding which has led to Dr. Cauffman’s complaint about the sharing of data. Data collected from all sources were made available, not to all members of all subcommittees, but to the appropriate subcommittees on which members served. Dr. Cauffman, for example, received all papers and testimony relating to school health education, her primary study area. No member received copies of all 2,000 papers, 71 hours of testimony, reports, etc., although all Committee members received a summary of analysis of all testimony at all regional hearings, especially prepared for the Committee by the American Institutes for Research.

In addition, a major portion of one Committee meeting was devoted to an exchange of experiences and information about members’ participation in the eight regional hearings.

And finally, Dr. Cauffman would prefer that there be included more details with respect to a number of the recommendations of the report. Most of the Committee believed that such details should be left to the implementing responsibility of the proposed Center and of the myriad of public and private organizations whose work impacts upon effective health education.
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Emory School of Medicine  
Emory University  
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Don W. Schmidt  
Director  
Lions International  
Cedartown, Georgia
Thomas F. Sellers, Jr., M.D.
Chairman and Professor
Department of Preventive Medicine
and Community Health
Emory School of Medicine
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Sencer, M.D., Chief
National Center for Disease Control
Atlanta, Georgia 30333

Mr. Mary Lou Skinner
Health Education Consultant
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
Regional Office IV
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

John H. Venable, M.D., Director
Georgia Department of Public Health
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Jack H. Watson, Jr.
King & Spaulding
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Robert E. Wells, M.D.
Medical Association of Atlanta
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

HOUSTON
Deral Castle (Co-Chairman)
Director of Health Education
Harris County Health Dept.
Houston, Texas

Scottie Gale Stevenson
(Co-Chairman)
Director of Health Education
City of Houston Health Department
Houston, Texas

Bess Atwell
Hester House
Houston, Texas

Eugene W. Aune
Vice President, Public Relations
Group Hospital Service, Inc.
Dallas, Texas 75201

Grant Burton
Director of Health Education
Texas State Health Department
Austin, Texas 78756

Hugh H. Ford, D.D.S.
Health Care Inc.
Houston, Texas 77022

Mrs. Helen Hill
Chairman, Health Education Section
Texas Public Health Association
Austin, Texas

Mrs. Alice Johnson
Regional Health Education Consultant
Public Health Service
Dallas, Texas 75202

Mary Lou King
Director of Education
American Cancer Society
Harris County Unit
Houston, Texas 77006

Mary Ella Montague, Ph.D.
Health and Physical Education Department
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

Johnny W. R. Smith
Harris County Community Action Association
Houston, Texas

Reuel A. Stallones, M.D., Dean
University of Texas
School of Public Health
Houston, Texas

Lewis Spears, Consultant
Health and Physical Education Department
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas 78711

Marian Upchurch
Health Educator
City of Houston Health Department
Houston, Texas

Carlos Valbonas, M.D., Chairman
Department of Community Medicine
Baylor University Medical School
Houston, Texas
Neighborhood Health Center Directors Who Attended Special Meeting Of Committee

Ernest B. Campbell
Project Director
Matthew Walker Health Center
Nashville, Tennessee 37208

Robert E. Clements
San Luis
Sangre de Cristo Comprehensive
Health Center
San Luis, Colorado 81152

Clifton Cole, Director
Watts Neighborhood Health Center
Los Angeles, Calif. 90002

Forest A. Cornwell, M.D.
Mountaineer Family Health Plan
Appalachian Regional Hospital
Beckley, West Virginia 25801

Robert Council, Jr.
West Oakland Health Center
Oakland, Calif. 94607

James H. Daugherty, ex-officio
Deputy Equal Employment
Opportunity Officer
CHS, HSMHA, DHEW
Parklawn Building
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Doris DeSainz
Hunts Point Multi-Service Center
Corporation Health Center
Bronx, New York 10456

Edward G. Dreyfus, M.D.
Denver Neighborhood Health Program
Eastside Neighborhood Health Center
Denver, Colorado 80205

