


THE AUSTRALIAN FLUORIDATION NEWS



ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION
IS WATER POLLUTION
www.fluoridationnews.com
afavaust@gmail.com

G.P.O. Box 935,
Melbourne, Vic., 3001
PLEASE PASS ON WHEN READ

Vol 28
No. 3

Price \$2.00
\$15 per annum posted Australia

MAY-JUNE
1992

Registered by Australia Post —
Publication No. NBG0721

FLUORIDATION KINKS AND DENTS

A kink has appeared in the fluoridation professional armour, but an extraordinarily large dent has appeared in the credibility of dentists, doctors, governments and their bureaucrats who set up and continue the fluoridation and fluoride fable.

Not only is fluoridation under concentrated scientific questioning, but the long established so-called safe amalgam mercury fillings are found to be a health hazard.

In July 1991 research was published about the A.D.A. cover-up claims on amalgam mercury fillings. This research was by the International Academy of Oral Medicine and Toxicology U.S.A., (I.A.O.M.T.).

The I.A.O.M.T. put it in simple scientific language when they said:

"... the majority of dentists in North America rely on the guidelines of the leadership in the American Dental Association, the Canadian Dental Association and the National Institute of Dental Research ..."

Everyone knows the above (A.D.A., C.D.A., N.I.D.R.) are the promoters of fluoridation and amalgam mercury fillings.

Their credibility is scientifically bound up in both propositions.

As an indicator of A.D.A. non-scientific evidence in their five quoted supporting references on the safety of amalgam fillings, the I.A.O.M.T. state:

"The total lack of valid science to support the continued use of amalgam is apparent in the A.D.A. Special Reports, Bibliography.

They cite only review articles and lay media reports and no primary research into either animal or human physiological or immunological reaction to dental amalgam metal."

"Moreover, none of the articles referenced in the A.D.A. Bibliography contain hard research. They merely cited other primary research papers to support their divergent conclusions. Many of the primary research scientists referenced in the review articles did not conclude that amalgam was safe. This Bibliography would therefore be

Fluorides are good; But what for?

Export of "Game Products" from Africa require a declaration by an Official State Veterinarian that the "Game Trophies" have been treated for 48 hours with a solution of Sodium Silicofluoride, the same chemical used in the fluoridated water you drink by compulsion.

All "untreated" game trophies must be processed and in particular "skulls and bones" **boiled in a solution of Sodium Silicofluoride!**

Add that to the WHO Killing List of the same fluoride chemical that is added to your drinking water by your **caring Government** and the politicians you vote into Parliament to "represent your will".

very misleading to anyone not familiar with the current research."

It would appear from the I.A.O.M.T. paper that the dentists' hierarchy and dictators panicked because they also altered their ADA code of ethics and professional conduct to read:

"... the removal of amalgam restoration from the non-allergic patient for the alleged purpose of removing toxic substances from the body, when such treatment is performed solely at the recommendation or suggestion of the dentist, is improper and unethical."

So the dentist is flouting his dental association's "code of ethics": if, by his own research, expertise and understanding recommends the removal of amalgam fillings. No wonder he is forced to recommend fluoridation!

Actually the answer is so simple — the majority of fillings throughout the world today are not amalgam, which seems to follow the fluoridation myth. The previous "safe" fluoridation ingestion is scientifically agreed to be too high and must be reduced or indeed removed completely.

Two bad principles do not make good science.

Fluoridation Action Stations

In the State of New York Senate, January 21, 1992, the following Senate Bill was introduced:—
Bill Number S6736

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

- 1 Section 1. The public health law is amended by
- 2 adding a new section 1109 to read as follows:
- 3 S 1109. Fluoridation of public water supplies. 1.
- 4 Notwithstanding any law to the contrary relating
- 5 to or regulating public potable water supplies, no
- 6 agency or official of the state of New York, nor
- 7 any county, town, village or city or agency or of-
- 8 ficial thereof shall have any power or authority
- 9 to promulgate, adopt or make any rule, regula-
- 10 tion or order requiring or directing the addition
- 11 of fluoride or fluorine containing compounds to
- 12 any public potable water supply and any such
- 13 rule, regulation or order heretofore promulgated,
- 14 adopted or made is terminated and of no effect.
- 15 2. No person, firm corporation, agency, authori-
- 16 ty, district, municipality or any entity engaged in
- 17 the distribution of public supplies of potable wa-
- 18 ters shall add fluoride or fluorine containing
- 19 compounds to any such water supply.
- 20 S 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of
- 21 April next succeeding the date on which it shall
- 22 have become law.

The above Bill demonstrates there are courageous honest politicians if only you can find one.

What about an Australian Search Programme to find some in our Country.

REMARKABLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE FLUORIDATION DISCUSSION

Glen S.R. Walker, F.I.M.F., E.M.E.C.S., M.A.E.S.,
Editor,
The Australian Fluoridation News.

Dear Mr Walker

The time is long overdue for someone to acknowledge publicly your remarkable contribution to the fluoridation discussion. Therefore I submit this letter which I hope you will publish in a prominent place in your next edition.

I have just completed re-reading the March-April News, and noted that it is unusual amongst newsheets in that it does not have an editorial. Then I realized that, in a sense, the entire paper is an editorial, having been compiled, written and published by you personally — it is a remarkable effort. Even more so is the fact that you have, by your personal efforts, managed to publish *The Australian Fluoridation News* month after month for many years. In doing so you have provided reliable information which you have gathered from all over the world to assist, inform and continue to inspire, your readers, both in Australia and overseas.

By continuing to publish the *Australian Fluoridation News*, despite the failure of similar overseas publications, by publishing your landmark 458-page book 'Fluoridation: Poison on Tap' in 1982, which was devoted to pointing out the errors in the report of the Victorian Government inquiry into fluoridation, by your many lectures and by answering innumerable telephone inquiries and posting portfolios of information about fluoridation to interested people, you have established yourself as the leading figure in the opposition to fluoridation in Australia, and indeed, elsewhere.

After reading this latest issue of the News I fell to thinking of the small, but very distinguished number of medical and dental scientists I have encountered during the thirty-five years during which I have studied fluoridation (and written numerous articles and two books opposing it). I thought of those people, some of them

not known to me, who have had the moral courage to continue to oppose this form of medication and have done their best to reveal the misleading official statements on this subject.

Those who come readily to mind are Professor Sir Arthur Amies, who for many years was Dean of the Faculty of Dental Science, University of Melbourne, and Professor Sir Stanton Hicks, the pharmacologist of the University of Adelaide, who was the wartime Advisor on Foodstuffs and Feeding to the Australian and American armies. Dr George Waldbott the eminent American allergist, formerly the editor of *National Fluoridation News* and the author of several outstanding books on fluoridation, Lord Douglas of Barloch, the former Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords, and the distinguished South African pharmacologist, Professor Douw Steyn. All of these distinguished men opposed fluoridation until their deaths.

The list of living scientists who oppose fluoridation is too long to mention them all here.

None of these men fit the description of simple-minded fools which 'health' bureaucrats use to describe those who oppose their 'sacred cow' called fluoridation. It appears that the tactic of governments who wish to impose this medication on their people, is to attempt to swamp them with pro-fluoridation propaganda until they are 'brain-washed' and to await the deaths of the present opponents, most of whom are old enough to have escaped these 'brain-washing' tactics. (This is a similar 'solution' to the government practice of delaying providing compensation to the victims of its atomic testing, forty years ago, so that it has avoided paying many victims because they have already died.)

I conclude by again congratulating you on your outstanding attempt to preserve the wellbeing of the community.

Yours sincerely,

Philip R.N. Sutton, D.D.Sc., FRACDS.

WORLD FLUORIDATION SCORE

FINLAND

Only one fluoridation plant was installed in Kuopio, Finland 1959 supplying only 1½% of the population.

After 32 years of experimenting on those people it was decided to stop fluoridation in June 1991.

Scientists in Finland found health problems associated with fluoridation especially relating to the increase of hip fractures in the fluoridated areas compared with non fluoridated areas.

ENGLAND

The result of a City of Sheffield poll on 16 January 1992 asking, yes or no to fluoridation, resulted in 86% "against" and only 14% "for". The Council is recorded as being against fluoridation.

