BPA, Chemical Used to Make Plastics, Found to Leach from Polycarbonate Drinking Bottles Into Humans

Source: Environmental Health Perspectives (via Harvard School of Public Health)

A new study from Harvard School of Public Health (HSPH) researchers found that participants who drank for a week from polycarbonate bottles, the popular, hard-plastic drinking bottles and baby bottles, showed a two-thirds increase in their urine of the chemical bisphenol A (BPA). Exposure to BPA, used in the manufacture of polycarbonate and other plastics, has been shown to interfere with reproductive development in animals and has been linked with cardiovascular disease and diabetes in humans. The study is the first to show that drinking from polycarbonate bottles increased the level of urinary BPA, and thus suggests that drinking containers made with BPA release the chemical into the liquid that people drink in sufficient amounts to increase the level of BPA excreted in human urine.

The study appears on the website of the journal Environmental Health Perspectives and is freely available at:


* BPA: Chemical Used to Make Plastics, Found to Leach from Polycarbonate Drinking Bottles Into Humans

(* NOTE: this free PDF was hosted on Scribd. I received this notice from Scribd: This content was removed at the request of National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences*)

Cancer Risk: Toxic Chemicals Release Report Shows Mercury, PCB Pollution Rise Dramatically

Mercury, Lead, PCB’s and Dioxin. All these chemicals are a result of making your life more “convenient” and will continue to menace society as globalization continues. Most people have no idea what is in the food they eat or air they breath. How about those
plastics to keep our food fresh or the plastics used by automobile manufactures or the by-product wastes that make the furniture we use in our homes or the “PCB-containing hazardous waste such as fluorescent lighting” (Polychlorinated biphenyls, or PCBs, are found in electrical equipment manufactured between 1932 and 1979. These include transformers, capacitors, switches and other items. PCBs can be found in fluorescent light ballasts, air conditioning units, and sometimes refrigerators). People take risks without even knowing it. Yet people have no idea why “cancer” is on the rise. And certainly people don’t care about the **nanoparticles**, do they?
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Health Risks Of Nanotechnology: How Nanoparticles Can Cause Lung Damage, And How The Damage Can Be Blocked

Flashback: BUYING & SELLING THE RIGHT TO POLLUTE

Experts Present Evidence to Committee on Nanotechnology in Food

Bill Gates funds British scientists in unorthodox health research

**Environmentalists** were co-opted a long time ago (who owns the environmentalist movements) and in 2009 only do the bidding of the elite whether they realize it or not.

Behind the Green Curtain 2008

Understanding Sustainable Development Pamphlet

**Dioxins** are environmental pollutants. They have the dubious distinction of belonging to the “dirty dozen” - a group of dangerous chemicals (super-toxic chemicals). Dioxin is a highly toxic and persistent family of chemicals that is an unintentional byproduct of medical waste incineration and PVC plastic production. Other sources of dioxin include paper and pulp mills, municipal incinerators, cement kilns that burn chemical waste, and the manufacturing of some chlorinated pesticides.

**Dioxin is a known human carcinogen.** According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, current general population exposure to dioxin may cause a lifetime cancer risk that is 1,000 times higher than the EPA’s “acceptable” risk level. Other health problems that may be associated with dioxin exposure include birth defects, learning disabilities, endometriosis, infertility, suppressed immune function, reduced IQ and hyperactive behavior in children.

In 1994, the US EPA estimated that medical waste incinerators were the leading source of dioxin air pollution — medical waste incineration is still a source of dioxin pollution, due in part to the large amount of disposable PVC plastic products used by hospitals.
CDDs are not intentionally manufactured by industry except for research purposes. They (mainly 2,3,7,8-TCDD) may be formed during the chlorine bleaching process at pulp and paper mills. CDDs are also formed during chlorination by waste and drinking water treatment plants. They can occur as contaminants in the manufacture of certain organic chemicals. CDDs are released into the air in emissions from municipal solid waste and industrial incinerators.

