


# THE AUSTRALIAN FLUORIDATION NEWS



ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION  
IS WATER POLLUTION

[www.fluoridationnews.com](http://www.fluoridationnews.com)

[afavaust@gmail.com](mailto:afavaust@gmail.com)

G.P.O. Box 935,  
Melbourne, Vic., 3001

PLEASE PASS ON WHEN READ

Vol. 28  
No. 1

Price \$2.00  
\$15 per annum posted Australia

Jan-Feb  
1992

Registered by Australia Post —  
Publication No. NBG0721

## FLUORIDATION — PRIORITY ONE IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER

The New World Order is, one government, one bank, one language and one control of the world population.

Fluoridation is the prime example of what to expect. A compulsory daily drug dose for all people from the cradle to the grave.

Nothing compares with fluoridation or fits the dangerous ambitions of the New World Order disciples like the forerunner to controlled world population, mass medication via the only common denominator — the kitchen tap in every home.

Clearly the facts illustrate that fluoridation has nothing to do with children's teeth.

If the world fluoride lobby was really sincere, honest and scientifically orientated in the care of children's teeth, they would be spending their (our) billions of dollars on proper child care throughout the world beginning with baby health centres through to the child's school years.

**Bad teeth scientifically reflect bad and neglected attention, not the lack of fluoride.**

It is so simple to understand — unattended small holes become large holes..

The Melbourne Age 18th December, 1991 quotes Professor of Child Dental Health, Melbourne University, Professor Louis Brearley as saying:

*"Fifteen percent of Australian babies have decayed teeth because of bad bottle and breast feeding habits."*

The Professor is absolutely "spot on" **bad teeth reflect bad attention, not the lack of fluoride or fluoridation.**

But the unseen world of fluoridation lobby steam-rolls opposition of fluoridation in spite of scientific world opinion against this process.

Reports from throughout the world show a recent increased "investment" by the fluoridation lobby, even though public statements are made that would ordinarily silence that kind of involved people.

Who are those people? They are the puppets of the New World Order even if they are unaware of their involvement in the huge international scam.

---

*Four NSW local government referendums which all voted against fluoridating their water supplies.*

---

Reviewing the 1991 results of fluoridation in Australia, we find two official government reports, both admitting the community is being dangerously overdosed with fluorides, especially babies. The fluoride pushers failed to understand that these are the adults of tomorrow.

Four local N.S.W. government referendums which all voted against fluoridating their water supplies.

Hardly had the results been announced, the New South Wales Government was out again pushing fluoridation (Moree Champion, December 12, 1991).

**The sun never sets on fluoridation!**

The City of Gosford, New South Wales voted against fluoridation September, 1991 in their referendum.

On 12th December, 1991 the Central Coast Sun Weekly advised Gosford people "fluoride in Gosford's water".

Pollution gets lip service world-wide and the U.S. Milwaukee Journal, May 5, 1991 under the heading "Environment" stated:

*"The health of aquatic habitats in North America continues to decay,"*

*and..*

*"Fish and other animals are fast disappearing from the Nation's waterways."*

The Melbourne Age, 4th January, 1992 printed an extract from the Washington Post:

*"Toxic Omission - Twenty years after the U.S. Congress ordered regulations of water pollution, the Environmental Protection Agency (E.P.A.) has failed to impose Federal controls on four-fifths of the industrial plants that dump toxic substances into waters, lakes and estuaries."*

On November 1, 1991 Robert J. Carton PhD, Vice President, Local 2050 of the U.S. National Federation of Federal Employees gave evidence before an E.P.A. Drinking Water Committee of the Science Advisory Board of the Environmental Protection Agency.

---

*"The seriousness of the cover-up on this issue (fluoride) requires that we go back to square one . . . let the chips fall where they may."*

---

He explained that members of his organisations are the professionals responsible for providing scientific bases for E.P.A. regulations.

