


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. 4

Price \$2.00
\$15 per annum posted Australia

July-August
1992

Registered by Australia Post —
Publication No. NBG0721

DEMOCRACY AND HONESTY THE BIG LOSER IN THE BLUE MOUNTAINS PUBLIC REVOLT AGAINST FLUORIDATION

Over the past 20 years in the Blue Mountains there has been a referendum and a petition on fluoridation, both of which overwhelmingly demonstrated a No vote.

A few weeks ago the people of the Blue Mountains in N.S.W. discovered their drinking water supply would be fluoridated in the next 7 days, all without any public notification from the Government.

The discovery by the people resulted in community shock, but the reaction was immediate. Within a day, a committee was formed and the first public protest meeting held.

One day about 300 residents met outside the office of their local member of Parliament — with zero results!

A deputation drove 100 kilometres to the Premier's home to deliver a letter of protest from the people of the Blue Mountains — with zero results!

On the Friday night a Public Meeting was held where speakers explained the dangers of fluoridation to about 250 people in attendance.

A unanimous vote at the meeting decided to advise the Blue Mountains' Council that the people of the Blue Mountains did not want forced medication with fluoridated water.

Further public protest meetings were held showing the anger of the locals, whose rights were being ignored by the Government.

On the Sunday night the committee, backed by many residents, decided on an all night vigil outside the fluoridation plant, which was planned to commence early Monday morning.

The committee blocked all entrances to the plant with cars and in zero temperature they stood their ground

until arrested by local police who then escorted workmen to start fluoridating the drinking water supplies.

The 12 arrested people were bailed out to attend court proceedings in June 1992.

On the following Tuesday night the Council met with the Council Chambers bursting at the seams. About 250 residents attended and were delighted when the Council unanimously voted to advise the New South Wales Government they did not appreciate their action, and ask for a democratic referendum allowing "the will of the people" to be expressed. — All with zero results.

Why is fluoridation so important to the New South Wales Government and its Premier? And what constitutional authority have they to walk over the people, when the Constitution of Australia describes politicians as "servants of the people".

Please, never laugh at Russia, China, Cuba, Afghanistan and others, your rights are also being eroded every day by the very people YOU vote into power to represent and respect you.

What a case for democracy! People attempting to stop a poison fluoride chemical being pumped into their kitchen taps without permission or indeed their requirement. Sounds like the good old days of Joan of Arc and the treatment of people revolting against totalitarian and draconian regulations that do not follow today's so-called democracy and government for the people, by the people.

The equation to complete is an answer to "Who really represents the people?" And WHO DIRECTS THE GOVERNMENT to these uncivilised deeds and threats against the community?

Whose side do you want to be on?

SAVE BABIES FROM FLUORIDE TOXICITY

This serious matter is becoming a medical, dental and government treacherous cover-up.

When babies are denied well-known medical science and a minimum of 50 years documented medical warnings about the toxicity of fluoride chemicals, especially for very young children, it makes a mockery of both professional people, their organisations and so-called health ministers controlling a health department.

The original charter given to health ministers and their bureaucrats very carefully identified them (one-and-all) as the *guardians* set up for the sole purpose of protecting the community health interest.

The Health Charter has long been lost in a maze of bureaucratic commercialism and draconian health laws which completely conflict with what we not only expect, are entitled to, or what we pay for in taxes, and indeed our moral understanding of representation from our elected politicians who, like the original Health Charter, should direct their political party accordingly in the interest of the people, not to be confused with commercialism of any kind, be it professional, industry or commerce.

Extreme toxic properties of fluoride chemicals

Scientific literature up to the early 1940's expounded in substantially clear terminology the extreme toxic properties of fluoride chemicals. (Journal of American Medical Association 18 Sept. 1943; Journal American Dental Association 1 Oct 1944)

However, at the same time the big fluoridation push was on and sponsored by the U.S. Government Health Department, a Department that has consistently pillaged the rights of American people and similarly affected other countries such as Australia.