**How might I be exposed to CDDs?**

- Eating food, primarily meat, dairy products, and fish, makes up more than 90% of the intake of CDDs for the general population.
- Breathing low levels in air and drinking low levels in water.
- Skin contact with certain pesticides and herbicides.
- Living near an uncontrolled hazardous waste site containing CDDs or incinerators releasing CDDs.
- Working in industries involved in producing certain pesticides containing CDDs as impurities, working at paper and pulp mills, or operating incinerators.

Exposure to lower levels can cause a variety of effects in animals, such as weight loss, liver damage, and disruption of the endocrine system. In many species of animals, 2,3,7,8-TCDD weakens the immune system and causes a decrease in the system’s ability to fight bacteria and viruses. In other animal studies, exposure to 2,3,7,8-TCDD has caused reproductive damage and birth defects. Some animal species exposed to CDDs during pregnancy had miscarriages and the offspring of animals exposed to 2,3,7,8-TCDD during pregnancy often had severe birth defects including skeletal deformities, kidney defects, and weakened immune responses.

**Dow Chemical to resume talks with EPA on dioxin cleanup**

NEW YORK, June 29 (Reuters) - Dow Chemical Co is resuming negotiations with federal officials over cleanup of dioxin pollution near its plant in Michigan, a spokeswoman said on Monday.

Dow was notified by the Environmental Protection Agency that an offer Dow made regarding clean up of dioxin contamination would pave the way for more discussions, according to Dow spokeswoman Mary Draves.

The negotiations, which were stalled earlier this year, will resume in mid-July, Draves said.

Dioxins are an unwanted byproduct of combustion and have been found in elevated levels near the company’s plant in Michigan.
PCBs, or polychlorinated biphenyls, are a group of man-made chemicals.
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Here is the environmental spin: 2009 Courting Disaster - Across America, Waters in Crisis

Toxic Chemicals Release Report Shows Mercury, PCB Pollution Rise Dramatically

July 2, 2009

Releases of mercury, PCBs, lead and dioxin into the environment increased significantly between 2006 and 2007, according to the annual “Toxics Release Inventory,” published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

“This information underscores the need for fundamental transparency and provides a powerful tool for protecting public health and the environment,” said EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson. “Serving the public’s right to know is the crucial first step in reducing toxic chemicals in the places where we live, work and raise children.”

The “Toxics Release Inventory” classifies all releases together, including legal and illegal dumping, disposal in mine reclamation ponds (which leach into groundwater) and disposal in toxic dump sites.

Between 2006 and 2007, PCB releases increased by 40 percent, due to disposal of supplies manufactured before the substances were banned in 1979. Mercury releases, mostly due to mining, increased by 38 percent. Dioxin releases increased by 11 percent, and lead releases increased by 1 percent. Overall releases of all persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic chemicals or metals increased by 1 percent.

PCBs and dioxins are highly toxic to animal life, particularly birds. Both accumulate in animal (including human) bodies and disrupt the body’s hormonal and reproductive systems. Lead and mercury can cause neurological and behavioral problems, particularly in children. All four pollutants are especially dangerous to pregnant women and children, due to their effects on the body’s development.

According to the “Toxics Release Inventory,” slight decreases in air and water pollution occurred between 2006 and 2007 — 7 percent and 5 percent, respectively.

In December 2006, the Bush administration implemented a rule decreasing the thoroughness of the EPA’s toxics release reporting program. In March of this year, however, President Obama signed a law overturning the Bush policy.
“The public has a right to know about chemicals in their air and water,” said New Jersey Sen. Frank Lautenberg, who authored the law. “The Bush administration watered down this law and let facilities hide critical data about their toxic chemical emissions. It is time to restore the public’s right to know about the release of toxic chemicals in their communities.”

