THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC
The Arizona Republic (Phoenix, AZ), from an editorial published on September 11, 2012:

“The Phoenix City Council tackles many tough issues, matters for which strong and convincing arguments can be made for either side. An item on today’s agenda is not among those. The council will decide whether to continue fluoridating the city’s water: It’s a yes vote that should take, oh, about 5 seconds.

“Medical and dental professionals rank fluoridation as among the greatest advances in public health. For a relatively tiny public outlay, the incidence of tooth decay was drastically reduced.

“But there are skeptics. Just as you can find people who doubt Neil Armstrong stepped on the moon, there are those who are certain fluoride is ruining their health. Their evidence is equally strong, coming down to ‘this is what we believe.’ Two of those skeptics ran the water department in Gilbert, where they unilaterally shut off the fluoride, circumventing a vote of the people. They were fired, as they should have been.

“Phoenix’s council also must weigh its public trust. It can listen to a few well-intentioned but misinformed skeptics. Or it can continue to support public dental health. It will not face an easier decision.”

The Wichita Eagle
The Wichita Eagle (Wichita, KS), from an editorial published on November 7, 2012:

“Wichita voters defeated water fluoridation again, tossing aside established science and the expertise of more than 533 local dental and medical professionals as well as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

“Fluoridation’s opponents seemed to tap into voters’ concerns about big government and big water bills. But it was shocking to see so much junk and rumor passed off as credible science during the divisive campaign, and disappointing that Wichita passed on another opportunity to reduce its tooth decay and improve its oral health.”
The Star-Ledger (Newark, NJ), from an editorial published on February 2, 2012:

“Opposition to fluoride in public water supplies began in the 1950s and the connection to the Red Scare is no coincidence — when true-blue Americans were trained to see “red” conspiracies and Commie spies hiding under every rock.

“... the conspiracies have evolved — up to and including the worry that industrial polluters conceived of fluoridated water as a way to cheaply dispose of chemical wastes. Here’s a bottom line you can sink your teeth into: Fluoride fights tooth decay. Yes, there is fluoride in toothpaste and mouthwash, but for populations where dental hygiene is lacking or considered an expensive luxury, fluoride in drinking water is good public health policy.

“Opponents of fluoride sound frighteningly similar to those who oppose vaccinations for their children — pointing to questionable studies ‘proving’ health dangers while ignoring the broader societal health benefits.”

The News-Journal (Daytona Beach, FL) from an editorial published on December 4, 2012:

“It appears that Ormond Beach is going to have a re-do on the issue of fluoridation of water — 55 years after the city got voters’ approval for fluoridation. Insistent complaints may force city government to have another public referendum on the issue.

“The mail-in referendum could cost taxpayers more than $45,000. But the real costs may be borne by children and adults who could see less protection from tooth decay from their water, long a source of such protection.

“Fluoride skeptics have raised many health concerns. One thing is clear, however: Since the addition of fluoride to many public drinking-water sources, dental decay has become less common. ... there have been no major findings that fluoride in drinking water represents a serious public safety threat. Critics, however, have been unrelenting in questioning the safety of fluoride and the city’s provider of hydrofluorosilicic acid.

“Ormond Beach residents should also weigh the costs of removing fluoride from their drinking water. The CDC estimated that for every $1 invested in fluoridating water, there is $38 in savings on dental costs. Any person who has ever needed fillings, root canals, crowns, dentures, etc., knows full well the very real costs of dental work. And there is a cost beyond cash — bad or weak teeth can have an effect on enjoyment of life. Dental problems also can lead to more serious health problems.

“Fluoride is a way to alleviate those public health care costs, both financial and personal.”
**Union-Tribune**

The San Diego Union-Tribune, from an editorial published on November 10, 2007:

“It's far past time that San Diego lost the dubious distinction of being the largest U.S. city without fluoridation, which has an extraordinarily long and well-documented record of reducing tooth decay. The biggest beneficiaries are young kids in poor families who often have inadequate dental care ...

“Unfortunately, this decision (to fluoridate San Diego’s water) is likely to bring back into the spotlight one of the strangest fringe movements in modern-day America: Groups that maintain fluoridation causes cancer, Alzheimer's and a long list of other ailments. They do so absent any proof of any kind — and absent any common sense. If fluoridation really amounted to the introduction of a highly toxic substance into water supplies, where are all the body bags?

**Journal Sentinel**

The Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel, from an editorial published on May 31, 2012:

“Fluoridation is not a panacea, nor is it a substitute for visits to the dentist, brushing, flossing and proper diet. But it is an important aid in reducing tooth decay, and for some does provide almost the only protection they get. It’s especially important for children but a report published in 2007 … found that fluoride also prevents cavities and tooth decay among adults of all ages.”

