


Citizens for Safe Drinking Water Mtn. View California

[HOT News](#)




Respected Medical Professionals and Scientists
are warning that water fluoridation
has dangerous long-term consequences to health.




 "The American Medical Association is **NOT prepared to state that no harm will be done to any person by water fluoridation.** The AMA has not carried out any research work, either long-term or short-term, regarding the possibility of any side effects." - Do. Flanagan, Assistant Director of Environmental Health, American Medical Association. [[letter](#)]



 "I am appalled at the prospect of using water as a vehicle for drugs. **Fluoride is a corrosive poison that will produce serious effects on a long range basis.** Any attempt to use water this way is deplorable." - Do. Charles Gordon Heyd, **Past President of the American Medical Association.**



 "E.P.A. should act immediately to protect the public, not just on the cancer data, but on the **evidence of bone fractures, arthritis,** mutagenicity and other effects." - Do. William Marcus, **Senior Toxicologist** at E.P.A.



 "**Water contains a number of substances that are undesirable, and fluorides are just one of them**" stated Do. F. A. Bull, **State Dental Director** of Wisconsin, speaking at the Fourth Annual Conference of State Dental Directors.

[\(More quotes by Medical Authorities & Research Scientists\)](#)

These are strong, deliberate statements. They are made by the top medical authorities in our nation based on the latest medical research.

Fluoridation is also objected to by 14 Nobel Prize winners. These scientists and researchers have been recognized for their outstanding work in the fields of Medicine and Chemistry.

[\(NOBEL Prize Winners\)](#)



There are 4 main arguments against water fluoridation:

◆ Any purported benefits of fluoridation are in scientific controversy. Studies from 50 years ago do not pass muster under today's standards for safety or effectiveness. Research from the same era also "proved" [cigarettes](#) don't cause cancer.

Even the AMA concedes that no studies were done to determine any side effects caused by fluoridation. [[letter](#)]

◆ The fluoride used for water fluoridation does not have FDA approval and is considered by the FDA as an "unapproved drug". The proper use of any drug requires an understanding of **how much is too much.** Since fluoride is already in many foods and beverages, an estimated total intake of existing fluoride amounts is imperative. Research shows fluoridation is unnecessary since we're already receiving 300% or more of the

American Dental Association's recommended daily amount.

◆ Civil liberty and Constitutional issues regarding the forced mass medication of the population when alternative means of reducing cavities are easily available. (such as tooth brushing)

◆ The chemicals used for fluoridation are not high purity, pharmaceutical quality products. Rather they are byproducts of aluminum and fertilizer manufacturing and contain a high concentration of toxins and heavy metals such as [arsenic](#), [lead](#) and [chromium](#). All proven to be carcinogens.

"Water contains a number of substances that are undesirable, and fluorides are just one of them"
Dr. F. A. Bull, State Dental Director

There have been many government sponsored [reports](#) - U.S., England and Canada - which have reviewed the various aspects of fluoridation and all have questioned the practice. This is a good place to see what scientists have already said.

Unfortunately, most dental professionals have a difficult time accepting that new medical and scientific understanding often change what we held to be true decades earlier. This is just human nature.

Dennis Mountjoy, a California Assemblymember, sponsored AB1565, a bill which required fluoride compounds to be tested and approved for safety and effectiveness. Unfortunately, his colleagues thought his idea was too radical! They believed our children's health was a secondary consideration when confronted by industry lobbyists. [\[read his letter\]](#)

Several [environmental groups](#) are also on record as opposing fluoridation due to its impact on plants and animals, including people.

One of the arguments by those advocating fluoridation is that it's needed to help the poor kids. The latest report by the Surgeon General, ["Oral Health in America"](#) (May 2000) stated ".80 percent of Medicaid kids don't receive dental care because few dentists take Medicaid." Perhaps the money used to fluoridate could be better used to subsidize dental care.

Delta Dental, the largest dental insurance company in California advocates fluoridation and gives grants to cities to who fluoridate. In our local area, we estimate they given away over \$1 million. In what can only be considered a hypocritical action, [Delta Dental](#) advocates fluoridation but won't pay for any dental repair work caused by fluorosis.