Sources for this story include: www.ens-newswire.com.

related:

**GAO - Biomonitoring Data 2009**

(April 2009) **Biomonitoring, which measures chemicals in people’s tissues or body fluids, has shown that the U.S. population is widely exposed to chemicals used in everyday products. Some of these have the potential to cause cancer or birth defects.** Moreover, children may be more vulnerable to harm from these chemicals than adults. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is authorized under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) to control chemicals that pose unreasonable health risks.

**Report Shows Record Number of Medicines in Development to Treat Leading Causes of Cancer** - Nationwide, cancer is the second leading cause of death, affecting more than 10 million Americans, according to the National Cancer Institute.

How Many People Will Have Cancer in 2030?

DEADLY DISEASE: US Cancer Diagnoses Will Jump 45 Percent By 2030
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Medical Mystery: Thyroid Cancer Rates Soar
Pollution around Cities Increases Risk of Cancer

According to the latest estimates from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), people who live around larger cities face an increased risk of developing cancer.

The report *National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA)* is based on the air pollution data from 2002. It is meant to help federal, state, local and tribal governments identify areas and different pollutants so that they may better understand the risks they may pose. The study assessed 181 air toxics, of which 80 were known to cause cancer and other serious health problems like birth defects. The report concluded that 25 percent of all air toxin cancer risks are from industry emissions, 30 percent are from mobile pollutions, and 45 percent are from background toxics with unknown emission sources.

More than 2 million people, mostly residents around large cities such as New York, Los Angeles and Chicago, face an increased risk of cancer because of air pollution. According to the report, the risk in such areas is increased to over 100 in 1 million compared to the national average of 36 in 1 million. In one neighborhood, situated between two highways, outside of Los Angeles, the EPA estimated the risk of cancer to be over 1,200 in 1 million. “Large cities appear to carry greater cancer risk because of a higher volume of cars, trucks, construction equipment, gas stations, and in some cases, dry cleaners,” David Guinnup, PhD, the lead EPA scientist told WebMD. Large cities weren’t the only ones with pollution problems; regions like northern Mississippi and southern Kentucky, both of which have chemical industries, were also estimated to exceed a risk of 100 in 1 million.

There are also states which have a lower cancer risk, like Wyoming, Nebraska, Montana and the Dakotas. “Air toxic risks are local. They are a function of the sources nearest to you,” says David Guinnup to HealthNews. “If you are out in the Rocky Mountains, you are going to be closer to 2 in a million. If you are in an industrial area with a lot of traffic, you are going to closer to 1100 in 1 million.”

The estimates are based on the assumption that people are exposed to the same amount of pollution constantly their whole lives, and it doesn’t account for rises or drops in risk when citizens move around the country. The average estimate of 36 in 1 million is actually a drop since the last estimate in 2006, where the number was 41.5 in 1 million.

Sources:
Lead is in Everyday Products

There is no level of lead that is safe for the system, especially when it comes to children or pregnant women. So then why is lead in so many of our products? Lead is intentionally added to vinyl plastic as a stabilizing agent, and although there are cost effective alternatives this seems to be what manufacturers are sticking with. Companies that add lead to their products claim that their lead level is low, but considering it is added to so many different products, consumers are dealing with lead from several areas. The most disturbing lead laden products include children`s vinyl lunchboxes, bibs, toys, wallets, handbags, and jewelry - things one is in contact with every day.

In 2005 it came to light that many children were toting around soft vinyl lunchboxes that contained lead. Lead can be harmful to children even in small amounts. It can cause behavioral and developmental problems as well as impair brain development. Of the sixty lunchboxes tested, one in five contained a level considered unsafe and some had more than ten times the hazardous level. The level of lead in one lunch box tested at 56,400 parts per million (ppm) of lead, more than 90 times the 600 ppm legal limit for lead paint in children`s products. Companies told consumers that if they containerize their food and wash hands after handling the bag all would be well. It was argued that children would not be putting the bag into their mouth, but most parents didn`t think this was good enough. Many of the bags were recalled from major retailers, but only a couple of states have totally banned the use of lead in children`s products.