“… [opponents’] arguments, no doubt sincere, aren't based on much more than anecdote, conjecture and studies that aren't particular relevant to the U.S. practice of community water fluoridation. Hundreds of studies carried out in many different countries in the past 50 years have proved the effectiveness of fluoridation …”

**Valley News**

The Valley News (West Lebanon, NH), from an editorial published on December 2, 2012:

“… the town of Bradford, Vt., has taken a step back in time by rekindling a public health debate that we thought had been settled long ago — whether fluoride should be added to the municipal water supply to combat tooth decay. As much as we admire quaintness and those who must be dragged kicking and screaming into the modern world, Bradford should move quickly to quell this non-controversy.

“It was the Bradford Water and Sewer Commission that decided to turn back the time machine by voting in October to permanently discontinue the decades-old practice of adding fluoride to town water … [citing] financial and health reasons for their decision. The district had built a new pumphouse and fitting it out for fluoridation would have cost additional money, as would the continuing purchase of fluoride. And they had concerns about whether fluoridation might pose health risks.
“To whatever extent the budgetary reservations were legitimate ... they no longer are. State public health officials have pledged to cover the bill for the fluoridation equipment. And the cost of buying fluoride is trivial — estimated at $1,200 annually.

“To better understand the commissioners’ health concerns, it’s worth noting that when they voted to discontinue fluoridation, they had heard from an out-of-town anti-fluoridation activist, but had failed to consult local dentists, public health authorities or the Selectboard. Considering that their decision affects the oral health of between 1,500 and 2,000 people, including schoolchildren, their initial lack of interest in seeking out informed opinion was irresponsible.

“... until the skeptics present a persuasive case, the vast majority have every right to implement practices that experts believe will promote public health. Dissenters can opt out by buying bottled water. In this case, leaving the decision about whether to use fluoride up to individuals makes no sense. Too many children would suffer tooth decay because their families lacked the resources, information or skills to act on sound advice.”

---

**The Times-Picayune**

The Times-Picayune *New Orleans, LA*, from an editorial published on July 13, 2007:

“... water treatment plants quit adding cavity-fighting fluoride in all of New Orleans and large parts of Plaquemines after Hurricane Katrina. But residents should have been told, so dentists could prescribe fluoride supplements for those who need them, particularly children.

“... extensive research has shown that water fluoridation reduces tooth decay by between 20 percent and 40 percent, even in places where fluoride is available from other sources. Water is also the most reliable and equitable method to deliver fluoride, especially to people who may not have dental insurance.”

---

**Orlando Sentinel**

The Orlando Sentinel *FL*, from an editorial published on May 15, 2005:

“Sixty years after fluoride was first introduced in American drinking water — with fewer cavities among subsequent generations as a result — the Eustis City Commission is scheduled to debate Thursday whether to remove fluoride from its water supply.

“The subject was raised by commission newcomer James Rotella, a podiatrist by trade. He should have left it alone, because dental studies confirm that fluoride hardens the teeth against decay and improves their resistance to acid. It is especially important for children whose teeth are forming. Exposure to fluoride at recommended levels poses no health risk, study after study has shown.

“... when a foot doctor meddles into teeth doctors' business, a fight is on. ... It's a matter of sound public health. Keep fluoride in the drinking water.”
The Columbia Daily Tribune (Columbia, MO) from an editorial column published on December 5, 2012:

“In 1973 the city of Columbia (Missouri) began adding fluoride to public drinking water. I remember the move as a nonevent, a no-brainer. Fluoride was praised by health officials as the best institutional way to combat tooth decay. Only a few lonely voices expressed dismay, and through the intervening years overwhelming consensus has prevailed.

“... For 40 years the issue has lain dormant, but now a Columbia chemical engineer raises questions again. I’m not here to criticize Amy Bremer. Seriously intentioned citizens should be willing to question long-standing public policies. The question is: After a respectful period of hearing, what should city officials do? Should they seriously consider changing the long-standing fluoride policy?

“... If one bit of consensus about a health issue should be easy to divine, it is the value of fluoride in drinking water. The city only began adding fluoride when supplies from the alluvial plain near McBaine were developed to replace deep wells that for years had produced naturally fluoridated water. I can remember hearing from dentists that Columbia’s deep well water augmented oral health.

“... Colin Malaker, a local dentist and chairman of the Board of Health, says his group will discuss the matter on Jan. 10 and issue a “credible and evidence-based answer” to Bremer’s suggestion of adverse effects from fluoridation. Malaker indicates his belief in the overwhelming consensus by researchers in the value of fluoridation. Thank goodness.”

