

Nestle the infant formula controversy

Business



Nestle: The Infant Formula Controversy The responsibility of companies in this situation is to analyze social conditions and possible threats of their products for potential consumers. They should be well aware of educational background of their customers and should not sell a product which can be injurious to health. Lack of knowledge (education) does not allow violation of humans' rights. From the very beginning, they should clearly inform customers about threats and negative impact of the product. A pack of cigarettes is the best example of such type of advertising informing their potential customers about a threat of cancer. Nobody can say that he/she does not know about the threat to be killed by smoking.

2. On the one hand, Nestle should bring a message comprehensible to its customers to avoid accusation in "killing Third World babies". The problem is that the level of education and personal development of mothers in Third World countries is very low. They believe in most things coming from advertising and promotion campaign. Nestle should print warning on each bottle. Nestle did not follow ethics and corporate responsibility, because it did not inform Third World mothers that the product cannot substitute breast milk and, if a mother has no problems with breast feeding, she should use "Nestle" only as additional feeding.

3. To protect itself in the future a company like Nestle should be honest or responsible towards its consumers. It means that it should follow strategies mentioned above (a warning label and a comprehensible message), and should organize special education programs for mothers teaching them how to use the products. This procedure should take place at the beginning stage of a marketing campaign, and take into account national differences, the level of country development, and possible outcomes of their marketing

<https://assignbuster.com/nestle-the-infant-formula-controversy/>

campaign.

4. This case study shows that Nestle pursued its marketing interests more than code of corporate social responsibility and professional ethics. Nestle has not stopped selling " infant formula" being keenly aware of deaths caused by their marketing and promotional campaign. The company should stop selling products like " infant formula", if they cannot be properly used by all buyers. A company should think in terms of 'ends' rather than 'acts'.

5. In this case, HIV infection is more a social problem than an ethical one. If Nestle stops marketing activity in these countries, its competitors will substitute it. So, the only possible solution is to organize new marketing campaign using a slogan like " bottle feeding does not mean HIV", which helps Nestle to survive.