In 2000, the global consumption of carbonated soft drinks (soda) reached 179 billion liters—29.4 liters per person.1 (See Figure 1.) Soda maintained its ranking as the third most popular commercial beverage and edged closer to milk, which fell to 196 billion liters (32.2 liters per person).2 While milk consumption fell 3.0 percent between 1999 and 2000, soda consumption grew 2.9 percent.3

The United States, with less than 5 percent of the world’s population, is the largest soda consumer and accounted for one third of total soda consumption in 1999.4 (See Table 1.) The 58 billion liters sold there generated $48 billion dollars in revenue for the soda industry.5 Soda is already the number one drink for Americans, who took in an average of 211 liters of it in 1999—compared with 109 liters of tap water.6

This rapid growth in soda consumption is also occurring in the developing world. China, with about a fifth of the world’s population, is the fourth largest consumer of soda.7 Between 1994 and 1999, per capita consumption in China grew 60 percent, to 7 liters per year.8 Annual per capita consumption in Brazil, the third largest soda market, also shot up 60 percent between 1994 and 1999, reaching 61 liters per person.9

Unlike juices or milk, which contain vitamins and important minerals like calcium, soda consists of carbonated water, sweeteners (either caloric or high-intensity), flavoring, and in many cases caffeine. Consumption of these calorie-dense but nutritionally devoid drinks often displaces healthier foods, which can lead to dietary deficiencies.10

In the United States, as soda consumption doubled between 1970 and 1999, milk consumption fell 25 percent.11 During this period, total calcium intake by children fell significantly.12 A recent study found that children who drank soda took in a significantly smaller amount of vitamin A and calcium each day than those who drank milk.13 As calcium is central to building strong bones, and as most bone mass in women is built by age 18, an increase in osteoporosis rates is a real threat.14 A recent preliminary study found that drinking soda is significantly associated with increased prevalence of bone fractures in active adolescent women.15

As soda is a large source of added sugars and calories, it can also contribute to obesity. A recent study showed a direct correlation between consumption of sugar-sweetened drinks and childhood obesity.16 The results suggested that children increase their odds of becoming obese by 60 percent with each additional sugar-sweetened drink they consume.17 In America, overweight and obesity among children have tripled to 14 percent since 1970, and have increased to 61 percent among adults.18 On average, Americans consumed about 185 calories from soda each day in 1999, which is more than the suggested daily maximum of added sugars.19

Soda consumption can also contribute to tooth decay. Although all sugars can cause tooth decay, soda is a primary concern because it is often consumed between meals or sipped over a long period, which prolongs the time that sugars remain in the mouth.20

Of the top 10 global brands of soda, more than 80 percent of the volume sold in 1999 contained caffeine.21 This mood-altering drug
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**Figure 1: World Beverage Consumption, 1995–2000**
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is physiologically and psychologically addictive and can produce physical dependence with a daily intake of just 100 milligrams.\textsuperscript{22} Coca-Cola, the world’s most popular brand, contains 34 milligrams of caffeine per 355-milliliter can.\textsuperscript{23} Because the effects of caffeine are weight-proportionate, a child will be more strongly affected by a small amount of caffeine.\textsuperscript{24} While caffeine is supposedly added to enhance soda’s flavor, a recent study found that only a small percentage of consumers were able to tell the difference between caffeinated and caffeine-free colas.\textsuperscript{25}

The soda industry aggressively markets its products. In 2000, the two largest soft drink corporations, the Coca-Cola Company and PepsiCo., spent $4.6 billion worldwide on advertising.\textsuperscript{26} A significant portion of this directly targets children, often connecting soda with children’s heroes. For example, Coca-Cola signed an exclusive $150-million global contract with Warner Brothers, the producer of *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*, to be the sole marketing partner for the movie.\textsuperscript{27}

The soda industry also markets to children in schools, often signing exclusive marketing contracts with school boards, which in many cases tie monetary bonuses to a minimum amount of soda sold. In response, some schools have ended contracts after community objections.\textsuperscript{28} In early 2001, Coca-Cola announced that it would start selling more nutritious beverages along with soda in U.S. schools.\textsuperscript{29} Yet this change is probably as motivated by economic considerations as by grassroots pressure—recognizing that the U.S. soda market is saturated, Coca-Cola has started to diversify its product base to include other soft drinks such as water, juices, and sports drinks.\textsuperscript{30}

With obesity becoming a global epidemic, health organizations and governments are trying to encourage healthier diets and lifestyles.\textsuperscript{31}

In a recent campaign, the Washington-based Center for Science in the Public Interest mobilized the health and education communities to “Save Harry Potter” from Coca-Cola and prevent children from being the target of an aggressive advertising campaign.\textsuperscript{32}

Several countries have restricted the marketing of products to children. In Poland, for example, there is a ban on all television and radio marketing to children, which has significantly reduced product sales, including of soda.\textsuperscript{33} Sweden also bans advertising to children on TV. But because of the strong presence of satellite TV, to which the ban does not apply, this has had less impact on consumption.\textsuperscript{34}

In the United States, several states tax soda and other “junk foods.” California, for example, has a 7.25-percent sales tax on soft drinks, which results in an annual revenue of $218 million.\textsuperscript{35} Junk food taxes help reduce consumption of these unhealthy, often packaging-intensive foods and beverages. Further, while these taxes currently go to general funds, using them to counteract the huge advertising budgets of the soda and other junk food industries would help counter their pervasive messages and educate consumers about the importance of a healthy diet.

### Table 1: Market Share and Per Capita Consumption of Carbonated Soft Drinks, Top Five Countries, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share of Global Market (percent)</th>
<th>Per Capita Consumption (liters)</th>
<th>Growth Per Capita, 1994–99 (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>−3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Five</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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