The New York Times, from a “Well” blog column published on January 23, 2012:

“In the early years, rates of tooth decay among the young dropped by 60 percent in communities that adopted fluoridation. ...even though it may have diminished the fortunes of the dental community, the American Dental Association, as well as most national and international health agencies, endorsed fluoridation without reservation.

“In the years since, fluorides have been proved to reduce the rate of tooth decay in adults as well as in children. Older adults whose exposed tooth roots are highly susceptible to decay have particularly benefited.”

The News-Leader (Springfield, MO), from an editorial published on November 29, 2012:

“Here we go again. With a major university right there in Columbia (Missouri), you’d think people would be smart enough to recognize the benefits of fluoridation of public water supplies. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has called it one of the 10 greatest public health achievements of the 20th century.”
“According to the best available scientific evidence, fluoridation is safe, effective and economical in preventing tooth decay. No community should be thinking about cutting fluoridation. It’s just common sense.”

The Press Democrat

The Press Times (Sonoma County, CA), from a column published on February 26, 2012:

“In our editorial Friday (‘The Problem: Our dental crisis’), we detailed the deteriorating state of oral health in Sonoma County, particularly among low-income children. As the county Task Force on Oral Health notes in its final report … the county is experiencing ‘a staggering burden of suffering and a growing oral health divide between rich and poor.’

“Some of the task force’s recommendations are already in the works, including expanding public-private partnerships to reach more people, particularly in low-income areas. Other efforts include opening up more community-based facilities … to create more dental clinics.

“All of these measures are needed and should be pursued. But all of them pale in comparison to the single most cost-effective way that Sonoma County can combat its dental crisis — by fluoridating our water.

“So what’s the hang-up? In a word: fear. The issue of fluoridation is often mired in refuted claims of dire health risks, fears based on mumbo jumbo science. But in an era of distrust, they succeed in paralyzing decision-makers and blocking meaningful progress.

“... 1 part per million of fluoride is equivalent to 1 inch in a 16-mile journey — an extremely small amount. But all journeys begin with a single step. Sonoma County needs to take this one.”

The Oregonian

The Oregonian (Portland, OR), from an editorial published on August 14, 2012:

“Of the 50 biggest cities in the United States, only a handful do not fluoridate their water, and the list could soon be smaller.”

“... a serious move to fluoridate drinking water here will receive fevered opposition, just as it has over the years in many places. City residents will be told that proponents want to lace their drinking water with toxic industrial waste. They’ll be directed to Internet sites claiming, among other things, that fluoridation could hurt kids’ brains, lower their IQs and compromise various other organs and glands.

“To believe such crackpottery is implicitly to believe the following: That state and federal health agencies are, for some mysterious reason, hiding the truth and helping to poison more than 200 million citizens, aided by the American Dental Association and, we guess, credulous editorial boards like The Oregonian’s. While we don’t consider any of these groups infallible, or even close, it’s far more likely that fluoridation receives so much
mainstream support because it does exactly what it’s supposed to. It reduces the incidence of cavities.”

**THE SACRAMENTO BEE**

The Sacramento Bee (Sacramento, CA), from an editorial published on August 1, 2012:

“The overwhelming weight of the evidence is that fluoride is safe as long as it’s kept at appropriate concentrations. The National Cancer Institute says that numerous studies have found no link between fluoride and an increased cancer risk.

“Public health authorities steadfastly support fluoridation as a safe and effective way to improve dental health, particularly of the poor. The federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention says that community water fluoridation is one of the top 10 public health accomplishments of the 20th century.

“Sacramento was a late adopter, starting fluoridation in 2000 under the thumb of a state law that requires it of all public water systems with more than 10,000 service connections—if there is an outside funding source, usually a federal or foundation grant.

“…The total cost of fluoridation—both operations and equipment—would be somewhere around $45 million over the next 20 years. That’s a big investment, but the payoff is real. While the city can go slow on less urgent upgrades, it also should be very cautious about giving up fluoride’s benefits to public health.”

**PalmBeachPost**

The Palm Beach Post (FL), from an editorial published on January 24, 2008:

“Fluoride has a 70-year track record of decreasing tooth decay, especially among children, and also offers benefits for senior citizens’ dental health, particularly if they did not have fluoridated water as children.

“…Opponents of fluoride rely on myths … Adding fluoride to water is comparable to adding iodine to salt, folic acid to bread, or Vitamin D to milk. The federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention endorse fluoridation as a safe and inexpensive way to promote oral health, as does the American Dental Association.”