SCOTLAND

At its meeting 25 February 1992 Tayside Regions Water Service Committee rejected Tayside Health Board's proposal to fluoridate their water supply. The Committee unanimously agreed to a motion stating that the Council, in light of overwhelming opposition to fluoridation, expressed by members of the public, opposed fluoridating their public water supplies.

CANADA

Dr Richard Foulkes B.A., M.D., a former promoter of fluoridation and a special consultant to the Ministry of Health, Province of British Columbia 1972-1975 and author of official advise to the Government for manda-

tory fluoridation has now publicly denounced his past endorsement of fluoridation.

Dr Foulkes stated —

"I have reviewed the subject recently and now conclude that fluoridation of community water supplies should be abandoned. The practice can no longer be held to be safe or effective in the reduction of tooth decay. It is no longer ethical to state that fluoride in the water supply is effective for the purpose claimed.

The trials in the 1940's in the USA and Canada have been shown to be invalid . . .

Fluoride in water supplies even at the levels of 1 ppm has now been shown to be toxic."

(Personal Communication to the Editor)

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

Vol. 28, no. 3, p. 2

NEW SOUTH WALES HEALTH DEPARTMENT SLAMS DOWN ITS SHUTTERS

By JEANETTE GOW, New Brighton NSW

Our Health Department has consistently refused to recognise and take seriously the significant fluoride levels in infant formula and other commercial products. This crucial factor has been callously ensconced from parents.

When I sent a copy of Silva and Reynolds fluoride assays (N.H. and M.R.C. 1991 Report) to a Baby Clinic nurse, the reaction was one of astonishment. The alarmingly high fluoride levels in some brands of baby formula food are not only grossly in excess of the Department's own recommendations, but could be further increased by mothers unwittingly adding fluoridated water.

But instead of addressing these matters, there was only the usual adulatory praise for the Health Department, the N.H. and M.R.C. and the great American example.

Never was there a hint of concern about infant formula, or an interest in investigating the many sources of fluoride in commercial products. The Silva and Reynolds essays contained in the very Report held aloft as the "fluoride bible" could just as well been written in invisible ink.

Even though the official daily fluoride dose for infants up to two years is 0.25 mg. F. the Department seems unconcerned that amounts considerably in excess of this will be detrimental to babies under two years of age.

Information on many sources of fluoride is not readily available to parents, nor are they given any help whatsoever to calculate total fluoride intake. And the first sign of fluoride poisoning — tooth mottling — is dismissed as a trivial cosmetic problem.

Tragically many young children are the innocent victims of a cynical, political exercise which protects careers rather than child health.

It is clear that the Health Department has lifted only one recommendation from the N.H. and M.R.C. Report, and kept very quiet about the other ones. The misgivings expressed by the Working Party, the contradictions and errors in the Report are ignored by the Health Department.

Tragically many young children are the innocent victims of a cynical, political exercise which protects careers rather than child health.

Last year a "Sir Humphrey" at the N.H. and M.R.C. decided to form an expert panel in the hope of stringing things along for another decade.

The Government still can't give a logical reason why a smidgeon of sodium chloride has to be listed on food

labels, but sodium fluoride must remain unlisted. Consumers can avoid common salt but not sodium fluoride. The market basket scheme which assays food products is now the responsibility of the National Food Authority. We must apply relentlessly, pressure for testing and disclosure of fluoride levels in commercial products. Because this data will make fools of "people in power", I can only speculate as to whether it will be listed on labels or quietly removed by manufacturers.

In February this year the strain of evading a relentless storm of crucial questions and allegations, finally took its toll on departmental nerves. Or maybe it was the defeat of fluoridation in four shires of New South Wales and further rejection at Moree. In a 'dummy spitting' mood, the Director advised me that **Health Department files on fluoridation are now closed, and all correspondence must cease.**

How can the public discussion and ongoing monitoring by the N.H. and M.R.C. occur if the Health Department refuses to communicate with the public on fluoridation matters?

The stated freedom to choose unfluoridated water is only a partial one whilst consumers have no way of choosing an unfluoridated product over a fluoridated one when labels are not required to list fluoride impurities.

The stated freedom to choose unfluoridated water is only a partial one whilst consumers have no way of choosing an unfluoridated product over a fluoridated one when labels are not required to list fluoride impurities.