He stated:

*"In this context I am here today to alert you to the fraudulent nature of E.P.A.'s previous efforts on fluoride, and to request that you take an active role in insisting that E.P.A. conduct an unbiased, in-depth investigation of the risks posed by exposure to fluoride, not a whitewash as occurred in 1985." (The animal - cancer study).*

He continued:

*"Ethical misconduct by E.P.A. management included the following, they ignored the requirements of the Law to protect sensitive individuals such as children, diabetics or people with kidney impairment. Contrary to Law, they made the criteria for considering health data so stringent that reasonable concerns for safety were eliminated. Data showing positive correlations between fluoride exposure and genetic effects in almost all laboratory tests were discounted."*

A very sensitive, short statement by Carton when he said:

*"By selective use of data, they fit science to the desired outcome."*

In several statements, Robert Carton said the E.P.A.

accepted falsified reports from the Surgeon General's Office.

In his concluding remarks he made this profound statement:

*"It is about time that science prevailed on this subject and past errors corrected. The seriousness of the cover-up on this issue requires that we go back to square one, evaluate the primary literature and let the chips fall where they may."*

Sometimes the fluoride lobby has a jackass who literally lets the cat out of the bag.

The Melbourne - Herald Sun, 4th January, 1992 printed an article from New York on aspirin.

One paragraph was enough to signpost the New World Order of control.

*"The new love affair with aspirin has even lead one U.S. researcher to suggest the drug be placed in water supplies as fluoride was after World War 2."*

Fluoridation is war, war against democracy and human rights and as an expression of war the "big world push" is on from the fluoride nerve-centre, its origin the same as fluoridation, and backed by the World Health Organisation which in turn depends on U.S. finance for its continuation. (Melbourne Herald, 11th May 1989 U.N. Annual Assembly).

Even with all English speaking countries in a state of economic depression, there is seemingly unlimited flu-

oridation money available to waste on this unlawful and undemocratic process of polluting public drinking water supplies with poisonous fluoride chemicals. This is not directed at only large cities, they are willing to play the domino game with small and indeed very small towns.

What about our politicians, you know, those people voted into Parliament to represent their electorate, or more importantly all Australia.

They are all shedding crocodile tears about lack of money for essential purposes, such as schools, hospitals, roads, and even school dental clinics.

These aristocrats of government expenditure seem to believe in the fluoridation tooth fairy fable, and are coerced into appropriating unlimited money for the polluting of our drinking water supplies with poisonous fluoride chemicals against "the will of the people."

Nino Culota wrote in 1957 the book "They're a Weird Mob" the title still fits snugly on the shoulders of Australian politicians and their bureaucrats.

English speaking countries, U.S.A., U.K., Australia, New Zealand, all suffer from a serious sickness, sickness in epidemic proportions.

This sickness is APATHY, and it is on that basis the New World Order will flourish, together with its number one agenda item "World compulsory artificial fluoridation".

How is your Apathy?

---

## GAMES PLAYED BY OUR POLITICIANS "CAN YOU KEEP A SECRET?"

Those promoting fluoride and fluoridation (the pushers), are knowingly or unknowingly lying in downplaying the toxicity of fluoride chemicals and the harm they do to humans, even if some scientific literature indicates low toxicology, contrary to the truth.

Today throughout the scientific world, a semblance of truth is emerging, even in the International Fluoridation Lobby where statements of confession are being made indicating the past so-called fluoridation scientific data was not really properly researched or documented. Indeed, the latest N.H. and M.R.C. Report on Fluoridation 1991 admits, "There is no proper data base in Australia".

But what value has such confessions? Are they just a cover-up for future protection of the fluoride pushers, politicians, government health departments, and dental and medical organisations?

There is no Government published public information properly and honestly advising the people on the known health hazards of fluorides and fluoridation.

---

*There is no Government published public information properly and honestly advising the people on the known health hazards of fluorides and fluoridation.*

---

One inquiry to the Victorian Health Minister asked when the Victorian Government would be publishing in **public daily papers** the dangers of feeding babies with formula food made up with fluoridated water, and was advised that the Health Department would be giving health authorities the warnings, but **no multi-language media advertisements would be given to the people via newspapers.**

Of course such a public notice will make "monkeys" out of the so-called dental and medical health experts for their past false actions and recommendations, but that is of little consequence compared with the safety of our young children.

One well known anti-fluoridationist who has studied the problem with fluoride ingestion of babies, sought

official permission to discuss baby formula food with staff of the baby health centres. **He was refused.** Public apathy is the main reason for the continuation of the abhorrent process, but it also has a more alarming reason in the fact that fluoridation studies are officially suppressed. The public must not know!

The joining of all fluoride lobby groups and their personnel make a formidable array of endorsements, maintaining a profitable status quo, but without scientific credibility or indeed moral principles to support their propaganda.