Do. Hirzy, [EPA Toxicologist](#), called for a **"moratorium on fluoridation"** as he testified before the U.S. Senate on June 29, 2000 about the dangers of water fluoridation. Citing numerous studies he said that when the relative toxicity levels of lead, fluoride, and arsenic were compared, fluoride is slightly less toxic than arsenic and more toxic than lead. The federal maximum contaminant level (MEL) for lead is 15 parts per billion (pub), with the EPA recommending 5 pub for arsenic; yet the maximum contaminant level for fluoride has been established by EPA at 4000 pub.

Even the federal government is concerned about fluoridation. The U.S. Army Medical Command, MEDCOM, which is in charge of the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, in Washington, D.C. and three other major

**Army
Medical
Command**

in [stallations](#) are concerned about fluoridating the water supply of Fort Detrick, Maryland. They contacted an acknowledged expert in neurotoxicity, Do. Mullenix, and requested an expert opinion concerning fluoridation. [Do. Mullenix's revealing analysis](#) stated that **"fluoride exposures today are out of control," and "... there are no advantages to water fluoridation. The risks today far exceed the hoped for benefit."** Do. Mullenix cites data from 18 clinical studies in her analysis.

A [Toxicological Profile](#) done by the Department of Health and Human Resources, revealed that certain people may be **unusually susceptible to the toxic effects of fluoride and its compounds. These populations include the elderly, people with deficiencies of calcium, magnesium, and/or vitamin C, and people with cardiovascular and kidney problems.** Other studies show some people do have an [allergic reaction](#) to fluoride.

Do. Mullienix is not alone. [Do. James B. Patrick](#), a Harvard Ph.D and former NIH (National Inst. of Health) scientist, testified in front the U.S. Congress in 1982 about why most European nations reject fluoridation.

In Sweden the government sought the opinion of the Nobel Medical Institute, one of the most prestigious in the

world. The Institute recommended against fluoridation, based largely on toxicity, and Swedish water remains unfluoridated. In a similar manner the French government consulted the Pasteur Institute. That Institute strongly recommended against fluoridation and France also remains unfluoridated.

Europe & Asia Reject Fluoridation



The respected magazine Newsweek, advised the public that "political decisions [about fluoridation] were at odds with expert advice" and "fluoride from your tap may not do much good-and **may cause cancer.**"

In 1992, **Newsweek** published another fluoride safety related article, "[Is Science Censored?](#)", a look at how political considerations influence what

scientific studies get published.

A quote from the leading paid advocate for fluoridation,

"a most flagrant abuse of the public trust occasionally occurs when a physician or a dentist, for whatever personal reason, uses their professional standing in the community to argue against fluoridation, a clear violation of professional ethics, the principles of science and community standards of practice" (Michael Easley, Director of the National Center for Fluoridation Policy & Research).

Comments like these led the associate technical director for Consumers Union, Dr. Edward Groth, to conclude that

"the political profluoridation stance has evolved into a dogmatic, authoritarian, essentially antiscientific posture, one that discourages open debate of scientific issues." (Scientific Knowledge in Controversy: The Social Dynamics of the Fluoridation Debate, 1991)

**"..public health officials have often suppressed legitimate scientific doubts in order to reassure the public."
- Oakland Tribune**

No fluoride advocate ever discusses how much fluoride is already being consumed in the food and beverages we drink. If they did, the truth would be known that we already consume excessive amounts of fluoride from our diets. The need for water fluoridation would be unnecessary.



For example, if you have [cereal with milk and a Coke](#), you have overdosed on fluoride. You have exceeded the American Dental Association's recommended daily dose

by over 130%.

Many juices our children drink are loaded with fluoride, just look at the [list](#) and you can see for yourself.

If we examine an average elementary [school lunch](#) in a **nonfluoridated** community, we can get an estimate of how much fluoride our children are actually receiving. The facts clearly show an overdose of the "recommended" amount of fluoride in just one school meal.

In Ireland, the Chairman and six other councillors of the [Kildare County Council](#) took a urine test to check the current level of fluoride in their system after a lecture by a British expert discussed how we are already overdosed on fluoride. The test showed they had enough fluoride to cause medical concern even though their community isn't fluoridated.

In 1993, the Environmental Studies and Toxicology Board of the National Research Council (NRC) [reported](#) that [fluoridation of municipal drinking water supplies may result in dental fluorosis in about 10% of the population.](#) **You have a 1 in 10 chance of experiencing tooth damage from water fluoridation!!**

Even UNICEF, a United Nations organization, cautions that excess fluoride exposure negatively affects children's health. In their [official position](#) statement, they state, "But more and more scientists are now seriously questioning the benefits of fluoride, even in small amounts."

