

Less Sugar Means Good-bye to Your Surplus Fat

Uncle Sam's Appeal Demands a Tightening of Belts Among the Sweet-Toothed, for Whom This Extravagant Country Is Famous

By RICHARD BARRY.

There is on the bodies of one million New York men and women between the ages of 35 and 55 at least 10,000,000 pounds of excess fat. The Government of the United States wants that 10,000,000 pounds of excess fat. Moreover, it is going to get what it wants.

You saw it get a billion and a half of dollars out of your pockets last month. Well, it is going after its 10,000,000 pounds of flesh, and it will get it, just as surely as it got its billion and a half of dollars.

It will take longer, certainly. The process will not be as simple, surely. The results will not be so dramatically tabulated, undoubtedly. Criers will not waylay you on the street corners; the newspapers will not give so much space to the campaign. Your mail will not groan under the weight of the appeals.

But you are going to give up your pounds of flesh. It will be possible, though difficult, for you to evade this gigantic cannibalism, this piecemeal extortion, this indeterminate inroad on embonpoint, but—mark well what it means for you to evade. You will be a slacker, a shirker, a fat and sugar profiteer, ergo a pro-German; in fine, a traitor!

Most wonderful of all it is not going to hurt unduly to slice off these ten million pounds of flesh, and, after they are gone, every one is going to feel better—very much better!

Already we feel the first fine inroads of the campaign. Like a good General, like a masterly strategist, the Government has opened the attack on the most vulnerable item of our diet—sugar. And like a superb tactician it has already sunk its skirmish line well within the enemy lines before we are aware that the offensive war is on.

Beware! This is but the beginning of the inexorable end! After sugars come the fats; after fats come the starches, and after the starches, we are right down to skin and bone. Long before that time the war will, perhaps, be over.

For the moment, for this present week, let us consider the case of sugar. It is a sweet case and a heavy one. It bears complexities and a toothsome lure that penetrates our luxurious desires, and batters on our characteristic weakness, and offers subtle spread for a revolutionary diet.

Here are some facts gleaned from the insurance actuaries, from authorities on diet, from the Life Extension Institute, from the United States Department of Agriculture. They point a malign way to a beneficent goal.

The average consumption of sugar, as nearly as can be estimated, for each person in the City of New York at the present time is about two pounds a week. One pound a week each is amply sufficient for nine-tenths of the people, and they could get along with half a pound a week each and not suffer. Their only loss would be in foregoing the palatable enjoyment of tasting sweets.

In 1916 the per capita consumption of sugar in Germany was approximately 20 pounds a person per annum, or about two-fifths of a pound a week. In England it was about 40 pounds; in France about 37 pounds, and in Italy about 29 or 30 pounds. In the United States it was 85 pounds! In New York City it was almost a hundred pounds.

Conditions have tightened in all those countries in the last ten months, so it is quite safe to say that Germany has less than one-fifth the sugar to the person that New York has now, England and France less than two-fifths, and Italy less than a third.

So much for the superficial facts. The meaning of sugar is more profound.

Sugar is the most easily available

source of human energy. It is like coal for heat or gasoline for traction, capable of being put to almost immediate use in the body.

At the same time many condemn sugar as an "indigestible" food, the source of ills from gout to Bright's disease, a more dangerous enemy than alcohol.

Rival schools of scientists are still fighting over these alleged merits and demerits. They denounce each other and refuse compromise. To listen to one exclusively, you will conclude that sugar should supplant meat in all diets. To believe the other, it is safer to eat clay and almost as bad to drink pure gin as to indulge in sugar regularly.

Where the truth lies between the two is immaterial here. The fact does re-

TABLE INDICATING HOW MUCH WEIGHT IS CARRIED BY THE MEN AND WOMEN OF A SUGAR-LOVING NATION.

Based upon the report of the Medico-Actuarial Investigation, 1912, covering an analysis of 221,819 men and 136,504 women.

Average Heights and Weights—Men.														
Age.	5 ft. 0 in.	5 ft. 1 in.	5 ft. 2 in.	5 ft. 3 in.	5 ft. 4 in.	5 ft. 5 in.	5 ft. 6 in.	5 ft. 7 in.	5 ft. 8 in.	5 ft. 9 in.	5 ft. 10 in.	5 ft. 11 in.	6 ft. 0 in.	6 ft. 1 in.
15.....	107	109	112	115	118	122	126	130	134	138	142	147	152	157
20.....	117	119	122	125	128	132	136	140	144	148	152	156	161	166
25.....	122	124	126	129	133	137	144	145	149	153	157	162	167	173
30.....	126	128	130	133	136	140	144	148	152	156	161	166	172	178
35.....	128	130	132	135	138	142	146	150	155	160	165	170	176	182
40.....	131	133	135	138	141	145	149	153	158	163	168	174	180	186
45.....	133	135	137	140	143	147	151	155	160	165	170	176	182	188
50.....	134	136	138	141	144	148	152	156	161	166	171	177	183	190
55.....	135	137	139	142	145	149	153	158	163	168	173	178	184	191