Lead has been found in plastic vinyl baby bibs, diaper bags, children`s toys, jewelry, and even candy. Most recently in Northern California various retailers have been warned that they are in violation of Proposition 65, a law that requires businesses to post warnings if they are selling products containing substances listed as causing cancer or reproductive harm. In April major retailers were found to be selling women`s purses, totebags, and wallets that contained a level of lead that exceeded state standards and in May the same was true for jewelry. Of the jewelry tested there was a $200 necklace that contained more than 175,000 ppm of lead, proving that the cost of the item has no bearing on what substances the product may contain. Pregnant women handling these wallets, handbags, and jewelry are at an increased risk. New studies have shown that lead crosses the placenta and can harm the fetus.

There are environmental organizations trying to keep harmful chemicals out of our products. They have made great advances, but for now consumers also need to make informed choices on their own. It may be wise to consider natural fibers when buying products that will be touched all the time such as a handbag, and there are companies that now sell lead free vinyl lunchboxes. For the products already owned a person can do a
simple test to determine whether the product contains lead. There are about five test kits on the market today.

http://www.hpakids.org/holistic-hea…
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dy…

High Fructose Corn Syrup Contaminated with Toxic Mercury, Says Research

New research published in *Environmental Health* and conducted in part by a scientist at the *Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy* has revealed that high-fructose corn syrup (HFCS) is contaminated with the toxic heavy metal mercury.

That means that many of the products using HFCS may also be contaminated with mercury. Carbonated sodas are sweetened with HFCS, as are candy bars, bread, salad dressings, pizza sauce, fruit drinks and thousands of other grocery items.

Mercury is so highly toxic that it causes severe neurological disorders. It can also result in the loss of hair, teeth and nails as well as muscle weakness, loss of kidney function, emotional mood swings and memory impairment. ([P.S. Somebody please update this Wikipedia page with this latest research about HFCS being a source for mercury exposure, too.](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercury))

The highest level of contamination found in the study ([http://www.ehjournal.net/content/8/1/2](http://www.ehjournal.net/content/8/1/2)) was 0.57 micrograms of mercury per gram of HFCS. The *EPA* says that an average-sized woman should consume no more than 5.5 micrograms per day of mercury, meaning that the average American consumer may be eating five times the upper safety limit of mercury every day due to high-fructose corn syrup consumption if they consume the foods tested in the study.

That’s because the average American consumes 12 teaspoons of HFCS every day! So just by eating the standard American diet of processed foods, consumers are right now potentially exposing themselves to exceedingly high levels of mercury that far surpass the safety limits set by the *EPA*.

Buy groceries, get free mercury!

High-fructose corn syrup is used in almost everything, it seems. A second study conducted by David Wallinga, M.D., entitled “Not So Sweet: Missing Mercury and High Fructose Corn Syrup” ([http://healthobservatory.org/librar…](http://healthobservatory.org/librar…)) reveals that nearly one-third of all grocery items sweetened with HFCS were contaminated with mercury.

Eating some sweetened yogurt? Mercury!

How about some salad dressing with HFCS? Mercury!
Want some ketchup on that burger? Mercury!

In fact, mercury is found in thousands of grocery products sold across the world right now. And it’s no exaggeration to say that mainstream consumers of popular food items are likely suffering from widespread mercury poisoning (especially if you add in the mercury exposure they’re getting from dental fillings).

**Where does all the mercury come from?**

Most people don’t know how high-fructose corn syrup is really made. One of those processes is a bizarre chemical brew involving the creation of *caustic soda* by exposing raw materials to pools of electrified mercury in a large vat. Through this process, the caustic soda gets contaminated with mercury, and when corn kernels are exposed to this caustic soda to break them down, that contamination is passed through to the HFCS.

Another toxic chemical, *glutaraldehyde*, is also used in the production of HFCS. It’s so toxic that consuming even a small amount of it can burn a hole in your stomach.