**JAMA study demonstrated a link between hip fractures in the elderly and water fluoridated at 1 ppm
- Journal of American Medical Assoc.**

See what [mild fluorosis](#) looks like and then decide if it's o.k. for your children's teeth to be disfigured.

In 1993, the National Research Council stated African-American children experience twice the prevalence of dental fluorosis as white children and it tended to be more severe.

Fluoride advocates also don't want you to know that the chemicals used for fluoridation are not pharmaceutical quality, rather they are derived from the waste

byproducts of fertilizer manufacturing. Unfortunately, they also contain heavy metals, such as lead and arsenic. Chemifloc Ltd., a fluoridation chemical manufacturer, clearly states this in a [letter](#).

NSF, a corporation which developed drinking water standards stated the "most common [contaminant](#) in [fluoridated water] is [arsenic](#)" along with other significant contaminants, such as [lead](#). The chemicals used for fluoridation exhibit [similar toxicity](#) as lead and arsenic but are permitted in 100x quantities.

In the fluoridated city of Newburgh New York, the onset of menstruation for girls was 5 months earlier than the non-fluoridated control city.

- Caries Research, Vol 28 p.204 1994

"There is no safe level of blood lead"

Dr. Bruce Lanphear

Children exposed to lead at levels now considered safe scored substantially lower on intelligence tests, according to researchers who suggest one in every 30 children in the United States suffers harmful effects from the metal.

"There is no safe level of blood lead," said Dr. Bruce Lanphear, lead author of the [lead study](#) presented Monday at the Pediatric Academic Societies annual meeting.

The [New England Journal of Medicine](#) reported that the vast majority of cancers (50%) are caused .. by environmental and behavioral factors such as chemical pollutants.

Here's an [plant](#) in Florida where fertilizer is processed and fluoride is created as a waste byproduct. Other plants are in Juarez, México. Even more interesting is the published description, by a [large manufacturer](#), of various uses of this fertilizer byproduct, such as "Rust and Stain removal for textiles" and "Wood preservative"

EPA is investigating why its own officials ignored evidence for 18 years that asbestos was used in an array of building products.

The City of Palo Alto California, home of Stanford University, is well aware of the dangers of fluoridation. In Palo Alto's [published water analysis](#), they also identify the source of fluoride, fertilizer manufacturer, and states that fluoridation damages water pipes [because it dissolves lead out of the pipes and/or solder joints]

Several states, including Nevada, have [laws](#) that identify chemicals used for pesticides. Included is sodium fluoride, a chemical used for water fluoridation.

The Natick Report

An analysis of water fluoridation

The fluoride controversy isn't new. In 1997, the city of Natick Mass. considered the fluoridation of the town's water supply. In order to sort out conflicting claims, they commissioned a respected team of top scientists to analyze the data and make recommendations. The widely read analysis is known as the [Natick Report](#). The panel of doctors and scientists made 12 very specific recommendations. In summary, the scientists "emphatically" recommended the water supply "not be fluoridated." Their analysis also concluded a host of other medical problems may ensue from artificially fluoridating the water.



In March 2000, Wilmington Massachusetts also reviewed both sides of the fluoridation issue and decided against it. The town's Board of Health cited many critical concerns in their [five page summary](#).

The [City of Auburndale](#) Florida was so concerned about the health of workers handling fluoridation chemicals that they stopped their fluoridation efforts.

Most recently, the [York Report](#), a review of several hundred selected papers on fluoridation was published. Profluoridationists touted the report as "proving" fluoridation was safe. So misleading were their statements, that in an unusual step, the Chairman in charge of the York Report had to [issue a statement](#) a month later clarifying what was stated in the report, including "The review did not show water fluoridation to be safe."

"..results of the review have been widely misrepresented. The review did not show water fluoridation to be safe."

**T. Sheldon - Chairman
York Advisory Board**

Natick, Wilmington and Auburndale aren't alone. Over [80 cities](#) have rejected fluoride since 1996, including [Santa Clara](#), Santa Cruz and Mtn. View California in 1985. This includes a number of towns which already were fluoridated.

In an 1998 fluoridation advisory vote in Mtn. View, a small town in northern California, population 75,000, the American Dental Association (ADA) spent over [\\$50,000 in a political campaign](#) to promote fluoridation. They paid almost \$5 for every yes vote they received, an expensive campaign by any standards. Perhaps the money would

be better spent towards subsidizing dental care for those who can't afford it instead of purchasing slick campaign brochures.