Even at the outset (1935) the false government fluoride propaganda was met with disapproval by both the American Medical and Dental Associations.

Their journals documented data of a frightening degree against fluoride ingestion, but the power, the wealth and the political network of the U.S. Health Department and its commercial cronies was soon to turn, almost overnight, both A.M.A. and A.D.A. objectors into fanatical endorsers of fluoridation without any honest scientific debate and research with their membership, the chemical, toxicological, pharmacology

and medical experts available to provide scientific proof of fluoride toxicity.

Those who originally scientifically exposed the fluoride false propaganda were hounded, character assassinated, and indeed were ostracized in a manner never before seen in a medical debate. No word or derogatory description was too low for a brand mark inflicted by the fluoride lobby.

But that was all happening 50 years ago. Time and a little honest science has demonstrated they cannot win in spite of their wealth and their might, and the commercial backing all used as icing on the fluoridation cake baked in the U.S. Government Health Department, the inner sanctum where politicians fear to tread, and where *on the doormat* they leave their respectability and electoral responsibility to be walked over by the ruling bureaucrats and their strange cohorts, few of whom are publicly known.

So in 1991, official government reports (USA and Australia) on fluoridation and fluoride chemicals lay bare the honest facts that fluorides are extremely toxic (poisonous) to humans and that the community is being seriously overdosed.

Most of us knew these facts for 50 years, we debated, we wrote books, we attempted to get the media to print the truth, but of no avail, we literally wrote thousands upon thousands of letters to the governments, most of which were ignored.

The truth about fluoridation was taboo in all governments, irrespective of their political persuasions. Why?

The fluoride lobby controlled all political parties and the "will of the people" expressed throughout the country is ignored! Why? Are we to understand the elected members of Parliament are no longer *servants of the people*, but servants of the international fluoride-lobby?

Shadow Government

It is time Australians understood that the "shadow government" is not in the Parliament.

We have had 50 years of absolute nonsensical dental and medical scientific fluoride hype from politicians, heads of responsible government departments and prestige organisations.

Actually, the official "scientific" dental fluoride mod-

In 1991, official government reports (USA and Australia) on fluoridation and fluoride chemicals lay bare the honest facts that fluorides are extremely toxic (poisonous) to humans and the community is being seriously overdosed.

els are only dental and medical beliefs, commercially controlled, political blind-flying and meek acquiescence to a power greater than our government democracy.

Australians are daily bombarded with "buzz words" professionally used to hide real issues. The politicians talk about "LEVEL PLAYING FIELDS" as though the playing field is *stacked against them!*

In reality the level playing field is an angle of 90 degrees against any community disagreement with party politics. The "will of the people" cannot grip onto the 90 degree angle of the arranged *fluoride playing field*.

What a disgusting manner used to protect the "shadow government" from the people, who in reality own their country. Let us weed out the unseen shadow government and return to old-fashion government by the people, for the people (the citizens of Australia).

At all times political and legal protection for this compulsory mass medication must be maintained, hence we play on the 90 degree fluoride level playing-field with biased political umpires.

Disinformation is the political protection to cover past fluoride and fluoridation actions — save and protect those responsible *at the expense of the populations' health*.

Joint statement on health

On 7th August, 1991 the Commonwealth Government issued a "joint statement" on "Diet related disease adds \$2 million to Australia's health care bill".

It is quite sad (for Australians) to find those "experts" do not consider water or air as part of good diet or that water is a food.

Can you live without air or water? You can live without much of what they consider food and diet.

They quote:

"There are now established links between diet and a number of chronic diseases, such as coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, some cancers, maturity on-set diabetes and gall bladder diseases. Other conditions associated with diet include overweight and obesity, diverticulitis and constipation, iron deficiency, anaemia, dental caries and under-nutrition."

Dental caries? All government groups say there are no such things now that everyone is daily drugged with fluoridated water.

