

Why Exactly Does the Government Dump Toxic Fluoride Into $\frac{3}{4}$ of the US Water Supply?

By [Ben Bartee](#)
Global Research, May 30, 2023

Region: [USA](#)
Theme: [Environment](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

73% of the US population, [according to official estimates](#), has its drinking water fluoridated.

"Water fluoridation" means that the government adds a synthetic form of the potentially toxic chemical fluoride into the water under the guise of Public Health™.

The most common synthetic form of fluoride the Public Health™ authorities use is a particularly dangerous formula called fluorosilicic acid.

Fluorosilicic acid has been shown to damage DNA and induce oxidative stress, per [Mutation Research](#), "at concentrations used in drinking water induced genotoxicity, oxidative stress, and acceleration of bone mineralization."

Fluoride in all forms is a documented neurotoxin, meaning it's toxic to the brain.

MCLG is an acronym that stands for "maximum contaminant level goal." As explained via the [EPA](#), "MCLG is the maximum level of a contaminant in drinking water at which no known or anticipated adverse effect on the health of persons would occur."

Via an integrated literature review on the potential adverse health effects of water fluoridation published in [Environmental Health](#):

"Within the brain, fluoride appears to accumulate in regions responsible for memory and learning... The MCLG for fluoride (4 mg/L)... is clearly not protective of adverse effects on the brain, especially in regard to early-life exposures..."

Out of the 18 studies that provided the water-fluoride concentrations, 13 found deficits at levels below the MCLG, with an average elevated level at 2.3 mg/L, the lowest being

0.8 mg/L [4].... and extend the documentation of cognitive deficits associated with only slightly elevated exposures.”

So what that means is that the study finds negative health effects from fluoride in water at levels below what the EPA deems acceptable.

The study’s authors, accordingly, plead for increases in the MCLG thresholds the government uses to assess water safety:

“The appearance of prospective studies that offer strong evidence of prenatal neurotoxicity should inspire a revision of water-fluoride regulations. The benchmark results calculated from these new studies, though tentative only at this point, support the notion that the MCLG is much too high.

Depending on the use of uncertainty factors, a protective limit for fluoride in drinking water would likely require that the MCLG be reduced by more than a 10-fold factor, i.e., below the levels currently achieved by fluoridation.”

The Public Health™ authorities are well-apprised of the dangers fluoride poses.

Per the [CDC Community Water Fluoridation](#) guidelines, for instance, parents are instructed to make sure their children spit out fluoridated toothpaste.

Yet it offers no similar caution regarding the drinking water statistically likely to contain toxic levels of fluoride, which the children are presumably encouraged to guzzle at will:

“For children aged 2 to 6 years, apply no more than a pea-sized amount of fluoride toothpaste to the brush and supervise their tooth brushing, encouraging the child to spit out the toothpaste rather than swallow it. Until about age 6, children have poor control of their swallowing reflex and frequently swallow most of the toothpaste placed on their brush.”

The dangers of water fluoridation are right out in the open. We have shown so far that the CDC acknowledges the threat fluoridated water poses at levels commonly found in the water supply, and there is good evidence that even the arbitrarily established “safe” threshold is unsafe.

[No fluoride, even naturally occurring forms, is passed to a baby through the mother’s breast milk](#). It is not a natural chemical that developing humans are meant to ingest, and it’s certainly not meant to be dumped by the government into the water supply.

Regardless of the safety or lack thereof of fluoride, it seems to me that, if the government insists on being in the business of water at all, it should be tasked with delivering purified water — as in the molecule H₂O minus any added toxic chemicals.

People would then be at liberty to add whatever chemicals they like to suit their taste. Were they so inclined to season their water with fluoride, they could go nuts.

That would not seem to be an unreasonable ask or an extreme policy prescription.

The ultimate questions we’re forced to reckon with are:

- Given that the government knows that water fluoridation is dangerous, even in amounts below what it officially recognizes as “safe,” why does it continue to fluoridate 73% of the water supply?
- Why is anyone who even entertains questions about fluoride’s safety [smeared as a “conspiracy theorist” in corporate media](#)?
- Why does the corporate media run grossly misleading fake news headlines like [“Science says fluoride in water is good for kids”](#)?

The answers, which you can come to on your own terms, are not pretty.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on [The Daily Bell](#).

Ben Bartee is an independent Bangkok-based American journalist with opposable thumbs. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from TDB

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Ben Bartee](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Ben Bartee](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca