THE AUSTRALIAN FLUORIDATION NEWS

Aqua Pura

ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION IS WATER POLLUTION
www.fluoridationnews.com
Email: afavaust@gmail.com
G.P.O. Box 935,
Melbourne, Vic., 3001
PLEASE PASS ON WHEN READ

Vol 26 No. 4 | Price $1.50 $15 per annum posted Australia | July-Aug 1990 | Registered by Australia Post — Publication No. NBG0721

DOES RIPLEY (believe it or not) LIVE IN TASMANIA?

ANOTHER FLUORIDE SPILL

It is one of those "believe it or not" situations. Perhaps it can only happen with fluoridation!

Last issue of *Australian Fluoridation News* (March/April 1990) was completely devoted to damage on the Braim's Tasmanian farm caused by the local fluoridation plant leaking deadly fluoridated water onto their property.

The publicity this caused in and out of Tasmanian Parliament, the Court Case resulting in $65,000 damages to the farmer against the Tasmanian Government, the $50,000 costs also against the Government would have, one would think, created a climate of very careful future operation of Tasmanian fluoridation plants.

After the drubbing in the Supreme Court of Hobart, and seemingly to prove a point, the water authority started stuffing fluoride into another old Cygnet Fluoridation Plant at Agnes Rivulet within a few miles of the one that was, by law, wrecked and cleared off the property adjoining John Braim's farm, and where a large replacement of soil to the depth of 2 metres was carried out by the Government.

. . . motors and pumps flushing concentrated fluoridated water out of the building . . .

On 4th April, 1990 John Braim was astonished to find the Agnes Rivulet Fluoridation Plant in operation.

He immediately inspected the plant and found motors and pumps flushing concentrated fluoridated water out of the building through a corroded, broken pipe, onto pasture land with cattle grazing. (Not too scientifically or professionally technical.) The corroded pipe was pumping the fluoride concentrate out at full bore for 7 hours onto and down the footpath, then across the Council road into spring water which ran across a farmer's pastures.

The liquid flooding out was not the town drinking water supposedly at one part per million, it was the tank of **concentrated fluoride mixture** to service the following 24 hour dosing of the mains.

Instead of injecting the concentrated fluoride mixture into the water mains, the heavy fluoride concentrated liquid was pumped for seven hours through the broken (corroded) pipe onto, and down the footpath, then across the road onto a farmer's pasture where his cattle grazed.

John Braim, with a reliable witness, not only took photos but also samples of the water gushing from the Sporling Meter Box, a large cement pit in which the Meter is located. The Sporling Meter measures the amount of water passing the fluoride injection unit.

The water sample taken from the overflowing Sporling Meter pit measured 1600 ppm F. *(Certificate No. 900784 Tasmanian Government Analyst Laboratory).*

So here was a fluoridation plant pumping from the front of the building toxic quantities of fluoride over a public road, a public footpath and into a farm where cattle graze.

ANOTHER FARMER'S PROPERTY POLLUTED

With the sight of another farmer's property being polluted with poisonous fluoride from a fluoridation dosing station, John Braim decided to check the french drain from the building which was the cause of animal deaths from fluoride on his farm.

The french drains were old and damaged. They were not working so again the poisonous fluoride mixtures were discharging over the soil surface.

. . . poisonous fluoride mixtures are discharging over the soil surface . . .

The *Tasmanian Government Analyst Laboratory Report No. 900896* for Soil and Water at the broken french drain were:

"Sample A. From broken 4 inch earthenware outlet pipe at rear of building from fluoride dosing station.

As received	4000 ppm F
Dry soil	4550 ppm F

Sample C taken from above the dosing station

As received	2.5 ppm F
Dry soil	3.0 ppm F

Sample B water discharging at the broken french drain at rear of building 135 ppm F."

The analysis shows water at the discharge pipe at 135 ppm F, the soil accumulating to 4550 ppm F and the Fluoride concentrate (1600 ppm F) discharging over the surface that can run into spring water which in turn runs over Mr Ben Olbrich's grazing land.

Photos and documents are in the hands of the author.

What can people do about this poison racket? Politicians don't care, health authorities are not interested, and the apathy of the Australian people is highlighted by their general disinterest.

The so-called fluoridation authority has conned politicians the world over (a job not too difficult) and even found allies in many medical disciplines, all of which is based on mystic beliefs.