However, their most interesting statement is: *"several European countries (Norway, Malta, Sweden, Netherlands, Germany and Czechoslovakia) have/are developing food and nutrition policies."*

As starters to nutrition, the above countries do not

Fluoridated toothpaste should be used with very small (pea size) quantities on children's toothbrushes under adult supervision.

M.H. and M.R.C.

use fluoridated water, an important point conveniently ignored by the Australian diet "experts".

The government nutrition experts stated:

"The objective is to ensure that all Australians have access to a safe and affordable and healthy food supply." (Minister for Health, Brian Howe).

What wonderful window dressing!! But is it honest?

In the Commonwealth Government's joint statement on health and diet it is noticeable that the 'f' word is taboo and in spite of all the scientific evidence from the Minister's own Department, the National Health and Medical Research Council, their report on fluoridation is completely ignored and diet related fluoride ingestion seems quite unimportant.

Perhaps some quotes from *Time* magazine June 3, 1991 could enlighten nutrition experts into scientific evaluation.

An essay by Barbara Ehrenreich in an essay "**Science, Lies and the Ultimate Truth**", made this statement:

"What does one more lie matter anyway? Politicians 'mis-speak' and are forgiven by their followers. Pop singers have been known to dub in better voices. Literary disconstructionalists say there is no truth anyway, just ideologies and points of view. Lies, you might say, are the great lubricant of our way of life. They sell products, flatter the powerful, and appease the electorate."

The following quotation leaves little to the imagination:

"But science is different, and the difference does define a kind of sanctity. Although we think of it as the most secular of human enterprises, there is a little known spiritual side to science, with its own stern ethical implications. Through research, we seek to know that ultimate Order, which could be called Nature if the term didn't sound so tame, or God if the word weren't loaded with so much human hope and superstition. Think of it more neutrally as the nameless Subject of so much that happens, like the It in 'it is raining'; something 'out there' and vastly different from ourselves, but not so alien that we cannot hope to know It's ways."

Writing on some falsified scientific data Barbara

Vol. 28, no. 4, p. 2

Ehrenreich stated:

"What he forgot is that low humans may respect these things, the truth does not. What he lost sight of, in the smugness of success, is that truth is no respecter of hierarchy or fame."

Our article started with "Save the Babies from Fluoride Toxicity".

Dangers of baby formula food

Now the reader will understand why no government warnings on the dangers of baby formula food are made to the public, even though their own department, the N.H. and M.R.C. confirm that fact, (1991 report) and also warn that *fluoridated toothpaste* should be used with very small (pea-size) quantities on children's toothbrushes under adult supervision.

In other words the government knows that babies are at grave risk of fluoride poisoning.

The conundrum is why the government appoint a specially selected committee (N.H. and M.R.C.) to investigate fluoride toxicity, (fluoride poisoning) and when they find fluoride is dangerously toxic for children in particular, the government keep the results away from the public!

What did we say? The Charter of the Health Department is **the protector of the people's health!**

Is it a conundrum or just a political fraud?

At least none of it is honest!

Research project

The **Lancet** 1st February, 1992 documented a research project by a Nutrition Unit, University Department of Paediatrics, Cambridge, on the difference in IQ of breast fed babies and bottle fed babies. They stated:

"Nevertheless our data are also consistent with the hypothesis that breast milk could have a beneficial effect on neurodevelopment. Various criteria that support the hypothesised causal role of breast milk have been satisfied."



Here was a great opportunity for scientists to examine the obvious difference between Nature's breast milk and the synthetic baby formula food which contains fluoride that doubles in fluoride concentration when made up with fluoridated water.

There are only two options — the scientists either fail to understand the significance of fluoride in baby formula food OR they were afraid of the consequences of "Whistle Blowing" on the dangers of fluorides and fluoridation for babies.

In 1978 Professor Carlsson, Professor of Pharmacology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden suggested precise studies be made into the possible problems associated with bottle fed babies on fluoridated water reconstituted baby foods.

