





actions have not resulted in community organizations completely refusing financial support from big soda or big food. From the perspective of communities of color, access to and attention from these companies has represented opportunity, inclusion, and an investment in their futures.

Scholars have argued that the conversation with communities impacted by industry investment need to be reframed by defining opportunity and inclusion; by encouraging organizations representing these communities to become more assertive in their relationships with beverage companies and by being more upfront about promoting healthier products. One thing advocacy organizations have done over time is to fight for increased funding for public education about the health risks associated with sugary drinks to build up community interest and knowledge.

### **2. Factors affecting perception of sugary drinks**

For decades, the tobacco industry (i.e., RJ Reynolds and Phillip Morris) has used its marketing tactics to lure children into consuming their products.(14) In the 1960s, the tobacco industry began purchasing food companies and developing sugary drink products using flavors and colors they had previously developed for use in tobacco products.(15) Products such as Kool-Aid, Tang, Hawaiian Punch and Capri-Sun are examples of the drinks which are developed and marketed disproportionality to children of color by RJ Reynolds and Phillip Morris. Tobacco executives directly transfer marketing expertise, personnel, and resources from their cigarette to their food and beverage enterprises. These companies use marketing tactics previously used to sell tobacco products, such as creating and developing brand characters and creating easy to consume, individually packaged drinks like juice boxes and twist top bottles that did not require adult assistance to entice children into consuming their products. They also combine target marketing with racial and ethnic minority events promotion, minority media outreach, and corporate donations to racial and ethnic minority leadership groups, launching a food industry leader.(16)

A recent report



## Historical Analysis of Structural Racism and Sugary Drinks



## Historical Analysis of Structural Racism and Sugary Drinks

Eight locations across the United States have adopted sugary drink taxes— San Francisco, Oakland, Albany, and Berkeley, CA; Philadelphia, PA; Boulder, CO; Seattle, WA; and Navajo Nation. Several other countries—including Mexico, France, Ireland, Hungary, and the United Kingdom—have all enacted sugary drinks taxes as well.

The perception of the taxes has varied by jurisdiction in the United States. Where the beverage industry has invested more resources between enactment and implementation of the tax, there has been a more negative perception of the tax by the community.(28) In Cook County, Illinois, where a sugary drink tax was enacted and later repealed, the beverage industry sowed distrust and resentment with residents causing a public outcry to repeal the tax.(29) The beverage industry poured millions of dollars into antitax radio, television, and print advertising calling the



## Historical Analysis of Structural Racism and Sugary Drinks