Average Heights and Weights—Women.														
Age.	4 ft. 8 in.	4 ft. 9 in.	4 ft. 10 in.	4 ft. 11 in.	5 ft. 0 in.	5 ft. 1 in.	5 ft. 2 in.	5 ft. 3 in.	5 ft. 4 in.	5 ft. 5 in.	5 ft. 6 in.	5 ft. 7 in.	5 ft. 8 in.	5 ft. 9 in.
15.....	101	103	105	106	107	109	112	115	118	122	126	130	134	138
20.....	106	108	110	112	114	116	119	122	125	128	132	136	140	143
25.....	109	111	113	115	117	119	121	124	128	131	135	139	143	147
30.....	112	114	116	118	120	122	124	127	131	134	138	142	146	150
35.....	115	117	119	121	123	125	127	130	134	138	142	146	150	154
40.....	119	121	123	125	127	129	132	135	138	142	146	150	154	158
45.....	122	124	126	128	130	132	135	138	141	145	149	153	157	161
50.....	125	127	129	131	133	135	138	141	144	148	152	156	161	165
55.....	125	127	129	131	133	135	138	141	144	148	153	158	163	167

main, undisputed, that sugar is more easily converted into energy and into flesh than any other food. From half to two-thirds of every pound of sugar taken into the body is converted into bodily tissue, and this tissue remains, in the great majority of individuals, in the form of excess weight. Not in the case of manual laborers, for they seldom have excess weight, and that is why the sugar matter affects New Yorkers especially. Day laborers are at a minimum here. Of the million men and women in this city between the ages of 35 and 55, less than one in ten is a manual laborer. The sedentary workers are the very ones who can least afford—from a dietetic standpoint, if one is considering the problem of excess weight—to indulge in sugar, and they are the ones who do most so indulge.

The object herein is to point out to each individual just how far and how much he is cheating the Government at the present moment. The potential dodgers of the income tax are comparatively few. The potential dodgers of the sugar levy—for that is what it amounts to in its final analysis—number the entire adult population.

"Adult?" Yes, because it is generally agreed, from Mr. Hoover to the casual

physician, that children and young people should not be denied sugar—not at present. Nor the old. But all active persons between 35 and 55 should cut down—for their good and for the Government's advantage.

The equation can be reduced to pounds and fractions—yes, to lumps of sugar for the morning coffee. It is just as easy as to measure how many dollars a week one can save for the Liberty Loan.

For instance, the Life Extension Institute says that a man or woman who is carrying on his or her body an overweight of ten pounds is carrying the equivalent in fuel value of fifteen pounds of sugar. As all adult persons between the ages mentioned are, in the average, ten pounds overweight, it may be said

TABLE INDICATING HOW MUCH WEIGHT IS CARRIED BY THE MEN AND WOMEN OF A SUGAR-LOVING NATION.

Based upon the report of the Medico-Actuarial Investigation, 1912, covering an analysis of 221,819 men and 136,504 women.

Average Heights and Weights—Men.														
Age.	5 ft. 0 in.	5 ft. 1 in.	5 ft. 2 in.	5 ft. 3 in.	5 ft. 4 in.	5 ft. 5 in.	5 ft. 6 in.	5 ft. 7 in.	5 ft. 8 in.	5 ft. 9 in.	5 ft. 10 in.	5 ft. 11 in.	6 ft. 0 in.	6 ft. 1 in.
15.....	107	109	112	115	118	122	126	130	134	138	142	147	152	157
20.....	117	119	122	125	128	132	136	140	144	148	152	156	161	166
25.....	122	124	126	129	133	137	144	145	149	153	157	162	167	173
30.....	126	128	130	133	136	140	144	148	152	156	161	166	172	178
35.....	128	130	132	135	138	142	146	150	155	160	165	170	176	182
40.....	131	133	135	138	141	145	149	153	158	163	168	174	180	186
45.....	133	135	137	140	143	147	151	155	160	165	170	176	182	188
50.....	134	136	138	141	144	148	152	156	161	166	171	177	183	190
55.....	135	137	139	142	145	149	153	158	163	168	173	178	184	191