Dr. Reginald Fitz, Guest
Commonwealth Fund
York, New York

David French, M.D.
Roxbury Comprehensive
Community Health Center
Boston, Mass. 02119

Jack Geiger, M.D.
Stony Brook University
Health Science Center
Stony Brook, New York 11790

J. Wayman Henry, Jr.
Admin. for East Baltimore Medical
Program
Johns Hopkins Hospital
Baltimore, Md. 21205

A. J. Henley
Yeatman Health Care Program
St. Louis, Missouri 63106

Charles R. Humphrey, M.D.
Development of Comprehensive
Health Care System in a Rural
Area of Mississippi
Fayette, Mississippi 39069

Carlos Perez Medinas, Director
Alviso Family Health Center, Inc.
Alviso, California 95002

Guests:
Juan Aldana
Chairman of the Board
Ruben Orozco
Community Developer

Jordan Popkin, Interim Director
Community Health Service
Parklawn Building, Room 7-05
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Sondra Reid
Atlanta Southside Comprehensive
Health Center
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Harvey I. Stoane, M.D.
Park-DuValle Neighborhood
Health Center
Louisville, Kentucky 40211

Eddie G. Smith, Jr., D.D.S.
Upper Cardozo Community—
Group Health Foundation, Inc.
Washington, D.C. 20010

Guest:
Mrs. Elois H. Jones
Community Group Health Fdn.

Mrs. Lula Tharpe, Coordinator
Education and Training
Economic Opportunity Family
Health Center, Inc.
Miami, Florida 33147

Gary L. Tischler, M.D.
Acting Director
Hill-West Haven Division
Connecticut Mental Health Center
New Haven, Conn. 06518

Carlos Vallbona, M.D.
Harris County Hospital District
Houston, Texas 77025

Courtney Wood, M.D.
Mt. Sinai Hospital
New York, New York

Wayne S. Zundel, M.D.
Neighborhood Health Center
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Governmental Agencies Represented
At Sub-Committee Discussions Of Their
Possible Role In Health Education

U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Extension Service (national office)
- Cooperative Extension Service, University of Maryland

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Food and Drug Administration
- Bureau of Community Environmental Management
- Comprehensive Health Planning
- Indian Health Service
- Migrant Health Branch
- National Clearing House for Smoking and Health
- National Health Service Corps
- Office of Communications
  - Region II
  - Regional Medical Programs Service
  - Northeast Ohio Regional Medical Program
- Office of Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs—
  Health Needs of Spanish-Surnamed Americans
- Office of Consumer Services
- Social and Rehabilitative Services

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

U.S. Department of Labor
- Manpower Administration

Civil Service Commission

Veterans Administration
- Wadsworth Medical Center, Los Angeles

State Governments
- Kansas State Board of Health, Material and Child Health
- Kentucky Department of Health, Health Education
- Maryland State Department of Health, Health Education
- New Jersey State Health Department, Program Planning and Education

Local Government
- St. Louis County Health Department

IN ADDITION:
National Institute of Medicine
- School of Public Health

University of California
Organizations Which Responded To Questionnaires

Foundations
Allen P. & Josephine B. Green Foundation
Mexico, Missouri
Joslin Diabetes Foundation, Inc.
Boston, Massachusetts

Hospitals
Albert Einstein Medical Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Charles T. Miller Hospital
Health Education Department
St. Paul, Minnesota
Children's Hospital Medical Center
Cincinnati, Ohio
Health Education Services
Department of Health and Hospitals
Denver, Colorado
Lankenau Hospital
Health Education Department
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Lutheran Medical Center
Brooklyn, New York
Moss Rehabilitation Hospital
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Porter Memorial Hospital
Denver, Colorado
Rutland Heights Hospital
Rutland, Massachusetts
St. Helena Hospital and Health Center
Deer Park, California
U.S. Public Health Service Hospital
Careville, Louisiana
U.S. Public Health Service Hospital
Staten Island, New York
University Hospitals of Cleveland
Cleveland, Ohio