Tasmania has the highest death rate in Australia.

Even Judge Jauncey in his official Judgement at the Edinburgh Court 1983 confirmed fluoridation action "on beliefs". He expressed his Opinion (page 383)

> "that there is no reason why a water supply should not add fluoride if they had genuine reasons **"for believing"** it was likely to improve the health of some or all the consumers, provided the water could be properly described aas wholesome."

My response is that **"beliefs"** are not true science, and no community should be compelled to take a daily dose of poison because of some person or group's **"beliefs"**.

The fluoride lobby influences politicians and such like with their wording such as "integrated logistical

projections, the total monitored mobility, the synchronised transitional time-phase, and the balanced monumental incremental contingency of fluoridation" all of which amounts to absolutely nothing except seemingly impressive statements to con those in control of our health.

With all the scientific evidence available that proves fluoridation is not effective, not safe, and is an imposition on the rights of the people, there is fresh, clean water at the end of the tunnel, but certain people and organisations must first be flushed out.

IS FLUORIDATION "HELPING" TASMANIAN PEOPLE

Whilst one of the world's most important medical authority (NTP) admits that after 12 years of Fluoride-Cancer Animal Studies, they *cannot any longer guarantee the safety of fluoridation* or fluoride treatments, the Health Minister of Tasmania (May 17, 1990) announced that Tasmania has the largest death rate in Australia.

He said:—

"Tasmania's death rate and infant mortality rate were unacceptably high and a reflection on the population's level of health.

"Tasmania also had the second highest rate of infant deaths in Australia at the rate of 10 per 1000. During the last decade the infant deaths in Tasmania attributed to Sudden Infant Death Syndrome were double the national rate."

The S.I.D.S. deaths have doubled since 1982!

Almost all Tasmania is fluoridated and has the first fluoridation plant (1953) in Australia. Many independent papers have been published (and ignored) on Tasmania's high SIDS rate and excessive industrial pollution which is protected by the politicians elected to serve the public of Tasmania.

An urgent improvement to protect the health of Tasmanian people would be to immediately stop fluoridation. The compulsory daily dose of poison is unjust, unscientific and undemocratic.

1988 SAW THE BERLIN WALL FALL
1990 SEES THE FLUORIDATION WALL FALLING

- **Claims for reduction in dental decay by artificial fluoridation radically reduced**
- **use of sodium fluoride for hip fractures not effective or safe**

After so many published world scientific studies over so many years showing no reduction of tooth decay between fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas, the non-existence of fluoridation practice is widespread in the scientifically advanced European countries, with their scientists continually advising their governments against the silly practice of mass medicating their people with a poisonous drug that is uncontrolled, uncontrollable and dose-related only by thirst. So simple to understand but too difficult for *our* politicians to even grasp the slightest significance.

For 50 years the public have been brain-washed by the constant fluoridation propaganda network emanating from our elected politicians, the government bureaucrats, the A.D.A., A.M.A., N.H. and M.R.C., radio and television, glossy magazines, even in the classrooms of schools.

What a sales pitch for the world's greatest medical hoax.

". . . low or high fluoride intake does not protect hip fractures."

The United States National Institute of Dental Research Program costing millions of taxpayers money ($3,670,000) completed their research (released 21st June, 1988) by announcing in a most embarrassed manner that their old worn-out claim of dental decay benefits ranging from 60 - 85 percent are incorrect and the best they can salvage from their gathered data of 40,000 children fluoridated and non-fluoridated is a mere 18 percent improvement.

The 18 percent translated into real 'effect' is about one tenth of a decayed part of a tooth, but when analysed properly their data shows no significant difference.

The data shows decayed, missing and filled teeth (DMFT) is 2.0 in fluoridated areas, 2.0 in non-fluoridated areas and 2.2 in partially fluoridated areas.

The percentage of decay-free children in fluoridated, non-fluoridated and partly fluoridated areas is 34 percent, 35 percent, and 31 percent respectively.

The present 18 percent claim is only a fraction of their 50-year non-scientific propaganda and seems more of a figment of their scientific imagination required to protect their reputations and lucrative empire protection.

Fluoride Treatment for Osteoporosis

The next big crack in the fluoridation wall came from a study published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* March 22, 1990 in which the Mayo Institute detailed their 4-year study on osteoporosis treatment with fluorides.