But don’t worry: The Corn Refiners Association insists that HFCS is a “natural” ingredient, and their Chicago-based PR firm *Weber Shandwick* is now also claiming that HFCS has been declared “natural” by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. It hasn’t really, of course, but that doesn’t stop the press releases from claiming it has. (If you think a liquid sugar processed with glutaraldehyde and contaminated with mercury is “natural,” then you’ve been duped. There’s nothing natural about a processed food ingredient made with toxic chemicals.)

A Weber Shandwick representative calls me every time I post an article about HFCS, by the way, usually with demands that I remove the entire article. I’ve invited the Corn Refiners Association to a phone interview to defend their position that HFCS doesn’t cause diabetes or obesity, and to answer questions about whether HFCS is really “natural.” So far, they have declined to be interviewed. It seems they don’t want to face real questions from an honest journalist who refuses to be censored by powerful corporations.

One thing I’ve got to say about the Corn Refiners Association is that they have a well-funded PR machine running around the internet trying to make everybody remove stories that say anything negative about HFCS.

I’ve noticed that the Corn Refiners Association is a master at spinning the truth. For example, the president of the CRA, Audrae Erickson, said this in a statement responding to the mercury findings: “Our industry has used mercury-free versions of the two reagents mentioned in the study, hydrochloric acid and caustic soda, for several years.”

Well sure, that’s true. But what is Erickson NOT saying? She’s not saying that ALL the HFCS is made without mercury. She just says that somewhere in the industry, somebody is using a mercury-free version of the caustic soda. That doesn’t mean all the HFCS is mercury free, yet if you don’t read her statement carefully, you might be misled into thinking that. Her statement, in fact, leaves open the possibility that **99% of all HFCS might still be manufactured using mercury.**
Note carefully that Erickson does not say all HFCS sold in the U.S. is free from mercury. Instead, she makes a clever statement that results in most readers assuming that’s what she means. The CRA is well known for using this kind of language spin tactics.

NaturalNews challenges the CRA to state that all HFCS is free from mercury (see below).

**The HFCS fairy tale**

The CRA isn’t just in the business of pushing HFCS, by the way. It’s also in the business of denial. For example: Virtually everyone who understands holistic nutrition agrees that HFCS promotes diabetes and obesity. But in much the same way that Big Tobacco executives once swore that “nicotine is not addictive,” the Corn Refiners Association insists that high-fructose corn syrup does not promote diabetes or obesity.

So don’t worry about the mercury in your HFCS. Or the other toxic chemicals used in the manufacturing process. That’s all natural, we’re supposed to believe. And high-fructose corn syrup is a healthy, wholesome, all-American sweetener grown without pesticides by poor Midwestern farmers who have given their lives and souls to create a sweeter, happier America.

Or at least that’s the fairy tale version of the story. In reality, HFCS is created by corporate agriculture giants using toxic pesticides and herbicides on the crops who subject their corn to numerous toxic chemicals in the creation of this potentially mercury-contaminated processed sweetener that promotes tooth decay, obesity, diabetes and possibly even neurological disorders thanks to the mercury.

Yum. I can’t wait to gobble down another chocolate candy bar sweetened with this stuff…

**Politics at the FDA**

There’s an angle on this story that nobody is yet reporting. The lead author of this study, Renee Dufault, used to work for the FDA. In fact, she investigated the use of mercury at chlorine plants, where the manufacturing process results in the chlorine being contaminated with mercury. With chlorine being dumped into the public water supply, this is obviously a health concern.

Renee Dufault retired from the FDA last year. Only now, nearly a year after her retirement, has she dared to release her findings about mercury and high-fructose corn syrup.

Can you guess why? As an employee of the FDA, there’s little question she would have been pressured into silence about the HFCS mercury contamination issue. A lot of powerful corporations that wield steady influence over the FDA would not be happy to see the truth come out about HFCS and mercury. So she waited until after retiring from the FDA to go public with these findings.

In fact, Reuters is now reporting that Dufault told the FDA about her findings, but the agency did nothing to act on them. Is anybody really surprised?