Professional Organizations
American Academy of Pediatrics
Evanston, Illinois
American College of Preventive Medicine
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania
American Dental Association
Chicago, Illinois
American Hospital Association
Chicago, Illinois
American Medical Association
Chicago, Illinois
American Medical Technologists
Park Ridge, Illinois
American Nurses' Association
New York, N.Y.
The American Occupational Therapy Association, Inc.
New York, N.Y.
American Optometric Association
St. Louis, Missouri
American Podiatry Association
Washington, D.C.
American Public Health Association
Washington, D.C.
American School Health Association
Kirt, Ohio
The American Society for Geriatric Dentistry
Chicago, Illinois
The American Society of Clinical Pathologists
Chicago, Illinois
Arizona Medical Association, Inc.
Phoenix, Arizona
Arkansas Medical Society
Fort Smith, Arkansas

Hawaii Medical Association
Honolulu, Hawaii
The Kansas Medical Society
Topeka, Kansas
Maine Medical Association
Brunswick, Maine
Massachusetts Medical Society
Boston, Massachusetts
Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of the State of Maryland
The State Medical Society
Baltimore, Maryland
National League for Nursing
New York, N.Y.
National Program for Dermatology
Portland, Oregon
Nebraska Medical Association
Lincoln, Nebraska
Oklahoma State Medical Association
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Pennsylvania Medical Society
Lemoyne, Pennsylvania
State Medical Society of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
Student American Medical Association
Rolling Meadows, Illinois
Tennessee Medical Association
Nashville, Tennessee
Vermont State Medical Society
Rutland, Vermont
The Washington State Medical Association
Seattle, Washington

Voluntary and Public Agencies
Alabama Department of Public Health Bureau of Primary Prevention
Montgomery, Alabama
American Association for Maternal and Child Health, Inc.  
Chicago, Illinois

American Cancer Society, Inc.  
New York, N.Y.

American Heart Association  
New York, N.Y.

American Nursing Home Association  
Washington, D.C.

American Social Health Association  
New York, N.Y.

The Arthritis Foundation  
New York, N.Y.

Diabetes Education Center  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Florida Department of Education  
Tallahassee, Florida

Group Hospital Service  
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Iowa State Services for Crippled Children  
Iowa City, Iowa

Maternity Center Association  
New York, N.Y.

The National Council on Alcoholism, Inc.  
New York, N.Y.

National Environmental Health Association  
Denver, Colorado

National Kidney Foundation, Inc.  
New York, N.Y.

National Multiple Sclerosis Society  
New York, N.Y.

Tuberculosis-Respiratory Disease Association of Nassau-Suffolk  
Riverhead, New York

Business and Industry

Aetna Life and Casualty  
Hartford, Connecticut

American Marketing Association  
Chicago, Illinois

American Telephone and Telegraph Co.  
New York, N.Y.

Blue Cross Association  
Chicago, Illinois

Celanese Corporation  
New York, N.Y.

CIBA-GEIGY Corporation  
Summit, New Jersey

Communications Workers of America  
Washington, D.C.

Eli Lilly and Company  
Indianapolis, Indiana

General Electric Company  
New York, N.Y.

Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc.  
Nutley, New Jersey

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers  
Washington, D.C.

International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO-CLC  
Washington, D.C.

Iowa Medical Service  
Des Moines, Iowa

Liberty Life Assurance Company of Boston  
Boston, Massachusetts

Merck, Sharp and Dohrn  
West Point, Pennsylvania

Metropolitan Life Insurance  
New York, N.Y.

Mobil Oil Corporation  
New York, N.Y.

National Association of Shield Plans  
Chicago, Illinois

New York Life Insurance  
New York, N.Y.

New York Telephone Company  
New York, N.Y.

North Carolina Blue Cross and Blue Shield  
Durham, North Carolina

Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association  
Washington, D.C.

The Travelers Insurance  
Hartford, Connecticut

United Mine Workers of America  
Washington, D.C.