For years the dental fluoride lobby has been using the osteoporosis fluoride treatment as a prop to their diminished fluoride tooth fairy tales, suggesting fluoridated water will build bigger and better bones in the elderly and stop hip fractures.

Their main propaganda was exposed when the Kuopio Univeristy in Finland published their in-depth research, showing fluoride has no benefits for the bone fractures in the elderly.

In their conclusions they state:

"These results show that low or high fluoride intake does not protect hip fractures."

The Mayo Institute in their 4-year study discovered bone changes in elderly patients treated with fluorides were structurally unsound, and the fluoride treatment led to a 3-fold increase in the number of bone fractures.

The editorial in the *New England Journal of Medicine* stated:

"The inescapable conclusion from this study is that sodium fluoride in the dosage used is not effective or safe treatment for post-menopausal osteoporosis."

So another fluoridation propaganda door closes and another part of the fluoride wall tumbles.

The extremes to which the fluoride lobby goes is remarkable, their Achilles Heel has been the fluoridation-cancer link.

"We are probably going to have to revise our numbers."

One example — on Radio 3AW December 1981, Professor Graham Craig, Dental Health and Education Research Foundation, University of Sydney stated:

"Fluoride protects against cancer."

Contacting Dr. Nigel Gray, Director, Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria for confirmation brought this reply:

"I do not agree with the reported statement that 'fluoride protects against cancer'."

The *Journal of the American Dental Association*, March 1984, published an article "Preserving the Perfect Teeth".

A conclusion was:

"Dental caries has become primarily a disease of pits and fissures of teeth. It is estimated that 84 percent of caries experiences in 5-17 year old population involves tooth surfaces with pits and fissures. ***Although fluorides cannot be expected appreciably to reduce our incidence of caries on these surfaces, sealants can."***

1984 saw a Congressional Hearing in the U.S.A. where Dr Loe, Director of the National Institute of

Dental Research gave evidence under oath. He said:

*"However, the chewing surfaces of posterior teeth are not smooth. They have crevices and pits and it is our experience that **fluorides don't really get access to these pitted areas.** Today these are tooth surfaces that are **most prone to develop cavities.**"*

Dr. Carlos, Chief Epidemiologist for NIDR stated:

"Today the difference (between fluoridation and non-fluoridation) is definitely smaller, and for cities thinking about fluoridation for the first time, making the right choice is more likely to be a 'much more difficult public health decision that it used to be.'"

Rick Asa, A.D.A. spokesman said:

"We are probably going to have to revise our numbers."

One of the problems facing politicians and the dental fluoride lobby is to explain the reason why dental services in Australia are rising every five years at an average 70 percent.

With fluoridation, large increased number of dentists, school dental clinics, dental therapists, record sales of fluoridated toothpaste and toothbrushes, the dental services charges are increasing on an average of 70 percent every five years, or 14 percent per year.

These costs are similar to the U.S. where they have forecast a continuing increase into the 2000's.

". . . evidence of adverse health effects either not accumulated or suppressed."

Since 1974 the number of dentists in Melbourne have increased by 50 percent, plus 313 school dental therapists. This is at variance with the claim that dental decay has fallen over 60 percent by the use of fluoridation. The equation seems logically plain that if decay falls 60 percent, then dentists should accordingly decline at a relative rate, but this has never happened.

Perhaps the whole fluoridation dental lobby is summed up by John Harkin, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Soil Science — Water Resources Centre, Environmental Toxicology Center.

In a statement 2nd February, 1989, John Harkin stated under the heading "Fluoridation — Boon or Bane?":

"Evidence is surfacing that the research supporting earlier claims of benefits (dental decay) was manipulated while evidence of adverse health effects was either not accumulated or suppressed. The controversy surrounding the questions of the benefits and risks of drinking water fluoridation illustrate an outstanding example of the importance of environmental toxicology in modern living, and the lack of appropriate application of accepted scientific norms to risk assessment and regulatory actions.

Currently, extensive efforts are being expended to investigate and regulate the concentrations of pesticide residues in drinking water from both surface and ground water sources. Limits on permissible concentrations have been set in the parts per billion/trillion range for some compounds. Paradoxically, since 1950 many communities in the U.S.A. have been intentionally adding other pesticides, sodium fluoride or fluorosilicate at levels of 0.7 - 1.2 parts per million to drinking water."