**The Mercury News**

The Mercury News (San Jose, CA), from an editorial published on November 25, 2011:

“While opponents of fluoride link it to everything from pitted teeth to the Manhattan Project, scientific study supports its success in dramatically reducing cavities for children and dental deterioration for the elderly.

“Only a few communities in Santa Clara County, such as Palo Alto, have fluoridated water. While San Jose puts fluoride in its municipal water system serving newer parts of the city, most is served by private suppliers that do not. As a consequence, it’s the largest city in the nation without fully fluoridated water.”
The Arkansas Democrat-Gazette (AR), from an editorial published on February 6, 2011:

“Oh, Lord, not again. Wasn’t fluoride a staple Soviet conspiracy back when there were still Soviets around? If faulty memory serves, the Rooskies wanted to dumb down America’s youth by adding fluoride to our water systems. By the grace of God and Star Wars, America somehow survived the attack.

“... After the Soviets imploded, the anti-fluoride brigade began making its cause a Health Issue. Never mind that the Centers for Disease Control has called fluoridation one of the top health improvements in the last 100 years. What do the doctors at the CDC know? You need to get on the Internet, darn it, where you can find the real truth.

“... Come, let us reason together.”

The Star (Sun Prairie, WI), from an opinion column written by dentist Timothy Durtsche and published on January 7, 2013:

“A handful of Wisconsin communities, often at the urging of out-of-state-activists, have recently given serious thought to eliminating fluoride from public water supplies. That’s a terrible idea that would severely threaten the oral health of our state’s children, adults, seniors and families.

“Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. ... It’s disturbing to see activist groups come into our state spouting half-truths and using scare tactics to reduce use of this important public oral health tool.

“... Even with today’s fluoridated toothpaste and mouth rinses, studies show community water fluoridation reduces tooth decay at least 25 percent during an individual’s lifetime.”

The New Mexican (Santa Fe, NM), from an editorial published on July 16, 2012:

“The Santa Fe City Council, that hotbed of science, decided last week to stop adding fluoride to the city’s drinking water supply. The reasoning, according to its backers, is that Santa Fe’s water contains enough natural fluoride. They said supplementing is a bad idea, even though fluoride has been added to the city’s drinking water since 1955 to help prevent tooth decay. So far, we fail to see what harm adding fluoride has caused.

“Poor children, the ones most likely to drink tap water and to benefit from added fluoride, also are less likely to brush and floss. A decision to drop fluoridation hurts them more. This decision, as well-meaning as it might be, will impact the most vulnerable among us. Cavities, pain and unnecessary suffering will increase.

“The issue deserves a re-hearing. This time, let’s put science and the good of the public health front and center.”
The Wichita Eagle, from an editorial published on August 23, 2012:

“The pro-fluoride side is led by dentists, physicians and health groups. They point to more than 65 years of experience and numerous studies showing that fluoridation is safe and effective. … The doctors estimate that raising the fluoride to the optimal level will save Wichitans at least $4.5 million a year in dental costs and contribute to overall improved health.

“Those opposing fluoridation are concerned about possible negative health effects. … The challenge for voters will be sorting through the competing claims. Though many of those opposed to fluoride are serious and careful, there are some — including a group that made robocalls — that try to scare people with claims not backed by reputable science.

“The Eagle editorial board supports fluoridation, a benefit enjoyed by 74 percent of Americans and 65 percent of Kansans supplied by public water systems. Wichita is the fourth-largest city in the country without fluoridation, and it is long past time that its citizens share in this health advancement.

The News-Journal (Daytona Beach, Fla.), from an editorial published on September 20, 2012:

“Ormond Beach has wisely decided to keep fluoride in its water supply. It decided to do so despite the efforts of a city commissioner who is convinced that fluoride could be a bad thing to add to drinking water.

“While it’s good to ask questions of government, the recent anti-fluoride efforts in Ormond Beach still came across as a bit of scare-mongering that doesn’t serve the public. It wasn’t the first time this year that we have seen this kind of political hypochondria.

“… Fluoridation has had benefits. The Centers for Disease Control said the addition of fluoride in water has been one of the 10 greatest public health achievements of the 20th century. Yet even now, some Volusia County cities such as Edgewater don’t add fluoride to drinking water. And that’s too bad. One local dentist told the News-Journal that children from Edgewater are 40 to 60 percent more likely to have cavities compared to other children in the area.

“… The best argument that opponents of fluoridation make is that adding fluoride is akin to medical treatment without consent — but only if you consider fluoride a medical treatment. It’s more like the efforts in the middle part of the last century to enrich flour with nutrients.”
The debate over fluoridation of water got some new life last week when the federal government issued new guidelines for the use of fluoride in public water systems. ... Generations of grass-roots activists have said it causes everything from cancer to communism.