United Steelworkers of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

U.S. Steel Corporation  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Western Electric  
General Medical Directors Association  
New York, N.Y.

Westinghouse Electric  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Xerox Corporation  
Business Products Group  
Rochester, New York
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna Life and Casualty</td>
<td>Hartford, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Marketing Association</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Telephone and Telegraph Co.</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross Association</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celanese Corporation</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBA-GEIGY Corporation</td>
<td>Summit, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Workers of America</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Lilly and Company</td>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electric Company</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc.</td>
<td>Nutley, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Medical Service</td>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Life Assurance Company of Boston</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merck, Sharp and Dohme</td>
<td>West Point, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Life Insurance Company</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobil Oil Corporation</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Blue Shield Plans</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Life Insurance Company</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Telephone Company</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Blue Cross and Blue Shield</td>
<td>Durham, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Travelers Insurance Company</td>
<td>Hartford, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Mine Workers of America</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Steelworkers of America</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Steel Corporation</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Electric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Medical Director's Organization</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westinghouse Electric Corporation</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Products Group</td>
<td>Rochester, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governmental Agencies Which Responded To Chairman's Request For Information

Department of Housing and Urban Development
Federal Trade Commission
Department of the Treasury
Department of State
Veterans Administration
Smithsonian Institution
Small Business Administration
General Services Administration
Department of Defense
U.S. Department of Interior
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Action
United States Atomic Energy Commission
Federal Maritime Commission
Federal Communications Commission
Selective Service System
Civil Aeronautics Board
National Endowment for the Arts
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
Federal Mediation and Conciliation

Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Federal Power Commission
Federal Home Loan Bank Board
Federal Reserve System
Office of the Attorney General
Agency for International Development
United States Information Agency
Occupational Safety and Health
U.S. Department of Labor
Securities and Exchange Commission
U.S. Department of Commerce
Railroad Retirement Board
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Central Intelligence Agency
National Science Foundation
U.S. Department of Transportation
Interstate Commerce Commission
Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Persons Who Gave Testimony
Written And/Or Oral At Regional Hearings

Patrick Accardi, Dir.
Health Education—Public Information
State of Tennessee
Dept. of Public Health
Nashville, Tenn.

M. Gene Aldridge, M.A.
Research Associate
Interhospital Education Association
Porter/Swedish Hospitals
Englewood, Col.

Doris Alexander, Director
Demonstration Day Care Project
State Dept. of Social Services
Raleigh, N.C.

E. Jack Allison, Jr., M.P.H.
Medical Student
Bynum, N.C.

Mrs. Leona Allman, Consumer Specialist
Food and Drug Administration
Dallas District
Dallas, Tex.

Mrs. Alan Amper
KDKA Caii for Action
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Stanley B. Anderson, Jr., D.D.S.
Chairman Council on Dental Health
Southern Calif. Dental Health
Southern Calif. Dental Association
Los Angeles, Calif.

Ann M. Anzola
Coordinator for Community Health
Education
Albany Medical College
Albany, N.Y.

S. B. Archiquet, Director
Indian Center
Denver, Col.

W. Brent Arnold
Executive Physical Fitness Specialist
Xerox Recreation Association Inc.
Rochester, N.Y.

Sigmund Arywitz, Executive Sec.-Treas.
L.A. Federation of Labor
Vice Chairman, Calif. Council for
Health Planning Alternatives
AFL-CIO
Los Angeles, Calif.

Arthur A. Atkinson
Prof. of Urban Health
The University of Texas at Houston
School of Public Health
Houston, Tex.

Roger Aubrey
Guidance Director and Health Ed.
Brookline Public Schools
Brookline, Mass.

Mrs. Mildred Avery, Past President
National New Professional Health
Workers
Allegheny County Health Department
Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. John Baca
Albuquerque, New Mexico

William C. Banton II, M.D., M.P.H.
Health Commissioner
City of St. Louis
St. Louis, Mo.

Melvin L. Barlow
Prof. of Education
University of Calif.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Marion C. Barnard, M.D.
Bakersfield, Calif.