Their unsupportable and unsubstantiated fluoridation propaganda is confined to the U.S.A., U.K., Australia and New Zealand with the scientifically advanced countries of Europe having scientifically rejected fluoridation as ineffective and a health hazard.

What a choice, seeing that the children's teeth in those European communities are just as good as any children who have had fluoridated water.

In Australia the more fluoridation, the more School Dental Clinics in that area. Here, something is lacking in fluoride and fluoridation logic, but the politicians do not care, they do as they are told by the faceless people who run their political parties. But who runs those faceless people? Even the medical profession are now entering the fluoridation propaganda field and it is not uncommon to see community medical doctors placing their collective names in public advertisements and articles endorsing fluoridation.

Is this a cover-up to take the public heat off their own profession, trying to make some impression on the public as "the medical do-gooders"??!

One is lead to believe they have much more important and demanding areas in their own profession that need constant, and indeed much improved professionalism, so we must ask who is pushing these groups of mislead medical practitioners who intrude into the wanted dental sphere of public duty and honest expertise?

To use the **ho..orary title** of Doctor of Medicine is a serious privilege, similar to the **honorary title** of Doctor of Dentistry not to be confused with a University Degree of Doctor and should be treated as such, not only in the interest of the doctors and dentists but the safety of the public in general.

*Vol. 28, no. 2, p. 2*

# WARNING: BABIES AT RISK

The latest National Health & Medical Research Council 1991 Report on Fluorides and Fluoridation gives serious warnings on the excess fluoride ingestion by babies on "infant formulas" and "fluoridated tooth paste". (Page 117).

How many years of documented evidence is needed before the highest medical authority in Australia comes clean and admits their dilatory past endorsements on the use of fluorides for children, especially babies!

In 1981 Kay Dupuy in her book "The Fluoridated Water-Gate Victoria 1981" Page 9 stated:

*"However if a powdered milk formula is used and prepared with fluoridated water, the infant will consume, from the water alone, well over 1 mg of fluoride daily. This is more than 4 times (400%) the maximum recommended in 1977 by the Council of Dental Therapeutics."*

The 1982 book "Fluoridation Poison on Tap" by Glen S.R. Walker page 276 states:

*"An average six month old baby weighing 16 to 20 pounds should consume 2½ ounces of milk per pound body weight per day, making the weight of its daily milk between 40 and 50 ounces.*

*If a powdered milk formula is used and prepared with fluoridated water, the infant will consume, from the water alone, well over 1 milligram of fluoride daily. This is FOUR TIMES the maximum recommended in 1977, by the U.S. Council of Dental Therapeutics. One would have expected the pathologist on the Committee to have alerted the two other non-medically-qualified members into taking this overdosing seriously. However, in spite of three full submissions on this subject, it was completely ignored.*

*Human milk contains very little fluoride, this being the case, it strongly suggests that infants do not require and should not have supplements of fluoride.*

*Development pharmacology is a new and rapidly expanding sector of pharmacology. It is based on the fact that cells in the course of rapid growth and differentiation may develop a specific sensitivity to low concentrations of drugs and toxins, with permanent disruption of their functions as a result.*

*The nerve cells of the brain are to a great extent homogeneous at the time before birth and thus constantly sensitive to a substance which disrupts this differential process. Animal experiments have shown that the administration of drugs in doses which are not harmful to the adult organism may produce specific permanent disorders in the learning ability and other subtle behavioural components of the young.*

*As Professor Carlsson said in 1978:*

*"One wonders what a 50-fold increase in the exposure of fluoride, such as occurs in infants bottle-fed with [fluoridated] water-diluted preparations, may mean for the development of the brain and other organs."*

*He also said:*

*"Again, problems associated with this can be solved only by precise and comprehensive epidemiological studies in which, for example, breast-fed and bottle-fed babies are compared in localities with a varying water fluoride content. No studies of this kind have yet been made.*

(Professor Carlsson, Professor of Pharmacology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden).

Again a public statement (never refuted by NH&MRC, ADA, AMA, or any Health Minister or Health Department of Australia) was printed in the Geelong Advertiser April 16, 1986.

