

Free essay on challenging the fructose hypothesis: new perspectives on fructose

[Health & Medicine](#)



Consumption and Metabolism1–3 Analytical Summary

The main topic addressed by this review is Fructose and whether or not the fructose hypothesis is valid. It presents new information that (at the very least) arouses the consideration that fructose alone is not the evil culprit of diseases for which it was blamed. It suggests that fructose was unfairly evaluated. This is based on the fact that fructose is ingested alongside of other causative agents such as food additives, fats, other types of sugars and preservatives. Meanwhile, none of the other additives were put on trial in the same manner. He positions the reader to consider that perhaps fructose judged unfairly.

The fructose hypothesis is that “ fructose is at the root of nay of contemporary America’s health problems” (White 246-256). This hypothesis rests on two explanations. The first explanation is that metabolism-related diseases are related to fructose consumption. Some diseases are “ obesity, diabetes, CVD, hypertension, cancer, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and metabolic syndrome” (White 246-256). These conditions seem to increase along with the increased amount of fructose consumption in the American diet. Secondly, there is a cause-and-effect link between fructose metabolism and these diseases at the usual levels of exposure to fructose.

This topic is quite relevant because all of the diseases mentioned in the article are prevalent in today’s American culture. They are linked to the consumption of foods that have two negative attributes. First, they either break down into sugar after digestion such as white breads, French fries, pastas. Or secondly, they are added in excessive amounts such as with sodas, candies, pastries, pancake syrups, kid’s cereals and other delights.

Many American people are eating these foods huge quantities. It may have led to extreme weight gain that pre-exposes them to very health problems which are difficult to manage. Sugars are even added to salad dressings. Meanwhile, people might believe that they are eating healthy but just didn't consider reading the food label carefully. Certainly, the salad dressing ingredients are not published in the menus of restaurants. In other words, because fructose (HFCS) and other sugars are included in salad dressing, so-called healthy snacks or protein bars, people who are dieting might ingest fructose and other sugars in high amounts without realizing it.

There were several conclusions to which the author arrived. The author of this article concluded that fructose is safe when consumed in moderation. However, it can be very unhealthy to consume fructose in excessively high amounts. The author admits that this statement is true of most nutrients. It is almost common sense. However, when greed and gluttony are a part of daily food regimens, then people might knowingly or unknowingly ingest extreme amounts of food additives with fructose being one of them. Another conclusion that the author came to was quite surprising. He said that American consumers are not abusing fructose, but scientists are the ones inflicting the abuse. This play on words has a double meaning. First, it indicates that Americans are not eating too much fructose. They might be consuming too much of other sugars in conjunction with fructose or other harmful additives. There is no direct connection between fructose by itself and these malicious diseases mentioned in the paper. Secondly, the abuse of fructose by the scientists means simply giving fructose a bad profile or a criminal record that is unjust. A third point made in the conclusion was that

when consumed in moderation, fructose might have a positive effect on glycemic control. However, if and when the scientists overdosed humans and animals with excessive amounts of fructose, adverse effects of fructose were recorded (to support their unfair hypothesis). The fourth conclusion deals with the inclusion of glucose. Apparently, clinical data can be altered to favor the long accepted fructose hypothesis. The data was published about fructose after experiments wherein glucose was added. Everything was based on unrealistic experimental designs and was a waste of tax dollars to conduct. For this reason, the “ last 2 Dietary Guidelines Committees routinely ignored reports of abnormal biochemistry related to fructose.” (White 246-256) It was better to publish recommendations that would encourage eating fructose in moderation along with all macronutrients. The data selected for analysis comes from Figure 3 on page 4 of the article. It shows historical trends about fructose consumption. Unlike that of caloric sweeteners, fructose consumption has stayed relatively the same for 100 years as of 2010. On the other hand, sweetener use has climbed consistently. It has a mild drop in usage from the year 2000 to 2010 as does the fructose. The obesity rate began climbing exponentially in 1960. It continued this trend along with an increase of sweetener usage and despite the fact that fructose usage remained the same without increasing. This graph should surely cause the scientific community to drop the criminal charges against fructose. It shows that the true blame should probably be applied to other forms of glucose that make up the sweeteners. This data certainly justifies the conclusion. It shows that adding fructose to their diet would not cause all of the health problems that Americans are facing

(particularly those that are severely over weight or are experiencing chronic weight-related illnesses). The problem with weight gain is not the fault of fructose. Lack of exercise and unhealthy food wreak more havoc on the human body than fructose alone.

Works Cited

White, John S. " Challenging the Fructose Hypothesis: New Perspectives on Fructose Consumption and Metabolism¹⁻³." American Society for Nutrition. 4. (2013): 246-256. Web. 16 Apr. 2014.