Byron A. Barnes, Ph.D.
St. Louis College of Pharmacy
St. Louis, Mo.

Harriet Barr
SOPHE
North Carolina Association of Health
Education:
Durham, N.C.

Jenny Batongmaloque, M.D.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Herbert Bauer, M.D.
Director of Public Health and
Mental Health
Yolo County Health Dept.
Woodland, Calif.

Dorothy Belcia
Counselor Coordinator
Alcoholism Counseling and
Recovery Program
La Marque, Tex.

Robert A. Bieggar
Counseling Supervisor
L.A. City University School District
Monterey Park, Calif.

Mrs. Z. William Birnbaum, Chairman
Member Services and Hospital
Committee
Group Health Cooperative of
Puget Sound
Seattle, Wash.
Harold J. Fishbein  
Executive Director  
California Association for Maternal and Child Health  
Los Altos, Calif.  

Dolores R. Floss, Executive Director  
New York State Interagency Council on Critical Health Problems  
Albany, N.Y.  

John T. Fodor  
Professor, Dept. of Health Sciences  
San Fernando Valley State College  

Richard Foster, Ed.D., Superintendent  
Berkeley Public Schools  
Berkeley, Calif.  

Floyd E. Galliher  
Senior Citizen Council of Alton, Ill.  

Angelita Garcia  
Health Coordinator  
Colorado Migrant Council  
Denver, Col.  

Hector Garcia, Dr. P.H.  
Associate Professor of Health Education  
University of Calif.  
Los Angeles, Calif.  

Rev. Rene Garcia O.M.I.  
Migrantes Por Salud  
San Juan  

Dorothy B. Garrison  
Action For Boston Community Development, Inc.  
Boston, Mass.  

Glen E. Garrison, M.D.  
Professor & Chairman of Community Medicine  
Associate Professor of Medicine  

Medical Director of Continuing Education  
Medical College of Georgia  
Augusta, Ga.  

H. Marie Garrity, Ed.D.  
Massachusetts Dept. of Education  
Boston, Mass.  

Evalyn S. Gendel, M.D.  
Director  
Division of Maternal and Child Health  
The Kansas State Dept. of Health  
Topeka, Kan.  

Cecil Gibson, Program Director  
Family Planning Program  
Williamson-Burnet County Opportunities  
Georgetown, Tex.  

Seth Gifford, Esq., Chairman  
Action Committee for Health Education  
Providence, R.I.  

Mrs. Opal Cilliam, Board Member  
San Fernando Valley Health Consortium  
Sylmar, Calif.  

Elsie Giorgi, M.D., Director  
Orange County Medical Center  
Orange, Calif.  

L. S. Goerke, M.D.  
Dean, School of Public Health  
Center for the Health Sciences  
U.C.-L.A.  
Los Angeles, Calif.  

Robert Goorleg, M.P.H.  
Chief, Health Education  
Colorado Dept. of Health  
Denver, Col.  

Bonnie Gool  
Eureka, Calif.  

Ira J. Gordon, Ed.D.  
Director, Graduate Res. Institute for the Developement of Human Resources Education  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, Fla.  

Stuart Gothold  
Los Angeles County School  
Los Angeles, Calif.  

Mrs. Anne M. Gough, R.  
Chief of Nursing & Allie  
Colorado-Wyoming Re. Program  
Denver, Col.  

Mrs. Lunie Grace  
Houston Weirare Rights  
Houston, Tex.  

Richard H. Grant, Ed.D.  
San Diego County Court  
Smoking and Health  
San Diego, Calif.  

Lawrence Green, Dr. P.I.  
(Associate Professor  
Johns Hopkins Universi. of Hygiene and Pul  
Baltimore, Md.  

Mrs. Nora Greenburg  
Denver, Col.  

Virginia D. Greer, Consul  
Vallejo, Calif.  

Hershel Griffin, M.D., Dr.  
Graduate School of Pul  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, Pa.
Medical Director of Continuing Education
Medical College of Georgia
Augusta, Ga.