"... Fluoridated water remains one of the public health success stories of the 20th century. It has been shown to dramatically reduce cavities by more than 60 years of experience. Its use is endorsed by major organizations of dentists and pediatricians, and by the same state and federal organizations that are now ordering reduced levels of fluoride allowed in public water supplies.

"It’s true that you can have too much of a good thing. But that doesn’t mean it’s not a good thing if you don’t have too much. It would be a big mistake to use these announcements as an excuse to remove fluoride entirely."

The fact that federal authorities are recommending slightly lower levels of fluoride in drinking water is not — repeat, not — confirmation of a long-standing government plot to corrupt our precious bodily fluids and turn us into submissive peons. But don’t expect conspiracy theorists to acknowledge this. Look for them to take this ball and run with it.

"... there’s no report of health risks resulting from current levels of fluoride exposure. The down side seems to be purely cosmetic — a tendency to spot or stain teeth — and in most cases the effects are barely noticeable, even by dentists.

"... [A dentist] offered the timely warning that those who insist on avoiding fluoride altogether ‘will pay the price with more fillings, root canals, extractions and dentures for themselves and their children.’"

Trying to sort out who’s right and who’s wrong in the renewed debate in Trenton on whether privately owned water companies should be required to fluoridate drinking water isn’t easy. But the burden of proof should rest with those who say it’s necessary.

“The New Jersey Dental Association wants the state Public Health Council to write a regulation that would result in about half of the state’s residents having fluoride in their drinking water."
“The federal government, dentists and toothpaste manufacturers hail fluoridation as a miracle that has dramatically reduced the incidence of tooth decay. ... The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention strongly supports fluoridation and wants to achieve 75 percent fluoridation of the nation’s water supply by 2010.

“Environmental groups, including the New Jersey Environmental Federation, regard fluoride as a health menace. They claim that the fluoride used in water supplies — a byproduct of phosphate fertilizer — is an ‘industrial grade’ variant that contains arsenic, lead, mercury and other cancer-causing agents. They also say the fluoride people get from toothpastes, breakfast cereals and beverages bottled with fluoridated water is enough to protect teeth from decay.

“... there is no clear correlation elsewhere between rates of water fluoridation and rates of dental decay. Most European countries — where tooth decay rates are similar to those in the United States — don’t fluoridate their water. And one that does, Ireland, is being pressured by a group of dentists to stop doing so, citing concerns about cancer risks and fluorosis — damage to tooth enamel caused by fluoride.

“The Public Health Council ... should vote no unless rule change proponents can demonstrate two things: that tooth decay in New Jersey is more common than in parts of the country where fluoridation rates are much higher, and that there is compelling evidence, based on New Jersey data, that residents need more fluoride than they are getting from other sources.”

---

**Omaha World-Herald**

**The Omaha World-Herald (Omaha, NE), from an editorial published on January 19, 2011:**

“Fluoride in a scientifically determined amount has been added to Omaha’s drinking water since 1968. The science remains the same, but circumstances have changed ... The federal HHS is proposing that the recommended level of fluoride be set at 0.7 ppm, which is the lowest end of the optimal range now in effect.”

“Science has always stood firmly in favor of fluoride, but conspiracy theories, health misinformation and other free-floating old wives' tales have maintained a level of paranoid fear nonetheless. But the practice of fluoridation has been an unmitigated good for the millions of younger Americans receiving its benefits. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has listed it as one of the 10 great public health achievements of the 20th century ...”

---

**Courier-Post**

**The Courier-Post (Camden, NJ), from an editorial published on April 10, 2005:**

“There are no immunizations to prevent tooth decay in children. But it is easy to fight — put fluoride, a naturally occurring element, in the drinking water.

“Nearly every state does a better job than New Jersey of providing this protection to its residents. New Jersey health officials must stop the foot-dragging and get the state’s public
water systems fluoridated. The hand-wringing over what to do has gone on too long. It’s time to act.

“...Opponents also promote unproved claims that fluoride poses significant health risks — from hyperactivity and brain disorders in children to cancer. But in 60 years, no one has proved a link between fluoridated water and any disease.”

**The Grand Rapids Press**

**The Grand Rapids Press** *(MI), from an editorial published on January 14, 2011:*

“In 1945 Grand Rapids became the first city in the country to add fluoride to its municipal water system, a public health triumph quickly duplicated elsewhere. ... Fluoride in water remains a safe, cost-effective and easy way to promote dental health, which is tied closely to over-all health. The new government guidelines suggest fluoride should be adjusted, not discarded.