**Lies about mercury**
The Corn Refiners Association, predictably, is attacking these study results, claiming “This study appears to be based on outdated information of dubious significance…”

That’s because the samples used in the study were taken in 2005. The CRA seems to imply they’ve cleaned up their act since then and are now using a mercury-free process (see statement from Erickson, above). But note that the CRA carefully avoids claiming all HFCS is free from mercury. Their official reply to the Environmental Health article is a perfect example of corporate doublespeak: http://www.corn.org/mercury-HFCS-st…

Specifically, note that the statement avoids promising that all HFCS meets the FDA’s definition of the term “natural” or that all HFCS is free from mercury.

**NaturalNews challenges the honesty of the Corn Refiners Association** in making these seemingly deceptive statements. We request that if the CRA is really to be believed, it must publicly state that all HFCS sold in America today is free from mercury and that all HFCS meets the definition of “natural” as described by the FDA.

Don’t hold your breath on that. I can already tell you the CRA will never make such statements because it knows they would be provably false. The truth is that last thing the CRA wants to make public, in my view. I think it’s really in the business of creating the *illusion of truth* through clever P.R. tactics.

**Did the CRA know about the mercury contamination of HFCS?**

But let’s give the CRA the benefit of the doubt for a minute here. Let’s suppose that right up to 2005, HFCS was routinely contaminated with mercury, but now suddenly it’s all mercury free.

Doesn’t anybody wonder why didn’t the CRA recall the mercury-contaminated HFCS when it became aware of the issue?

If all HFCS is now manufactured in a mercury-free process (which is highly doubtful, by the way), then that means at some point the CRA must have realized HFCS was contaminated with mercury and it made a decision to switch to a mercury-free process. Why was the public never warned about the pre-2006 mercury in HFCS? And why weren’t foods containing HFCS recalled from store shelves due to their mercury content?

If the CRA’s present-day statements are to be believed, it means the group must have been aware of the mercury contamination of HFCS through 2005 and yet it did nothing to make that fact known to the public.

So even if HFCS is free from mercury today, the CRA has a lot of explaining to do. The group either knew about the mercury contamination and did nothing to warn the public, or it didn’t know about the mercury contamination, putting it in a position of remarkable ignorance about the safety of a product it has routinely claimed to be “safe” and “natural” for many years.

**So which is it? Is the CRA run by liars, or just fools?**

My offer for a phone interview with a CRA representative remains open. If anybody from the CRA wants to get on the phone with me and defend HFCS, the door is wide open. You know how to reach me.
Disclaimer: This article is an opinion piece. All statements are my own opinion and are obviously not agreed to by the CRA, which vigorously defends the safety of HFCS. Almost as if their jobs depended on it, come to think….

Sources for this story:

Environmental Health: http://www.ehjournal.net/content/8/1/2
Reuters: http://uk.reuters.com/article/health…
Huffington Post: http://www.ehjournal.net/content/8/1/2
and http://images.huffingtonpost.com/20…

see also:

CDC Scientists Find Rocket Fuel Chemical in Infant Formula

*BPA: Chemical Used to Make Plastics, Found to Leach from Polycarbonate Drinking Bottles Into Humans

(* NOTE: this free PDF was hosted on Scribd. I received this notice from Scribd: This content was removed at the request of National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences) Download the report here instead.

A new study from Harvard School of Public Health (HSPH) researchers found that participants who drank for a week from polycarbonate bottles, the popular, hard-plastic drinking bottles and baby bottles, showed a two-thirds increase in their urine of the chemical bisphenol A (BPA). Exposure to BPA, used in the manufacture of polycarbonate and other plastics, has been shown to interfere with reproductive development in animals and has been linked with cardiovascular disease and diabetes in humans. The study is the first to show that drinking from polycarbonate bottles increased the level of urinary BPA, and thus suggests that drinking containers made with BPA release the chemical into the liquid that people drink in sufficient amounts to increase the level of BPA excreted in human urine.

see also: Depopulation of a Planet