The following letter by Dr Philip Sutton (D.D.Sc,

(Melbourne) L.D.S., F.R.A.C.D.S., Academic Associate, University of Melbourne, Formerly Senior Lecturer in Dental Science, Senior Research Fellow) again gives sound warnings about overdosing of babies with formula food made up with fluoridated water.

## Fluoride risk for bottle-fed infants

*"Sir: During the current discussion whether the people of Geelong should be compulsorily medicated with fluorine through their drinking-water, one important consideration has been ignored.*

*This is the feeding of bottle-fed infants whose formulas are prepared with water from domestic taps.*

*In November, 1985, a committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council stated that: "During the last decade there has been a reduction in the recommended dosage of fluoride supplements basically for children aged 0-2 years."*

*This reduction was made in an attempt to reduce the prevalence and the severity of the ugly condition known as dental fluorosis, which is due to the poisoning of the tooth-forming cells by fluoride.*

*The NH and MRC said that, where the water contains little fluoride, infants two weeks to two years of age should receive a quarter of a milligram of fluoride daily — only a quarter of the dose originally suggested.*

---

*". . . there has been a reduction in the recommended dosage of fluoride supplements . . ."*

---

*That amount of fluoride is contained in about a quarter of a litre of fluoridated water.*

*Therefore, for a bottle-fed infant to obtain the dose suggested by the NH and MRC experts, it would be necessary to give it only one-and-a-quarter bottles of milk a day (a quarter of a litre). This would be gross underfeeding.*

*The opinion of that NH and MRC committee ignored the 1981 finding by Ekstrand and his co-workers that infants did not require fluoride.*

*This is shown by the fact that there is a physiological 'barrier' which almost completely prevents the passage of fluoride from the mother's blood into her breast milk.*

*Ekstrand said that this ". . . suggests that the newborn is actively protected from this halogen" (fluorine).*

*In 1979, the main U.S. food and drug authority ceased classifying fluorine as "essential or probably essential" in human diet, therefore it is a foreign substance.*

*Professor Roger Short, FRS, said in 1985: "To introduce any foreign substance into the baby's diet at this time must be assumed to be hazardous until it can be proven otherwise." (One established hazard is the development of dental fluorosis).*

*He made that statement in a foreword to the recently-published book: 'Breastfeeding matters' by the Geelong researcher and author Maureen Minchin.*

*He referred to the author's ". . . complete mastery of the world's relevant medical and scientific literature".*

*This excellent book is destined to become the standard textbook on breast feeding.*

*It is possible that the Government may be sufficiently foolish politically to impose fluoridation on the Geelong population against its expressed wishes — demonstrated by the overwhelming vote against fluoridation at the Geelong and Dis-*

*Vol. 20, no. 1, p. 3*

trict Water Board elections last year.

If this occurs, all Geelong mothers who, despite the advice on Mrs Minchin's book, are forced to bottle-feed their babies, or are likely to do so in the future, must insist that arrangements are made to deliver to them regularly, without charge, adequate quantities of fluoride-free water, so that they will not have the trauma of knowingly overdosing their babies with this toxic substance every time they bottle-feed them.

In 1984, Ekstrand, Hardell and Spack found that bottle-fed infants (where fluoridated water is used) receive 150 times as much fluoride per day as is received by their breastfed counterparts.

The adviser on pharmacology to the Swedish Government, Professor Arvid Carlsson, expressed the fear that, although not affecting the development of the body, this massive overdose of fluoride may affect the development of the brain and lead to learning difficulties.

This problem with bottle-fed infants was brought to the attention of the Minister for

Health, Mr White, but no comment on it has been received.

(Dr) Philip R.N. Sutton

In a publication by the ADA on "Fluoridation of Water Supplies" — Questions and Answers, page 14, they state —

". . . no ill effect has ever been shown on the health of bottle-fed babies of the consumption of feeds made up with fluoridated water."

Who tells the scientific truth?

A recent British study printed in Lancet suggests breast fed babies have a higher IQ than bottle fed babies.

The study suggests mothers milk contains an unknown chemical that is necessary for the baby.

However those scientists failed to look closely at the bottle-fed mixture. Here **we know** it contains a dangerous poisonous fluoride chemical so the fact is that one is known and the other is a medical mystery!

Accept the obvious and warn all mothers to care properly for their babies irrespective of the Medical and Dental experts who push "fluorides for babies".