“The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services last week recommended a reduction in the fluoride level to 0.7 parts per million. ... However, the new recommendation should not feed the flawed notion — promoted on and off since the advent of fluoridation — that fluoride must be removed entirely from drinking water.”

**The Shepherd-Express** *(Milwaukee, WI), from a column published on June 5, 2012:*

“Until Milwaukee Alderman Jim Bohl introduced a resolution to immediately end fluoridation of Milwaukee’s water supply, most of us had no idea there was still any controversy. The last real opponent of water fluoridation in the Milwaukee area was the appropriately named James Quirk, who in the 1960s identified himself as the Greater Milwaukee Committee Against Fluoridation.

“... In an anti-fluoridation brochure, Quirk offered to pay $1,000 to the Jayces for fluoride promotion if they could prove he was wrong in claiming four glasses of fluoridated water a day could cause 'dermatologic, gastrointestinal and neurological disorders.' When the Jayces presented credible, expert testimony to a Milwaukee County jury that Quirk was wrong, the jury ordered Quirk to pay up.

“In the latest instance, apparently Bohl had read a book about the dangers of fluoride. And the author, who runs the modern-day equivalent of Quirk’s committee, something called the Fluoride Action Network, was only too happy to come to Milwaukee to bask in the publicity.

“We probably should encourage a lot more politicians to become readers. But there's a big difference between reading propaganda and becoming educated.”
Corvallis Gazette-Times (Corvallis, OR), from an editorial published on March 6, 2012:

“... the members of the Philomath council’s Public Works Committee continued to research fluoride, and they fell into some of the same traps that often snare people trying to sort through complex scientific issues — in this particular case, the natural tendency to put too much weight on a handful of studies and to overly discount the scientific consensus.

“We think that consensus is clear: Fluoridation still is the most cost-effective way to prevent tooth decay in a large population — and, it’s worth noting, tooth decay is the most common disease among children. And the most recent studies do not support claims that fluoridation causes cancer or lowers I.Q.

“To their credit, Philomath officials say they’re willing to take the $4,000 the city spends every year on fluoridation and invest it in programs to foster dental health. But that’s where that important phrase, ‘cost-efficient,’ comes into play. There’s no way that $4,000 spent on toothbrushes or other dental gear is going to create the kind of long-term results that you’ll see from fluoridating the water. In fact, the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that every dollar spent on fluoridation saves $38 in dental costs.”

The Poughkeepsie Journal (NY), from an editorial published on March 4, 2008:

“The Poughkeepsie Common Council recently found itself in the middle of a controversy over teeth. The council recently heard from medical officials, including Dutchess County’s leading health expert, that a recent vote by the local water board to remove fluoride from the water supply should be reversed.

“These experts are right. Fluoride should be put back into the water. The unanimous vote by the Poughkeepsie Joint Water Board is the latest in an on-again-off-again timeline on fluoridation in the water system that serves 80,000 in the city and town, as well as in parts of Hyde Park and Wappingers Falls.

“...This level of protest by respected medical experts over a policy decision made by those without the expertise speaks volumes. The water board should reverse its vote as soon as possible.”

The Telegram & Gazette (Worcester, MA), from an editorial published on May 26, 2005:

“In a rather surprising — and incorrect — vote, the Worcester City Council declined to oppose a Senate bill authorizing the state Department of Public Health to mandate the fluoridation of municipal water supplies serving more than 5,000 people.

“The Telegram & Gazette editorial board has endorsed fluoridation when the issue has appeared on the ballot here. However, the voters, most recently in 2001, have rejected the
proposal six times since the 1950s, in the belief that personal responsibility for dental care is the way to go. Worcester city councilors should reflect that view to the Legislature.”

Arkansas Business (Little Rock, AR), from a column published on March 7, 2011:

“While we’re on the subject of improving life in Arkansas, let’s flash a big, healthy smile for the enlightened majority in both the House and Senate for taking a bold step into the last half of the last century by requiring fluoridation in city water systems.

“This long-overdue law will require fluoridation in water systems serving 5,000 people or more. Some 60 percent of Arkansans already drink water treated with fluoride, and this bill will extend the benefit to another 20 percent of the state.

“Fluoridation is recognized by the Centers for Disease Control as one of the 10 greatest achievements in public health of the 20th century, up there with vaccines and automobile safety advances. Yes, excess fluoride can discolor teeth, but so can decay. And no, fluoridated water is not the only way to protect teeth from rot. But fluoridated water may be the single most cost-effective development in public health — about 50 cents a year per person. In other words, a lifetime of fluoridation would cost much less than a single dental filling.”

