

CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING OF OUR RESEARCH ON THE HARMS OF SUGAR

Conclusion presented by Ms Soumia Ben Amar

It is everywhere, we love it, it is beautiful, we ask for it and it gives us an indescribable well-being. Its name alone evokes pleasure and its consumption a culinary orgasm.

It is sugar, that best enemy, that faithful friend who shares our moments of sadness as well as our moments of joy.

Sugar acts on our brains like a drug and the old adage "sugar calls for sugar" is true, since like any addictive product the body craves its fix when it is in withdrawal.

Should we be seen as alarmists when we ask the question: "Is sugar a killer?" or that sugar is a poison when we know that more than 74% of ready-made meals contain **added sugar**?

The answer is no, because it is hidden everywhere: in industrial dishes, soft drinks, cereals, bread, sauces... even cigarettes have not been spared, and in order to drown out the fish, it is not unusual for its presence to be mentioned by a **term other than "sugar"**: fructose, sucrose, maltose, dextrose... so many names that most consumers are unfamiliar with and that mislead them and limit their ability to judge the quality of a product.

It should be noted that the addition of sugar guarantees an increase in sales, and therefore in the turnover of food companies. This is the real reason for its excessive use.

In 2016, the American scientific journal JAMA threw a new stone into the pond and pointed the finger at the powerful sugar lobby, which it denounced as having rigged many studies in order to underestimate the role of sugar in most cardiovascular diseases and to blame fat.

The scientists in charge of these studies are said to have been paid large sums of money to change their conclusions.

The same industry takes the initiative to fund research programmes against tooth decay in order to relegate to the background possible research on the dangers of sugar and its responsibility in the development of numerous diseases.

Even the global soda giant Coca Cola is funding scientific studies in an attempt to exonerate soft drinks from being the cause of many health problems. (note: one Coke contains the equivalent of 7 lumps of sugar, an industrial croissant contains 4 lumps)

In fact, in addition to being a powerful flavour enhancer, sugar improves the texture, lengthens the shelf life of products, delays or even prevents the oxidation of meats, and blocks the development of microbes in cooked meats (sausages, hams, etc.).

The feeding of geese is also very rich in carbohydrates in order to maximise the production of lipids in the liver (more than 80% of energy intake). Our so good foie gras !

The most alarming thing is the amount of sugar ingested by babies. Maltodextrin (A **maltodextrin** is the result of the hydrolysis of a starch (wheat, corn) or a starch (potato). It is therefore made up of different sugars (glucose, maltose, maltotriose, oligosides and polysides) directly resulting from this reaction, in proportions that depend on the degree of hydrolysis).

The verdict is clear; added to all our food at all stages of production, this white powder is addictive from a very young age, and will progressively deteriorate the human being throughout his life.

Don't parents worry about their children's health? Certainly they do, but they don't know that beyond obesity, cavities and diabetes there is one of the greatest ills: **pre-cirrhosis**.

(Often diagnosed at the turn of a blood test, almost by chance, it is a disease (NASH) it is not related to alcohol consumption, this disease would be due to another addiction **sugar**).

Indeed, when the child consumes a large quantity of sugar almost daily, the liver transforms these sugars into triglycerides responsible for this pre-cirrhosis. Worrying, isn't it?

Studies by Professor Lustig, a renowned endocrinologist and pediatrician at the University of California, are unequivocal: "sugar is a toxic substance" and has a disastrous impact on our health, especially in children.

It causes fat accumulation in the liver, cellular ageing, prevents the brain from regulating the sensation of satiety, is responsible for obesity, causes type 2 diabetes, cavities, accelerated ageing, cancer, intestinal candidiasis, heart disease, hypertension and many others.

In France, more than 15% of the population suffers from obesity, which represents 7million people, and more than 3.3% suffer from diabetes.

Yet in a 2015 publication the WHO did call on all countries to reduce sugar intake **to less than 25 gram** per day (6 teaspoons).

The creation and use of the **nutri-score** logo (Mandatory on all pre-packaged foods, the table of nutritional values is often difficult for consumers to decipher. There is a lot of information on the energy value of products, the fat, saturated fatty acid, carbohydrate, sugar, protein and salt content per 100 g or 100 ml of product. To make it easier to understand, the European regulation authorises the inclusion of additional nutritional information on packaging. This has proved to be effective but remains optional, much to the regret of certain consumer rights associations.

Indeed, this colour-based labelling system is based on the voluntary participation of companies, knowing that the major industrial groups such as Coca-Cola, Pepsi and Nestlé wish to counteract it by creating their own three-colour label, the Evolved Nutrition Label Initiative.

These very powerful lobbies always end up winning the battle of finance, against public health, because it is in their interest to avoid transparency on the nutritional composition of their products, so as not to slow down sales.

In May 2018 the National Assembly rejected the modification of food advertising especially for young people under 16.

(Many cinemas, universities, high schools, offer young people various sweets, hunger pills, Pop Corne sweets, chocolate bars, soft drinks, etc., in their environment, thus increasing the much sought-after financial intake).

Did the assembly give in to the agri-food industry lobbies? Should we really ask ourselves this question?

Business or health?

You don't need to be a graduate of Saint-Cyr to understand that these food industries really do have clout and influence, and what does the influence on health matter?

SEE ALSO on the Internet:

<https://www.alternativesante.fr/sucre/les-sugar-ravages>

This analysis is presented in the form of "CONCLUSIONS" because the reproduction here of the numerous files and research carried out over several months, and, having allowed this one, would have been for the readers, fastidious and long, however on simple request we will provide you with copy of these files.

contact@commission-diplomatique-consultative-internationale.org