## HAS DENTAL SCIENCE PROGRESSED OVER 446 YEARS?

The United Kingdom is the only part of the EEC pushing artificial fluoridation, and indeed the U.K. Government endorses its effectiveness and safety, contrary to what has happened all over Europe.

The other EEC countries, years ago stopped or banned fluoridation, or never even considered it safe or effective.

Independent scientists throughout the world know that diet, oral hygiene and proper attention is the answer to good teeth; all without fluoridation. Bad teeth are the product of bad care of teeth.

Of course, to the real scientist it is a simple fact that the daily fluoride 'dosage' through the drinking water supply has only one medical control, - **THIRST!** The dose depends on thirst!

This simple factual medical equation seems insufficient to influence politicians, the media, dental and medical organisations, all of whom follow a different principle in medical science, mostly based on commercialism and strange university teaching.

No evidence has been examined or published by the pro-fluoridation lobby (including your Government) showing the total daily intake of flouridated drinking water and its corresponding fluoride dose for the Australian people, who live under different conditions, such as —

atmospheric and environmental temperatures, humidity, physical exertion, work and sport, sex, age, size, diet, state of health (diarrhea, diabetes, fever, kidney disease) drug treatment (diuretics) and so on —

This establishes the dangerous medical ignorance of compulsory fluoride medication foisted on every person and controlled only by THIRST!

Can people have good teeth without the present day fluoride commercialism?

Archaeologists in recent times examining skeletons found in the "Mary Rose", sunk 1545, discovered the teeth of those sailors "in fine condition", even men over 40 had no dental decay.

How could men have such good teeth 446 years ago, compared with all the so-called specialised dental knowledge and the billions spent every year throughout the world on dental reasearch, and today's increasing number of dentists, dental school clinics and above all fluoridation, plus the huge national dental treatment bill for the population?

Is todays dental technology progressive and scientificallly sound? If people's teeth 446 years ago were so good, what is wrong with the dental science wisdom of today?

The answer is so simple, and has been documented in the wonderful book "A Gift of Love, Hopewood Story" by Jack Trop.

Hopewood Home was established 1942 by Lesley Owen Bailey in Bowral, New South Wales.

Children from all over New South Wales with vastly differing home conditions were "adopted" by Lesley Bailey to live in the Hopewood Home where great love was expressed together with proper diet. **'THE CHILDREN DID NOT DRINK FLUORIDATED WATER'**.

*The Australian Medical Journal* 20th February, 1960 expressed as "little short of miraculous" the state of the children's teeth! The Journal explained that:

"After a 10-years examining period, the Hopewood children continued to show remarkable freedom from dental decay."

The diet was simple, mostly consisting of wholemeal bread, wholemeal biscuits, wholemeal porridge, fruits (fresh and dried), vegetables, (cooked and raw), a small amount of meat, butter, cheese, eggs, milk, fruit juices, honey or molasses.

As far as possible, food was taken uncooked and/or with a minimum of preparation, the idea being to present the food in its natural state. Notable for their absence from the diet were such items as sugar (white and brown), white flour products (including cakes and sweet biscuits), and any combination of these items. No tea was used.

The above was published, endorsed and promoted by the Australian Medical Journal of the day (1960), but has since been completely buried by the commercialism that controls today's health organisations.

Today's medical and dental policies seem more intended in prescribing drugs instead of examining causes such as illustrated in the controlled experiment of good health and excellent teeth at Hopewood House 50 years ago.

**Did any of the Hopewood children get or need fluoride? Certainly not. Did the men on the "Mary Rose" get or need fluoride? Certainly not.**

Ask your dentist what he thinks about the Hopewood children.

What did the great dental scientist and researcher, Dr. Weston Price say about primitive man, with excellent teeth and perfect dental arches? He said all those lovely natural qualities of teeth and general health disappeared soon after their diets changed to "modern mankind foods".

Weston Price in a table on percentages of teeth attacked by caries in primitive and modern groups in his book "Nutrition and Physical Degeneration" shows primitive Australian Aborigines with zero teeth decay. But when "modernised" the figure rose to 70.9 percent.

His statement in Chapter eight on "Social Reforms by Education" sums up the whole position —

"The masses must be taught that **LIFE IN ITS FULLNESS IS MOTHER NATURE OBEYED.**" (at very little cost).

*Vol. 20, no. 2, p. 4*