In 1992 no-one seems brave enough to do some honest science on this problem and of course the question to doctors and scientists and government authorities is, why?

The truth is leaking out

Science is supposed to be a dependence on deductions from evidence of truth, logic, and soundness of conclusions with honesty predominating.

It should not cause a knee-jerk reaction by those opposing it, but with *true science* they are entitled to challenge any such scientific deductions.

This is not the case with fluoridation or fluorides, or indeed babies at risk with fluoride poisoning.

The panic and knee-jerk reaction by particular people and organisations to the **Lancet** article on breast feeding is so obviously panic-bias because they do not use science in their debate.

Baby formula foods made up with fluoridated tap water, make a food seven times above the maximum fluoride intake as set down by the Government.

Not one opposing claim has mentioned the contents of baby formula foods, which is the real difference between the tested babies.

Nature on the one side with natural food, breast milk, compared with a commercial product on the other side made up with fluoridated tap water, making a food seven times above the maximum fluoride intake as set down by the Government.

How can they pose as scientists, or responsible doctors when they do not examine the chemical difference between the two feeding materials?

It was reported that Dr Lex Doyle of the Royal Women's Hospital said (Age 12.4.92) —

"... it was not breast milk that was beneficial . . ." all without any reference to a chemical analysis of the different foods forced onto the babies.

Then U.S. "scientists" panicked on the **Lancet** research paper, also mindful that sooner or later, some "rare" respectable paper editor may publish the real facts and warn mothers about the dangers of overdosing their babies with fluoride chemicals.

The Government won't warn the people, and the fluoridation lobby will control most others.

The "U.S. Researchers" admitted the breast fed babies had an IQ advantage, but then endeavoured to destroy their own evidence. True science?

All this highlights the fluoride lobby panic when their evil game is being exposed and having painted themselves into a corner, they have no way to go except walking over their sticky past.

Company to stop toothpaste ads

The Associated Press

BOSTON — Procter & Gamble will stop advertising Crest toothpaste as cavity protection for youngsters' teeth "down to the root" and will donate \$50,000 for a student program, the state attorney general said Monday.

The company denied any wrong doing.

The disputed ad, entitled "Today's Kids", ran from December 1990 to June 1991 and promoted Crest as the first toothpaste clinically shown to protect down to the root of the tooth.

The clinical study was conducted on people age 54 to 92, not on children, he said. The commercial failed to disclose that more than 90 percent of children would not receive any of the claimed root protection benefits.

The Kansas City Star, Tuesday, January 14, 1992

Vol 28, no. 4, p. 3

IS THE COVER-UP INTENTIONAL?

BABY HEALTH

On 14th November, 1991 the Victorian Minister of Health, Mrs Maureen Lister, wrote to the Hon. Geoffrey P. Connard in reply to a question he asked in the Legislative Council relative to the N.H. and M.R.C. warning on fluoride overdosing of babies with baby formula food, made up with fluoridated water.

In the Minister's reply, she stated:

"For example two strategies aimed at reducing the fluoride swallowed by young children from toothpaste are under consideration."

How strange the Minister made no reference whatsoever to the fluoride poisoning of babies with fluoride chemicals in baby formula foods as documented by the National Health and Medical Research Council in their 1991 Research on Fluoridation and Fluoride (pages 11, 12, 121, 128, 129).

Are baby formula foods taboo like fluoridation, and embarrassing the Government?

Babies left at risk without Government public warning announcements! What kind of people are we?

... a difference of 10 percent showing less sudden Infant Death Syndrome in non-fluoridated areas.

Referring to the pressure on the Government, and in particular the Minister for Health to properly publicly notify the Victorian communities on the dangers associated with fluoride chemicals in baby formula foods and toothpaste —

The Minister stated:

"Health Department Victoria will continue to ensure that the beneficial effects of fluoride for dental health are received by the people of Victoria. I can further assure you that the Department is currently developing strategies to ensure that the community continues to be appropriately informed on all matters associated with fluoride intake, now that the N.H. and M.R.C. Report has been released."