The ADA states fluoridation is 100% safe (if not swallowed). Dentists cannot give a professional opinion of the safety of fluoridated ingested water. The California Board of Dental Examiners recently issued a [letter](#) (Dec. '99) stating that **"Effects of ingested fluoride is not within the purview of dentistry!!"** Dentists can not give a professional opinion as to the safety of fluoridated water as they would be practicing medicine without a license.

"Effects of ingested fluoride is not within the purview of dentistry."
-California Board of Dental Examiners

Why doesn't your dentist warn you about the negatives? The ADA simply refuses to discuss any negatives of fluoridation with member dentists or the public and wants no public discussion.

According to Section 20 of the American Dental Association Code of Ethics, **"Dentists' non-participation [in fluoridation promotion] is overt neglect of professional responsibility."** In recent years, several dentists who have testified on the anti-fluoridation side have been reprimanded by their state dental officers. If a dentist speaks out against fluoridation, he could lose his license. This is professional and scientific censorship.

**Big Brother
Censorship**

It's also impossible to discuss or debate any ADA member. They simply refuse to attend any town debate where fluoridation is the topic. Their strategy is not to expose the subject to common sense. When open minded people hear both sides, the ADA's arguments fall flat and fluoridation fails.

Perhaps this is why the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) "retaliated" against Dr. Marcus, [an EPA Senior Toxicologist](#), by firing him in May 1992 for his scientific reports which recommended removing fluoride from drinking water. The EPA was sued and found by the Court to have destroyed key documents and lied about other evidence.

The best proof as to which side current science supports is to prove it in [court](#) with expert witnesses. There were three landmark cases adjudicated since 1978 in Pennsylvania, Illinois and Texas.

"Segments of the population are unusually susceptible to the toxic effects of fluoride."
- United States Public Health Service Report

Testimony in the Texas case filled 2800 transcript pages and fully described the benefits and risks of water fluoridation. Judge Flaherty issued an injunction against fluoridation in the case, but the injunction was overturned on jurisdictional grounds but his findings of fact were not disturbed by appellate action.

Here's what Texas Judge Farris said was **PROVEN in court**.

"That the artificial fluoridation of public water supplies, such as is contemplated by [Houston] City Ordinance No. 80-2530, **may cause or may contribute to the cause of cancer, genetic damage, intolerant reactions, and chronic toxicity, including dental mottling**, in man; that the said artificial fluoridation may aggravate malnutrition and existing illnesses in man; and that the value of said artificial fluoridation is in doubt as to the reduction of tooth decay in man." - Judge Farris

For researchers, here's the background on [California's Law](#) mandating fluoridation.

From August 1995 to August 1996, the [American Dental Association's list of endorsements](#) diminished by the following eleven national associations and organizations.

- American Cancer Society
- American Heart Association
- National Kidney Foundation
- American Academy of Allergy and Immunology
- American Diabetes Association
- Society of Toxicology
- Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Activation Network
- American Psychiatric Association
- American Chiropractic Association
- American Civil Liberties Union
- National Institute of Law Municipal Officers

just say NO!





We talk research, they plead "trust me" and NEVER talk facts. God gave us all a brain and expects us to use it. DON'T take CHANCES - just say NO.



email us: feedback@nofluoride.com

Contact us at:

[California](#), Mtn. View [email](#) (650) 968-1424

other U.S & International [contacts](#)

◆ [Pdf file](#) of this page

◆ The Power of [ONE](#)

◆ [Key pages](#)

INFORMATION

- ◆ Use the following letters as a guide to your own "[Letter to the Editor](#)" or to government officials
- ◆ [Find](#) you California & Federal representatives
- ◆ Need [Promotional Items](#) for your fight?
- ◆ Join the [Nationwide Call](#) for Congressional Hearings on fluoridation
- ◆ Need a [ballot measure](#)?
- ◆ Need flyers?
- ◆ Join our mailing list.
- ◆ Here's what you can do to help [stop fluoridation](#).

PRESENTATION MATERIALS

- ◆ Order our new [Video Tape](#) containing TV news reports and interviews with top researchers.
- ◆ [Download](#) a compelling presentation loaded with "down to earth" information powerful enough to change most minds.

« [privacy policy](#) » « [legal](#) »