

# Free essay on health: 10 things coke, pepsi and soda industry wont say - the hard...

[Business](#), [Company](#)



We often find soft drinks in each and every store around us. People of all ages are crazy for drinking these beverages during any season and any time. Today, we even find energy drinks that have been introduced in the market especially for the young people, skateboarders, surfers, and people going to rock concerts. But, along with that we are also finding several oppositions against the beverage manufacturing companies. There was a lawsuit filed against Monster Energy, since it was targeting minors of age six. It was trying to change their mindsets by promoting a lifestyle that includes music, sports, gaming, and so on, which in turn will disturb these young children. Further, as per one of the research reports, it has been found that, there is a lot of caffeine content in these drinks. As a result, young generation people are found facing with issues of heart seizures, racing heartbeat, and severe headaches.

Hence, it is important for the people to realize that, these diet drinks are not any source of health foods. However, as per the research estimates, the sales of these drinks will increase from \$12.5 billion to \$21.5 billion in 2017. On the other hand, the Food and Drug Administration Department have found that the caffeine content has increased a lot. It has reached up to 72 milligrams in a 12-ounce can. It can have a deteriorating impact on health of the people (Brownell & Frieden 1805-1808).

The public-health advocates are trying to increase the federal taxes on the soda and other energy drinks, with a view to bring down its sales. However, the lobbying spending by these soda companies has become 30-fold and has increased to \$40.3 million as per 2009 reports. So, on one hand there are health-enthusiasts who try to protect the health of the people, and on the

other there are people who do not want to stop the selling of such drinks. These companies are now trying to donate huge sums of money, in order to improve their brand image. Coca-Cola recently spent \$45 million on community and charity organizations (Chriqui et al. 227-249).

There was one interesting report found that, which mentioned that, even drinking water selling companies are accepting money from the soda companies. These soda companies are even providing money to the doctors, dietitians, and dentists, for promoting their products as well as not to say any bad thing about the company. Thus, these companies in order to protect their image, they are indulging them into unethical practices. And, in order to silent the critics, they have been making charity donations. All these clearly show that, soda and beverages companies want to make profits at any costs. They do not bother about implementing unethical practices in their organization. They do not even care for the health of the people. Hence, it is important for the people to get aware of such drinks and the practices of these companies, and try to find out alternative solutions such as drinking fruit juices, and natural juices. The government on the other hand needs to take strict actions for overcoming such issues. They need to file a lawsuit against all those companies who are into such unethical practices, in order to protect the lives of the general people.

## **References**

Andreyeva T., M. W. Long, and K. D. Brownell. " The impact of food prices on consumption: a systematic review of research on price elasticity of demand for food." *American Journal of Public Health* 100 (2010): 216-222.

Brownell, K. D., and T. R. Frieden. " Ounces of prevention — the public policy

<https://assignbuster.com/free-essay-on-health-10-things-coke-pepsi-and-soda-industry-wont-say-the-hard-truth-about/>

case for taxes on sugared beverages." *New England Journal of Medicine* 360. 18 (2009): 1805-1808.

Chriqui, J. F., S. S. Eidson, H. Bates, S., Kowalczyk, and F. J., Chaloupka. "State sales tax rates for soft drinks and snacks sold through grocery stores and vending machines." *Journal of Public Health Policy* 29. 2 (2008): 227-249.