The question remains unanswered as to why the Health Minister and the Government in general does not issue public warnings about the dangers of fluoride poisoning from fluoridated toothpaste and baby formula foods.

Further questions were asked by the Hon. G. Connard (Hansard 18 March, 1992)

(a) *Who has the specific responsibility for providing information to parents, infant welfare centres, baby health centres, infant day care centres, mothers' clubs and similar bodies on the use of infant formulas in fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas of Victoria, as detailed in the 1991 National Health and Medical Research Council Fluoridation Report.*
(b) *To what extent does the Government accept responsibility for the now known excess fluoride ingestion by infants partaking of infant formulas prepared with fluoridated water.* (Victorian Hansard)

The Minister replied 16 April 1992 but did not answer the questions.

Why don't you ring your local Member and complain bitterly about this long overdue action by the Government.

Now a letter from the Sudden Infant Death Research Foundation (April 1992) in reply to a suggestion made to them that fluoridated water and fluoride chemicals may contribute to SIDS.

The SIDS Research Officer stated:

"During the years 1988-1990 the SIDS in Victoria was 1.91 per 1000 live births in fluoridated areas, and 1.71 per 1000 live births in non-fluoridated areas. As you will appreciate there is no significant difference between the two areas."

Well that is a difference of 10 percent showing less SIDS in non-fluoridated areas.

The Research Officer went on to state:

"I do not believe that using infant formula and baby food would result in an infant receiving more than 1 part per million of fluoride, since fluoride is not added to these foods during manufacture."

Here we have two silly and dangerous statements coming from the SIDS Research Foundation.

Although very wrong in both fluoride statements, it is alarmingly serious that such a Foundation, supposedly researching deaths of babies, does not know the Australian Health Standard maximum dose of fluoride for a baby up to two years is only 0.25 ppm fluoride.

Of course the matter becomes more serious because the N.H. and M.R.C. stated in their 1991 Report on Fluorides and Fluoridation:

"These findings and the evidence that the duration of infant formula usage is a risk factor for dental fluorosis suggests a need to limit infants ingestion of fluoride.

Manufacturers should assume that infant formula will be reconstituted in fluoridated areas. It is therefore preferable for manufacturers to use non-fluoridated water in semi-constituted formula, and to take other measures which may be necessary to reduce the concentration of fluoride in manufactured infant formulas."

The facts are clear, and demonstrated — baby formula foods contain 1 ppm fluoride, and when made up with fluoridated water, the food then contains 2 ppm fluoride, a factor of 700 percent overdosing of the baby.

... a factor of 700 percent overdosing of the baby ...

The SIDS Foundation Research Officer then states:

"The intake through other sources referred to in the Ombudsman's letter may refer to sources such as fluoride tablets and the like, not other foodstuffs."

Just how can the Foundation claim to read the mind of the Victorian Ombudsman — again the Foundation do not understand the total ingestion of fluoride from "all sources", and to claim the Ombudsman meant "not other foodstuffs" is nothing but humbug.

The next quote from the SIDS Foundation reads —

"The N.H. and M.R.C. are of the opinion that breastfeeding is preferable for infants, but at no time have they stated that infant formula and baby food is a health hazard to infants."

What are the facts? The N.H. and M.R.C. stated:

"Infant formula is a risk factor for dental fluorosis and suggests a need to limit infants ingestion of fluoride."

And what did the N.H. and M.R.C. say about "dental fluorosis"?

They described dental fluorosis as **"the first sign of toxicity"** and what is the medical term for toxicity? — **POISONING!**

How can a supposedly "baby research" foundation make such false statements about fluoride and fluoridation?

Why the apparent masquerading of the truth, when that terrible "F" word is presented to these people?

One would think, that in return for the multi-millions of dollars subscribed by the public to the SIDS Foundation these people would produce a much more responsible attitude to scientific proposals on a known potential danger to babies.

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. 4, p. 4