With fluoridation, logic, commonsense and humane conclusions are difficult because of the high investment (human reputation and money) in this great medical hoax, but at least we can no longer be lambasted by unintelligent, unscientific and non-caring politicians, their fluoride masters and the elite dental and medical conglomerate telling the population that fluorides do not cause cancer.

You can now challenge with authority any dentist/doctor, or your parliamentary representative. **THERE IS NO SCIENTIFIC/MEDICAL PROOF THAT FLUORIDE IS NOT A CARCINOGEN.** (See article *IS FLUORIDE A CARCINOGEN?* Australian Fluoridation News May-June 1990 issue).

It makes a mockery of the parliament, the Constitution and its members to continue fluoridation with the evidence that fluorides may be carcinogenic.

MEDICAL PROFESSIONALISM

Are our medical scientists true to their profession or are they true to questionable kite-flying payola that comes in many different ways? On 2nd May, 1990 the ABC Television Couchman Show discussed the subject of how to treat child sex offenders who had been found guilty by a court of law.

Those in attendance and speaking on the subject were doctors, QC's, psychologists, community workers, criminologists, etc. and even a judge.

On the subject of forcing a drug onto and indeed into sex offenders by law, there was a definite stance by both doctors and legal representatives.

The concensus of opinion was:

"1. It was against the ethics of medicine, the Hippocratic Oath.

2. It is against the common law, compulsory medication.

3. It is an assault on the individual.

4. It is an invasion of the body."

Strange how the legal and medical fraternity are so concerned for sex offenders, but quite happy to assault and invade the bodies of innocent people by compulsory fluoridation.

Performance of chemical castration would be the responsibility of the medical profession, but differing opinions were expressed as to whether it should be compulsory. This really put the medical scientists on the spot. The concensus of medical opinion was that they would not do such a thing as it was against their medical ethics, and no doctor is permitted such compulsory medical treatment against the patient's wish. They said it would be medically unethical, and how could you keep such **compulsory medication within limits.**

One newspaper report on the subject stated:

"Enforced medical treatment has echoes of the Third Reich: no free country in the world imposes it on sex offenders.

In Australia the right for medical treatment to be given only under informed consent is enshrined in common law."

Perhaps the community needs to look at long-term education to change society's attitude that puts such a high regard on aggression and power in a selected area (compulsory fluoridation).

How does this code of ethics of the medical profession fit fluoridation as set down by the Declaration of Helsinki in 1964 and revised in 1975 on the matter of "Proposed International Guidelines for Biomedical Research involving Human Subjects."

*"5. In the therapeutic trials involving drugs (fluorides and fluoridation) the protocol should contain **PRECISE INFORMATION ON DOSAGE,** formulation, frequency of dosage, **and methods of ASSESSING SAFETY."***

How does fluoridation fit into the endorsement of the medical profession with the Helsinki Code of Medical Ethics when they unconditionally support and endorse compulsory mass medication with a poison (fluoride) that cannot be claimed safe as shown in the recent Toxicology Animal Studies in the U.S.A. Also the medical protocol requires **"PRECISE INFORMATION ON DOSAGE"?**

Dosage by thirst (fluoridation) is scientifically and medically unacceptable if doctors are honest and believe and abide by their Hippocratic Oath and the Declaration of Helsinki.

In the A.M.A. Book of Ethics it states:

"Every patient has a right to expect a complete and thorough examination into his condition, and that accurate records will be kept."

This currently important "basic principles" page 34 of the A.M.A. *Code of Ethics,* should be read by every Australian doctor and then ask "Does my endorsement of compulsory fluoridation fit my code of ethics?"

> *"Biomedical Research involving human subjects must conform to generally accepted scientific principles and should be based on adequately performed laboratory and animal experimentation and on a thorough knowledge of the scientific literature."*

With the latest U.S. Government Toxicology Fluoride-Cancer Link Animal Studies stating they cannot any longer say fluorides and fluoridation does not cause cancer, how can the medical profession still endorse fluoridation and comply with their Code of Ethics?

Call their *Code of Ethics* by any name, but in reality it is a simple matter of honesty!

ANOTHER FLUORIDATION MONUMENT HAS DECAYED

HASTINGS, New Zealand, Stops Fluoridation

Perhaps the most used endorsement in Australia and indeed around the world for the effectiveness of fluoridation is the original plant in New Zealand at Hastings.