The Springfield Republican (MA), from an editorial published on March 2, 2005:

“Water fluoridation has been so successful that most health experts regard it as one of the greatest public health achievements of the 20th century. So why doesn’t Springfield — the cavity capital of the Northeast — fluoridate its water?

“Some opponents question its safety and effectiveness, but they are unable to substantiate these claims with widely accepted scientific evidence.

“... We’ll concede that getting some people in Springfield to believe in fluoride is like asking them to believe in the tooth fairy, but city health officials should know the drill by now.”

The Express-News (Easton, PA), from an editorial published on September 10, 2009:

“In 1961, paranoid conservative activists in Allentown won a political fight opposing water fluoridation, despite all evidence the practice was a benefit — a decision which led to a marked decline in the city’s dental health.
“... Sometimes fringe voices command media attention disproportionate to their number or the merit of their claims.”

**Bangor Daily News**

The Bangor Daily News (ME), from an editorial published on March 19, 2007:

“The public doesn't make decisions about what drugs best manage diabetes or what treatments are most effective for lowering cholesterol. Yet, Maine law allows local voters to decide whether fluoride should be added to their water. This leads to situations like the recent vote in which Mount Desert residents agreed to eliminate fluoride, based largely on warnings from one person.

“... Fluoridation reduces tooth decay by 20 to 40 percent and even more among children, with the benefits reaching all socioeconomic sectors.

“... Maine communities should have a more sophisticated debate. Having the state require and pay for fluoridation is one solution. Communities could opt out after holding a meeting where public health officials were invited to provide information on the benefits of fluoridation. This is more reasonable than votes based on confusion or misplaced concern.”

**The Wichita Eagle**

The Wichita Eagle (KS), from an editorial published on October 28, 2012:

“The Eagle editorial board advocates a “yes” vote on Nov. 6 to fluoridate Wichita's water system. ... more than half a century of peer-reviewed scientific research is on fluoridation's side — along with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the past five U.S. surgeons general, the American Dental Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and 533 local dental and medical professionals.

“In addition, a 2012 state report concluded that populous Wichita's ‘lack of community water fluoridation is a probable causal factor’ in why 58 percent of third-graders have cavities in south-central Kansas, compared with only 44 percent in northeast Kansas (home of fluoridated Topeka, Lawrence and the Kansas City area).

“Cost concerns have merit, especially with the city water system's financial challenges. But fluoridation saves money on dental treatment. More waiting will only mean more unnecessary tooth decay in Wichita.”

**Idaho State Journal**

The Idaho State Journal, from an editorial published on March 7, 2007:

“Some lawmakers want to remove fluoridation from water if city voters request it, though an array of medical experts supports fluoridation in public water to fight tooth decay. Salt Lake and Davis counties are the only fluoridated counties in the state now.”
The Colorado Daily (Univ. of Colorado), from an editorial published on July 14, 2006:

“Adding fluoride to the list of public health frights is the latest challenge to our community’s values of public health and its understanding of science. We don’t care how you vote on the (Boulder, Colorado) initiative, but we would like to see people read, study and analyze the issue carefully.

“Then, we’d like to see a debate on the issue that’s based on real scientific findings and hard data compiled by reputable sources, not on Web sites run by the hysterical or the corporate. If the record on fluoride is mixed, fine, let’s talk about that, openly, and make a rational decision as a community. But we can’t help pointing out that the tendency, when activists get into science, to turn ‘links’ into ‘direct causes,’ ‘traces’ into ‘lethal amounts’ ...

 “[The anti-fluoride group's] other assertion — that people can get enough fluoride from good toothpaste and sprayed vegetables — is a tad elitist.

“Sure, people who can afford good dental care and good toothpaste can get fluoride. But poor people — the ones local activists always seem to implore when it suits them and ignore when it doesn’t — often skimp on dental care, can’t go to a high-priced dentist for anti-cavity treatments and often don’t eat enough fruit and vegetables, so fluoridated water might be about the only preventive dental care they get.”

The Palm Beach Post (FL), from an editorial published on December 19, 2006:

“A half-century of public health experience nationwide and unanimous support from an advisory committee are more than enough reasons for Martin County commissioners to stick to their decision to add fluoride to drinking water.

“... If commissioners disregard the recommendation of their own panel of health advisers, it will be because of politics, not science. The American Dental Association has recommended fluoridated water for decades to fight tooth decay, and public health officials continue to credit the practice with greatly improving oral hygiene for millions of Americans.

“... Martin probably would have to return a $129,000 state grant if it stopped adding fluoride. The more significant damage, however, would be the diminished credibility of a commission that caves to shrill pressure and changes its mind for no good reason.”