H. Marie Garity, Ed.J.
Massachusetts Dept. of Education
Boston, Mass.

Evalyn S. Gendel, M.D.
Director
Division of Maternal and Child Health
The Kansas State Dept. of Health
Topeka, Kan.

Cecil Gibson, Program Director
Family Planning Program
Williamson-Burnet County Opportunities
Georgetown, Tex.

Seth Gifford, Esq., Chairman
Action Committee for Health Education
Providence, R.I.

Mrs. Opal Gilliam, Board Member
San Fernando Valley Health Consortium
Sylmar, Calif.

Elsie Giorgi, M.D., Director
Orange County Medical Center
Orange, Calif.

L. S. Goerke, M.D.
Dean, School of Public Health
Center for the Health Sciences
UCLA
Los Angeles, Calif.

Robert Gongring, M.P.H.
Chief, Health Education
Colorado Dept. of Health
Denver, Col.

Bonnie Goool
Eureka, Calif.

Ira J. Gordon, Ed.D.
Director, Graduate Research Professor
Institute for the Development of Human Resources, College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Fla.

Stuart Gothold
Los Angeles County Schools
Los Angeles, Calif.

Mrs. Anne M. Gough, R.N.
Chief of Nursing & Allied Health
Colorado-Wyoming Regional Medical Program
Denver, Col.

Mrs. Lunie Grace
Houston Welfare Rights Organization
Houston, Tex.

Richard H. Grant, Ed.D., Chairman
San Diego County Council on Smoking and Health
San Diego, Calif.

Lawrence Green, Dr. P.H.
(Associate Professor)
Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health
Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Nora Greenburg
Denver, Col.

Virginia D. Greer, Consumer
Vallejo, Calif.

Hershel Griffin, M.D., Dean
Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa.
William Griffiths, Ph.D., Chairman
Health Education Program
Head, Division of Behavioral and
Developmental Health Sciences
School of Public Health
University of California
Berkeley, Calif.

Arthur L. Grist
Black Caucus APHA
Edwardsville, Ill.

Jerome Grossman, Ph.D.
Professor of Health Education
School of Public Health
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Herschel Groves
Matthew Walker Health Center
Nashville, Tenn. 37208

Eugene H. Cuthrie, M.D.
Executive Director
Maryland Comprehensive Health Planning Agency
Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Margaret Guy, R.N.
Lubbock City-County Health Dept.
Lubbock, Tex.

Jessie Helen Haag, Ed.D.
Professor of Health Education
Dept. of Physical & Health Education
College of Education
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Tex.

William Hale, Ph.D.
Director
Communications Division
Georgia Center for Continuing Education

Marian V. Hamburg, Ed.D., Prof.
Director of Health Education
New York University
N.Y., N.Y.

Mrs. Mayme Hammond
Consumer and Health Rights Worker
Lutheran Mission Association
St. Louis, Mo.

Mrs. Eunice Hanks
Senior Health Educator
East L.A. Child & Youth Clinic
Los Angeles, Calif.

Don Hanson, R.S.
Compton Health Center
Calif. Environmental Health Assoc.
Southern Chapter
Compton, Calif.

Nathan C. Hanson
Program Director
American Heart Association
Columbus, Ohio

L. E. Tim Hardy, Jr.
Larkin St. Community Center
Houston, Tex.

Mrs. Eone Harger
Adult Education Association of N.J.
Annandale, N.J.

Franklin D. Harris,
Assistant Dir.
Division of Health Education
Dept. of Health
State of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Robert L. Hays
Texas Pharmaceutical Assoc.
Houston, Tex.

Wilma Dean Henry, M.A.
Associate Prof.
Graduate School of S
University of Arkansas
Little Rock, Ark.

Henry R. Herbert, Jr.,I
Associate Coordinator of Health Manp
& Continuing Co
Maryland Regional M
Baltimore, Md.

Sharan Higgins
Home Nutrition Advis
UC Extension
Los Angeles, Calif.