That great hoax of improvement in the Hastings children's teeth had been enshrined in the world history of misinformation on fluoridation before Dr. John Colquhoun commenced research through documents collected from the New Zealand Health Department Archives by using the Freedom of Information to obtain the original data.

The complete history of the Hastings Sham was published in *The Australial Fluoridation News,* March/April 1987.

FLUORIDATION VOTED OUT OF HASTINGS

On Tuesday 28th March, 1990 the Hastings Council voted to stop fluoridation after 37 years of misinformation and bureaucratic dishonesty and fluoridation ceased.

Hastings Mayor Jeremy Dwyer said after the Council Meeting:

> *"It was an historic vote because it represented a swing in public opinion over the course of a generation."*

Representatives of groups against compulsory mass medication via the kitchen tap said it was a vote "for the choice of the individual and for the rights of the people to decide such health matters relating to ingestion of drugs (fluorides)."

Now the fluoridation fire is out of control (of the fluoride drug pushers) and uncertainty also rests over the future of fluoridation in Auckland.

How refreshing to see "people" receiving the respect of their elected representatives instead of the other way that has existed for so long not only in New Zealand but the crazy fluoridated nations of the world.

Last time the author was in the South Island of New Zealand, they complained about the bush fire ash from our Australian bush fires discolouring their lovely white snow — Let us hope the reverse happens and we collect some of their fluoridation bush fire ash in Australia, where it will be most welcomed.

FROM GOVERNMENT BLACKMAIL TO COMMUNITY INDEPENDENCE

Gosford Council votes to protect community from fluoridated water

During September 1984 the New South Wales Government was accused in the Gosford Council of blackmail over its quotation of $10 million to relocate mains water pipework at Wyong so Gosford people would receive unpolluted water instead of the Wyong fluoridated cocktail which the Gosford people did not want to drink.

At the Council meeting (September 1984) it was suggested the New South Wales Health Department and the Public Works Department (PWD) were working together to force Gosford to have fluoridated water against their wish.

What incensed the councillors was, that after publicly attempting to frighten the Gosford ratepayers having to pay $10 million to continue to get good water, the PWD reduced the quote from $10 million to $500,000.

It was known a private quote of $200,000 was floating around the Council whilst the PWD's $10 million blackmail was tabled.

Details of that blackmail was published in the *Australian Fluoridation News* October 1984.

Six years have passed and Gosford community are once again faced with the New South Wales totalitarian compulsion of a daily dose of fluoride, a poisonous drug now scientifically unable to be proved not a carcinogen. (See separate article Australian Fluoridation News, May-June 1990 issue).

What is that old-fashioned democratic "will of the people", and where in these days do you see it demonstrated?

Gosford Council made Australian democratic history in February this year.

The Council voted to set aside $500,000 for works that will protect their community against the dangerous practice of fluoridating their public drinking water supplies.

The Council also agreed to plan a further $200,000 making a total of $700,000, all in the name of democracy, "the will of the people", "freedom of choice", and by proper representation of the people, a moral act that should put Premier Greiner and his fluoride cohorts to shame if of course that is at all possible especially when fluorides and fluoridation are involved.

Today, with all the evidence available on the dangers and the inefficiencies of fluorides and fluoridation, it remains a mystery why politicians are so entrenched into this hoax. There must be something at the end of the road for each and every one to place their credibility on this mass medication, undemocratic, unconstitutional, uncontrolled and uncontrollable and against "the will of the people" whom they represent!

QUOTE OF THE YEAR!

"Currently, there is no legislative basis or regulatory enforcement of the need for authorities to supply safe water or to measure and analyze regular samples."

Andrew McCutcheon
Minister for Planning and Urban Growth
Victoria, 3 May 1990, printed letter

***Australian Health and Healing* looks at fluoridation**

We recommend purchase of the May-July 1990 issue, Vol. 9, No. 3 of this journal, which contains excellent material on fluoridation.

Subscriptions: *The Australian Fluoridation News*
- Australia (excluding Victoria) and overseas — Box C9, P.O. Clarence Street, Sydney 2000
- Victoria — Anti-Fluoridation Association of Victoria, Box 935 G, G.P.O. Melbourne. 3001

Printed by Allans (Printing) Pty Ltd, 70 Mary Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010