

Newspapers and fact-checkers agree:

Anti-Fluoride Activists Are Not Credible

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN

[\(Blog post published on May 22, 2013\)](#)

“When new medical treatments are implemented, when new drugs are introduced into the populace, there is always some hesitation.

There are (hopefully) some clinical trials to back up the new intervention, but the long-term implications are often unclear. Water fluoridation doesn’t have this problem. For over 65 years, it has been rigorously tested as a public health measure, and considered one of the most successful measures of the last 100 years ...”

The **NATION’S HEALTH**

[\(News article published in July 2011\)](#)

“... water fluoridation is under fire from some who claim its health benefits are overblown and that fluoridation creates a higher risk for heart disease and cancer. There is no valid science supporting these claims ... and yet they persist, kept afloat by Internet rumors and misinformation.”

PolitiFact[®]com

[\(News analysis published on April 19, 2011\)](#)

“(A Texas) resident says fluoride compound added to local water supply is ‘toxic waste’ ... We rate the statement False.”

ScienceBlogs

[\(Commentary article published on May 23, 2013\)](#)

“... the anti-fluoride forces (in Oregon) were playing on the public’s fear of chemicals and misunderstanding of chemistry to make fluoridation seem a lot more scary than it is. Actually, it’s not scary at all. As always, the dose makes the poison, and the levels used in municipal water supplies have a long history of safety.”