The stated freedom to hold and express an opinion is hollow when individuals cannot translate this into action. We have the majority of Australians opposing fluoridation, but unable to influence departmental policy.

Instead of respecting and acceding to this majority view, these dissenters are debased with the quick-stick label "uninformed scaremongers". This is an insult not only to lay persons, but the many professionals in the Anti-Fluoridation Movement. It is also a blatant ploy to avoid meaningful debate.

The health bureaucracy has used a rather Orwellian ruse and expunged all memory of past N.H. and M.R.C. misjudgements, so that it now stands as the unblemished, ultimate intelligentsia. NSW fluoridation laws rigidly exclude consensus and democratic rights. **HEALTH DEPARTMENT SHUTTERS ARE FIRMLY CLOSED.**

Government Movement to "Control Promotion of Drugs" Don't blink, you may miss the "movement"

The Minister for Health Services, Mr Staples, stated on 29th March, 1992 that legislation may be required to control "the activities of pharmaceutical companies".

During the previous week, the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Community Affairs recommended industry spending more on education, rather than brand promotion.

Imagine our chances of matching the medical payola? One doctor told the Committee that the pharmaceutical industry spends about \$8,000 per doctor "on incentives" to try and persuade "the pen that writes the prescription".

The strangest statement came from the spokesman for the Pharmaceutical Society.

He said a doctor could write a prescription only if a patient had a medical condition requiring pharmaceutical treatment.

All of this hypocritical procedure in front of respon-

sible (sic) Government members, none of whom seem capable of honest reaction to compulsory mass medication with poisonous fluoride chemicals, all without "a patient having a requirement for treatment".

The claim for fluoridation is treatment of children up to age 12.

That means even accepting the dental scam for children's teeth, at least 70 percent of the population (over the age of 12 years) do not have "a medical requirement" for fluoride treatment.

But the public still have a religious belief in the doctor's ability to *medicate poeple unseen!* Medical Mesmerism at its worst.

Greater misplaced faith hath no people, willing to render the health, well-being and rights of their families, to corrupt ethics, shoddy dishonest science, and immoral politicians, all of which freely abound throughout Australia, and indeed the world in general

Vol. 28, no. 3, p. 3

THE KEYSTONE OF FLUORIDATION

The Oxford Dictionary describes the Keystone as:

"Stone at the summit of arch locking the whole together, central principle etc. on which all depends.

A building has a keystone which fits exactly the expertly planned construction. Before a keystone is "set" the construction must be completed in a properly designed manner, built upon excellently surveyed foundations, all details checked and counterchecked for accuracy.

The fluoridation building, however, relies on "scaffolding" to hide its poor construction, its unprincipled design, its inverted pyramid type foundations, and its maze of locked rooms and endless dark corridors leading to nowhere in particular.

It is impossible for this fluoridation building to have a scientifically designed keystone "of central principles on which all depends" locking the whole "fluoridation propaganda" together.

Foundations are scientifically important, and inspection will reveal the fluoridation foundations, "original studies", "promotion and propaganda", do not pass scientific scrutiny, and such foundations are fraught with excessive human danger.

The internal design leading to the central nerve centre goes through a complicated maze of rooms, lifts, (that mostly go one way only) extensive blind alley-ways, all without any plan or final finish because the building is an ongoing piece of chicanery scientific architecture.

A building without light, and the only notice on its walls (put there by the Unions) identifies "THE MUSHROOM DEPARTMENT".

Another room has its door titled "Control of Media"; what some people would give to get that data so that officially it can be made public and "fed" to the appropriate Government Legal Department where it cannot escape democratic and legal justice.

The fluoridation Keystone should represent in its design honesty, integrity, scientific expertise, honest draughtsmanship, ethics, non-commercialism, non-political, non-international fluoride lobby membership, and the stone designed without any political, dental or medical impediment. Perfection that cannot be misplaced, misused or warped to other dimensions.

Hidden away in dark rooms are hundreds of propaganda and scam fluoridation studies, never again to see the scientific light of day, but the proprietors of the building are satisfied with the degree of success these studies have had in hoodwinking naive politicians, dental students and the public in general.

These hoax studies bolster new fluoridation propaganda articles by using the old data as references, even though it is admitted they are unscientifically suitable under the heading of true science.

