

Analyzing Conflicting Ideas

“How Sugar Changed the World” by Heather Whipps	“Sugar” by Anup Shah	“Louisiana Sugarcane Farmer” (Video)
Central Idea		
<p>The central idea of the text is that sugar had a positive and negative impact on the world.</p>	<p>The central idea of the text is that there are many “hidden costs” in the impact of the sugar industry.</p>	<p>The central idea of the video is that, for some families, sugar farming represents the fulfillment of a dream and a source of pride.</p>
Supporting Ideas and Text Evidence		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sugar industry gave rise to the increase of slavery, which was a negative impact. Text Evidence: “By the middle of the 19th century, more than 10 million Africans had been forcibly removed to the New World and distributed among the sugar plantations of Brazil and the Caribbean.” • Since sugar was so profitable, England had to keep control of its “sugar islands”. This meant that England had to give time and resources to controlling the slaves. This took away time and resources from fighting the Americans in the American Revolution. Ultimately, the Americans won their freedom, which is a positive impact of the sugar industry. Text Evidence: “Several decisive battles of the Revolutionary War would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slavery was a hidden cost in the economy. Text Evidence: “The growing demand for and production of sugar created the plantation economy in the New World and was largely responsible for the expansion of the Atlantic slave trade in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.” • Sugar had a negative impact on the environment. Text Evidence: “Given the rise in consumption of other sweet foods, such as jams, sugar in bread, and later, in soda drinks and other confectioneries, candies, sweets and fast foods etc, the amount of land to produce sugar, refine it, and support the industry has also increased.” • Companies associated with sugar have caused problems. Text Evidence: “In Guatemala and Colombia, there is strong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is pride in the Blanchard family passing down the sugar farm through five generations. Lane Blanchard, the head of the farm, says, “It’s the only thing I’ve ever done. Grew up on a farm; it’s the only thing I ever wanted to do.” • Continuing the farm is so important to the Blanchard family that Lane is taking a class on soil preservation through the Louisiana Master Farmers Program.

have turned out differently had Britain thrown its full might behind the war, experts believe.”	<p>evidence that the Coca-Cola company actively supported the murders of union activists by paramilitary members at bottling plants run by its subsidiaries and contractors over the years.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sugar has had a negative impact on health, particularly for children. Text Evidence: “In one of the most despicable marketing gambits,” Michael Jacobson, the author of “Liquid Candy” reports, “Pepsi, Dr Pepper and Seven-Up encourage feeding soft drinks to babies by licensing their logos to a major maker of baby bottles, Munchkin Bottling, Inc.” 	
Ideas that conflict with <i>Sugar Changed the World</i>		
The author supports the concept of the “triangle trade” that developed as a result of the sugar industry. This conflicts with the information conveyed in <i>Sugar Changed the World</i> . The authors of <i>Sugar Changed the World</i> believe that a more accurate description of this trade cycle would be a “spherical trade” because it was much more complicated than a simple, three-sided triangle.	The central ideas of the texts are in conflict. The author of “Sugar” contends that the impact of sugar has been negative, while the authors of <i>Sugar Changed the World</i> convey that there are also positive results of the sugar industry.	In “Louisiana Sugarcane Farmer”, the viewer meets a family that owns a sugar farm, and learns how sugar farming is an important source of income and the fulfillment of a dream for this family. In contrast, in <i>Sugar Changed the World</i> , the owners of sugar plantations are portrayed in a negative way, as exploiting workers and motivated only by profit.
Is this a matter of fact or interpretation?		

This is a matter of fact. Based on the explanation in <i>Sugar Changed the World</i> , it seems like the authors of that text have considered all of the facts, whereas the author of “How Sugar Changed the World” is considering only a limited number of facts related to the trade.	This seems to be a matter of interpretation. The author of “Sugar” seems to have looked at the facts and believes that the results of the sugar industry are overwhelmingly negative, while the authors of <i>Sugar Changed the World</i> looked at the same facts and drew a more nuanced conclusion.	This conflict is most likely due to interpretation - the video conveys a more modern perspective on sugar farmers, whereas the text focuses more on the history of sugar farming.
---	--	---

Glossary for “Sugar” by Anup Shah	
Word	Definition
abolishment	to officially end or stop
consumerism	the act of spending money on goods and services
consumption	the act of eating or drinking something
induce	to cause someone to do something
lobbying	the act of advocating to influence government decisions that relate to a particular industry, issue, etc.
lucrative	producing money or wealth
luxury	something that is expensive and not necessary
refineries	a place where something is refined (the unwanted parts of a substance are taken out)

tariffs	taxes on goods coming into or leaving a country
union activists	a group of people advocating on behalf of an organization of workers formed to protect the interests and rights of its members
wholesale	the business of selling things in large amounts to other businesses rather than to individual customers