The Spokesman-Review (Spokane, WA), from an editorial published on June 25, 2006:

“Voters remain resistant to the idea of fluoridation, shooting it down multiple times at the polls though it has proved to be helpful in other communities. The Smile Survey turned up better results in King County, where the water is fluoridated.
“Fluoridation has its drawbacks, but the fears about it are overblown. The purported risks and dangers have yet to surface in Cheney or Fairchild Air Force Base, where the water is fluoridated.”

**SunSentinel**

The Sun-Sentinel (Ft. Lauderdale, FL), from an editorial published on June 24, 2006:

“Once again, the fluoride debate turned toxic, but a (Palm) County Commission majority made sure responsible public health policy won out over hysteria. After heated debate, commissioners voted to keep adding small amounts of fluoride to the public drinking water, affording residents — namely poor children — their best safeguard against tooth decay.

“It is a divisive debate that will likely repeat itself across the American landscape, now that a National Research Council study raises new concerns about the health risks of fluoride at certain levels. ... it’s baffling how anyone could use the study to argue against fluoridation.

“It’s an irrelevant argument, drilled away by decades of research and the vast majority of scientists touting the benefits of fluoridated water. But the report was somehow enough to prompt County Administrator Bob Weisman to urge commissioners to drop the fluoridation program.

“Cavity-fighting water, and rational thinking, still flows, thanks to four astute county commissioners. But the EPA can help contain this emboldened debate by responding quickly to the report, especially by noting it has no implications for fluoridation.”

**Union-Tribune**

The Union-Tribune (San Diego, CA), from an editorial published on February 19, 2006:

“Despite literally no evidence for claims that fluoridation doesn’t reduce tooth decay or is a sinister aluminum industry plot to poison Americans, many California politicians continue to heed the loons — not the Centers for Disease Control, the World Health Organization or the 60-year record of beneficial fluoridation projects throughout the United States.

“One result: San Diego is the largest U.S. city without fluoridation and San Diego County is one of the largest U.S. counties to be mostly without fluoridation.

“Thankfully, the Metropolitan Water District, which supplies about 80 percent of the water used by the San Diego County Water Authority, will begin fluoridating next year. Unfortunately, things are more complicated for the cash-strapped city of San Diego ... We need a benefactor or benefactors to come forward with the money. Once funds for the equipment are made available, a 1995 state law requires that fluoridation begin, with the state covering operating expenses.

“So let’s get the fundraising started.”
The News Tribune (Tacoma, WA), from an editorial published on May 13, 2005:

Pierce County water providers’ continued opposition to assisting in the fight against oral disease among poor children is revealing — and ironic. When the Tacoma-Pierce County Board of Health first sought to require fluoridation of drinking water, the opposition framed its objections primarily in terms of personal choice: Water customers who didn’t want fluoride in their water shouldn’t be forced to have it.

“So the health department came up with an alternative. Water providers that didn’t want to put fluoride in their water supplies could instead pay for the health department to provide fluoride varnishes to schoolchildren. ... Now even that’s not acceptable.

“... What the growing opposition to the health department’s alternative is truly about is money. Water providers don’t want to pay, and they don’t think their customers should have to chip in to improve child dental health.

“But those same customers will end up paying more later to fix what public health measures like fluoridation can prevent. Dental decay — which disproportionately affects poor children who have limited access to dental care — makes it hard for children to learn and puts them at risk for illness. Eventually, kids either undergo more expensive procedures on taxpayers' dime or go untreated and become less productive than they might have been.

“Poor children don’t have a lot of political pull, so they depend on health officials to act on their behalf. Part of the health department’s mission is to improve access to health care. Fluoridation falls squarely within that goal.”

The Post-Standard

The Post-Standard/Herald-Journal (Syracuse, NY), from an editorial published on December 30, 2005:

“Nearly three out of four children in Cayuga County have cavities by third grade. In Onondaga County, fewer than two out of four do. Is it mere coincidence that the Central New York county with no fluoride in its water has the highest cavity rate, while the county with nearly universal fluoridation has the lowest? Not likely.

“Why does Cayuga County resist the advice of the Centers for Disease Control, the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association, local dentists and its own health department?

“... The answer in a word: fear. The irrational fear of adding another chemical to the water supply. "It's bad news," explained Homer Trustee Roy Crandall, referring to what he read about fluoride on the Internet. "It's toxic poison."

“That's pure nonsense. OK, fluoride is not something to drink by the gallon. Neither is mouthwash. However, the 1 part per million in the water supply is not only harmless, tasteless and odorless — it's proven to reduce tooth decay.”