Even Judge Jauncey, Edinburgh Court 1983, referred

to fluoridation dental studies that were "to some degree imperfect", a nice way of describing scientifically fraudulent studies.

Then the N.H. and M.R.C. in their 1991 Fluoridation Study stated on page 19:

"In practice the quality of the early intervention trials (The foundation on which fluoridation was promoted) was generally poor when judged against the above ideal. Random allocation was usually not possible, and the choice of control populations was often inadequate; insufficient baseline data were recorded to allow for adjustment between compared populations, there was a lack of 'blinding' of observers in the recording of dental health outcomes, and detailed and critical statistical analyses were often lacking."

So the foundation of fluoridation was shonky, dangerously inaccurate, unscientific and lacking in dental and medical ethical expertise, all supported by fraudulent government intervention.

Large apartments are installed to house the fluoridation international network communications, a very important part of the fluoridation promotion establishment from where most fluoridation dogma originates for local propaganda, scientific, and media circulation.

An important apartment is the political section where history explains who, how, and where fluoridation was accepted. The "how" being most important, and the "who" controlled by the unseen and unknown government shadow ministry.

Somewhere a room contains answers to how politicians worldwide of all political persuasions blindly support fluoridation in spite of such an unpolitical character when the vote-hungry politicians publicly rejects the "will of the people", the electorate, all of whom control the politicians' next "job".

The fluoridation building houses the answer to this intriguing question which obviously must be kept in the "Mushroom Department" under constant guard.

Politicians have plenty to answer.

"They poison our drinking water, the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the soil beneath our feet."

Stop and listen. Do you hear a sound like an earthquake? That is the growing world opposition to evil political manoeuvring with people's health. Soon it will hit the fluoridation house of cards which will crumble and crash, but the contents will forever be buried so that those responsible for this evil attack on humanity will be protected.

Dentistry and medicine relating to fluoridation is based on Voodoo Science, a science of fear and ignorance accepted only by superstitious people.

Do not get hooked on this Voodoo Science of the old type medicine men with their snake oil cures.

Their teflon claims just won't stick!

LETTER

Dear Sir,

On 7th August, 1991, the Federal Minister for Health Mr Howe, estimated that diet related diseases are adding at least a figure of \$2 billion to Australia's health care bill. In 1984/85 diet related heart disease cost the Nation about \$900 million and diet related cancers about \$200 million. (Joint statement on diet related disease Aust. Com. Gov.)

These two diseases can be caused by fluoridated water and fluoride chemicals.

The Australian Liberal and Labor Parties dogmatically promote fluoridation and reject the wish of the public.

The Melbourne Water Supply contains fluoride at 1 ppm. The famous Pittsburg Court Case 1978 accepted Dr George Waldbott's reliable evidence that water fluoridated at 1 ppm can induce cancer in humans. (Fluoridation: Poison on Tap, p.53)

Lime is added to Melbourne drinking water supplies to prevent the fluoride eating into the water pipes.

Dr James Edwardson and his colleagues in Britain's Newcastle General Hospital, now think they have evidence that aluminium is the cause of Alzheimer's dis-

ease. They used nuclear magnetic resonance to pinpoint precisely where the aluminium is in the brain. They found it as aluminium silicate right in the centre of the plaques. Alzheimers is a malfunction of the brain neurotransmitters — the chemicals that relay signals between nerve cells. (The Economist, 1986)

Aluminium has been shown to inhibit choline transport in erythrocytes (red blood cells) and also to decrease nerve tissue choline acetyl transferase activity. (Buist: Food Chemical Sensitivity)

The accepted level for aluminium in Australian water is 0.2 ppm; in Victoria it is not unusual for readings up to 25 times that level. (Geelong Water Board)

Iron salts could be used as a flocculant instead of aluminium (alum).

The public should be told the stomach antacid aluminium hydroxide gel which has many trade names can greatly reduce blood phosphate. With low serum phosphate, the bones dissolve, the muscles ache and are extremely weak. (Pfeiffer — Zinc & other Micro-Nutrients)

I am sure politicians are aware of the dangers of fluorides and fluoridation, but I find it impossible to discuss this matter with them — they just defend their Party's Platforms.

Yours faithfully

Joy Dixon, West Footscray

Doc. 28, no. 3, p. 4