Patricia Hill
Consultant in Health Ed.
Calif. State Dept. of Ed
Sacramento, Calif.

Robert T. Hirst, M.A., I
Director, Health Educ
Porter Memorial Hosp
Denver, Col.

Wilbur Hoff, Dr. P.H.
Institute for Health Re
Berkeley, Calif.

Benjamin Hogue
Navajo Tribal Council
Window Rock, Ariz.

Mrs. Maxine Homer
Director of Health Edu
Montana Board of He.

Steven Homel, M.D.
Consultant, Health Ed
Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
thas, Ph.D., Chairman Program of Behavioral and Mental Health Sciences California

Marian V. Hamburg, Ed.D., Prof. Director of Health Education New York University N.Y., N.Y.

Mrs. Mayme Hammond Consumer and Health Rights Worker Lutheran Mission Association St. Louis, Mo.

Mrs. Eunice Hankins Senior Health Educator East L.A. Child & Youth Clinic Los Angeles, Calif.

Don Hanson, R. S. Compton Health Center Calif. Environmental Health Assoc. Southern Chapter Compton, Calif.

Nathan C. Hanson Program Director American Heart Association Columbus, Ohio

L. E. Tim Hardy, Jr. Larkin St. Community Center Houston, Tex.

Mrs. Eone Harger Adult Education Association of N.J. Annondale, N.J.

Franklin D. Harris, Assistant Dir. Division of Health Education Dept. of Health State of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska


Wilma Daan Henry, M.S.P.H. Associate Prof. Graduate School of Social Work University of Arkansas Little Rock, Ark.

Henry R. Herbert, Jr., M.D. Associate Coordinator for the Division of Health Manpower Development & Continuing Communication Maryland Regional Medical Program Baltimore, Md.

Sharon Higgins Home Nutrition Advisor UC Extension Los Angeles, Calif.

Patricia Hill Consultant in Health Education Calif. State Dept. of Education Sacramento, Calif.

Robert T. Hirst, M.A., M.P.H. Director, Health Education Porter Memorial Hospital Denver, Colo.

Wilbur Hoff, Dr. P.H. Institute for Health Research Berkeley, Calif.

Benjamin Hogue Navajo Tribal Council Window Rock, Ariz.

Mrs. Maxine Homer Director of Health Education Montana Board of Health

Steven Homel, M.D. Consultant, Health Education Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
Paul B. Jennings, M.D.
St. Peter's General Hospital
New Brunswick, N.J.

M. Harry Jennison, M.D., Exec. Dir.
Children's Hospital at Stanford
Chairman, Council on Child Health
American Academy of Pediatrics
Palo Alto, Calif.

Howard P. Jeter
Balboa High Unified Schools
Berkeley, Calif.

Judith Jeter
Castro Valley Unified Schools
Berkeley, Calif.

Tung Ong Jew, Board Member
Northeast Medical Services
San Francisco, Calif.

Mrs. Alice M. Johnson, M.P.H.
Health Education Consultant
Community Health Service, HSMHA
Dallas, Tex.

Bernice T. Johnson
Health Subcommittee Rep. for
Planning Area 2
Texarkana, Texas Model Cities
Project Supervisor-Citizens Participation
Bowie County Economic Advancement Corp.
Texarkana, Tex.

Peter Johnson
Group Against Smog and Pollution
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Robert L. Johnson
Vice President
University of California

Berkeley, Calif.

Paper presented by Harold C. Gustafson, Dr. Ph.

Helen L. Johnston
Rural Health Consultant
APHA

Barbara Jones
Health Education Advisory Team
Fairmont, West Virginia

L. R. Jordan
President
Baptist Medical Centers
Birmingham, Ala.

Beatrice A. Judkins, Program Leader,
Home Economics Liaison,
Family Health Education
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Lloyd Kaiser, President
WQED
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Robert Kaplan, Vice President
American Association for Health,
Physical Education and Recreation
Columbus, Ohio

Raymond Kauffman, Director
Philadelphia Students Concerned with Public Health
Woodbury, N. J.
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