Average Heights and Weights—Women.														
Age.	4 ft. 8 in.	4 ft. 9 in.	4 ft. 10 in.	4 ft. 11 in.	5 ft. 0 in.	5 ft. 1 in.	5 ft. 2 in.	5 ft. 3 in.	5 ft. 4 in.	5 ft. 5 in.	5 ft. 6 in.	5 ft. 7 in.	5 ft. 8 in.	5 ft. 9 in.
15.....	101	103	105	106	107	109	112	115	118	122	126	130	134	138
20.....	106	108	110	112	114	116	119	122	125	128	132	136	140	143
25.....	109	111	113	115	117	119	121	124	128	131	135	139	143	147
30.....	112	114	116	118	120	122	124	127	131	134	138	142	146	150
35.....	115	117	119	121	123	125	127	130	134	138	142	146	150	154
40.....	119	121	123	125	127	129	132	135	138	142	146	150	154	158
45.....	122	124	126	128	130	132	135	138	141	145	149	153	157	161
50.....	125	127	129	131	133	135	138	141	144	148	152	156	161	165
55.....	125	127	129	131	133	135	138	141	144	148	153	158	163	167

that practically one million New Yorkers today are bearing about uselessly and carelessly and slovenly the equivalent of fifteen million pounds of sugar!

We hear a good deal about food speculators and food profiteers, about evaders of the Liberty Loan, and about coal robbers. But what about the sugar hoarders? What about those who pass among us each day with the equivalent of fifteen pounds of sugar stored in their capacious persons? Often more! What of the woman forty pounds overweight who is secreting, unpatriotically, sixty pounds of sugar?

So that we may all of us know exactly where we stand in this matter, so that no one may have the slightest excuse for evading longer the consequences of his self-indulging acts, the accompanying table will quickly reveal what each and all may do to assist, for be it known that abstinence from sugar is the easiest and quickest way in the majority of cases to reduce excess flesh.

Whatever any one weighs in excess of the average listed in the table for height and age, should come off. The quickest, easiest, and most patriotic way to get it off is to cut out the sugar—at least reduce the ration.

There is another, and perhaps a more

graphic way to describe exactly what effect sugar has both on weight and energy. It is conceded that for the average man or woman of sedentary habits 2,500 to 3,000 calories are the correct daily ration.

Bearing this in mind, consider the calories:

- In ordinary candy, one pound, 1,700.
- In granulated sugar, one pound, 1,800.
- In sweet chocolate, one pound, 2,770.
- In butter, one pound, 3,500.

In other words, one pound of sweet chocolate is all that any one needs to eat for an average day's supply of food fuel, and a pound of candy is all of two-thirds that any one needs for the entire day's supply, not of sugar alone, but of all food.

The ordinary lump of loaf sugar contains 100 calories, or one-twenty-fifth of the day's supply. A man who has four lumps of sugar in his coffee (such men, it is believed, are multitudinous) is taking thus one-sixth of his day's necessities in that form.

Now that we are on the subject of overweight, let there be offered an inducement for reduction beyond the merely patriotic, just as the Government added a 4 per cent. interest to its Liberty bonds to add an edge to thrift. Let us consider what the reduction of overweight (most easily secured by abstinence from sugar) means in increasing the length of life.

The following figures from the experience of forty-three American life insurance companies tell the story of overweight. So as not to confuse the issue with bewildering statistics there is shown here only the table covering those from 45 to 49 years of age, the period in which mortality is at its average lowest.

Average weight	% higher death rate than 10 lbs. under the avg. weight.
5 lbs. above avg. weight	8%
10 " "	12%
15 " "	18%
20 " "	22%
25 " "	24%
30 " "	32%
35 " "	40%
40 " "	49%
45 " "	55%
50 " "	60%
55 " "	65%
60 " "	71%
65 " "	78%
70 " "	85%
75 " "	92%
80 " "	100%
85 " "	110%
90 " "	120%

In other words, if you possess the average overweight of ten pounds, and should see fit, in the interests of the needs of the Government, to reduce that amount by cutting your allowance of sugar one pound a week for the next fifteen weeks, or, we will say, to take half the amount of sugar to which you have been accustomed, (provided you do not increase your diet elsewhere disproportionately,) you will not only take off ten pounds, but you will decrease your chances of dying just 4 per cent.

Curious—that 4 per cent.! The United States offers you 4 per cent. on your money if you wish to lend it, and a 4 per cent. increase in your life if you wish to reduce your flesh.

To be sure, there are other ways of reducing than by cutting down on sugar. That is merely the easiest way, in most cases. And it happens just now to be most advantageous to Uncle Sam.

At present no actual Governmental threat is offered—merely a gentle hint. But needs are imperative; the future exacting. If conditions are not met voluntarily, ways will have to be found to meet them arbitrarily. Uncle Sam has found a way to your pocketbook. He is searching, slowly, patiently, persistently—politely, of course; paternally, certainly—but inexorably, for that waistband.

He intends to tighten it!