


# 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. 29  
No. 5

Price \$2.00  
\$15 per annum posted Australia

September/October  
1993

Registered by Australia Post —  
Publication No. NBG0721

## IN WHOM DO YOU PUT YOUR TRUST?

The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr Robert Hawke, stated in the 1980's:

*"By the year 1990 no Australian child will be living in poverty."*

The audience to that statement rose as one in adoration and acceptance, their vocal admiration reverberated around Australia. Such exhortation fitted only a true statement.

However, by 1990 there were over one million unemployed, the charitable institutes (Salvation Army etc) were saturated with poverty stricken people!

### Star Wars

The U.S. deceived all the world including their own Congress and the U.S. people together with the Russian High Command in claiming their technology to turn what appeared to be fiction into fact.

### National Health and Medical Research Council

The N.H. and M.R.C. in a recent 1993 press release (undated) asked:

*"Organisations receiving this publication are asked to publicize its availability in relevant journals, newspapers, etc, with a review if possible."*

The type of material they wish to be widely distributed and publicized contains their very important statement:

*"There is **no evidence** of adverse health effects from the combination of fluoridated water and other sources of fluoride." (Emphasis added.)*

Firstly, it should be noted that the N.H. and M.R.C. has **never** carried out any original research studies into fluoride or fluoridation.

Just one statement from their 1991 Report on Fluoridation referring to baby formula foods reconstituted with fluoridated water (p. 122) is sufficient to prove their statement dishonest and unscientific.

*"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.**"*

So here we have a "risk factor" and "a need to limit infants' ingestion of fluoride", and yet the official Commonwealth Government Health Department News states, "there is no evidence" etc.

On page 104 they state:

*"... the increased frequency of fluorosis in recent decades appears to be largely attributable to the increased ingestion of fluoride from discretionary sources particularly fluoride tablets or drops, and fluoridated toothpaste in young children..."*

*"The advent of fluoridated toothpastes in Australia has almost certainly increased fluoride deposition in the bones of some Australians. It would not be surprising if there were some undetected cases of skeletal fluorosis in the Australian population in individuals with pathological thirst disorders and/or impaired renal function."*

The intellect of the hierarchy of the N.H. and M.R.C. is quite disturbing when they contradict themselves to such an extent whilst at the same time trying

to hoodwink the public on the dangers of fluoridation. Consider their first statement of "no evidence" and then on page 129 of their Report they make this statement:

*"A greater prevalence and severity of dental fluorosis is not only the first sign of toxicity, (poison) but has the advantage of being readily diagnosed and compared both over time and between groups. Hence a substantiated increase in dental fluorosis would be sufficient grounds for concern over total fluoride intake and would suggest the need for altering the current pattern of exposure to fluoride vehicles." (Emphasis added.)*

Further to their "no risk" evidence, it is interesting to note their remarks about the "equivocal animal experimental evidence of bone cancer", they state:

*"In that case an argument might be mounted that it would be a prudent decision, pending future resolution of this matter in human populations, to reduce long-term exposure to fluoride. Such a decision would necessarily entail a trade-off between a certain, **although not readily quantifiable**, increase in dental caries and the possibility of insuring at least a comfortable safety margin, or even of achieving a marginal reduction in actual risk, in relation to bone cancer." (Emphasis added.)*

Can you reconcile that statement to the claim that "there is no evidence of adverse health effects"?

*"It is a matter for concern that the Working Group cannot point to a single on-going Australian study which monitors adequately the impact and possible adverse consequences of this policy (fluoridation) and that in its pursuit of the terms of reference, the Working Group has had to rely on; indirect analyses of very inadequate data sets, collected not for the monitoring of this policy, but for other purposes," (page 139).*

Since 1953 the N.H. and M.R.C. have continually, year after year, conference after conference, endorsed their guarantee of the effectiveness and safety of fluoridation, and yet they now admit that even after 40 years of Government protection, this organisation has admitted that they "cannot point to a single on-going Australian study which monitors adequately the impact and possible adverse consequences" of fluoridation.

We can only hope that the 1993 advertised inquiry into the N.H. and M.R.C. by an independent committee, who are asking for submissions, will do their job as the Australian people would request, in an honest and efficient manner, with no whitewashing of anyone or anything within the orbit of fluoridation.

How do you like the manner in which our Australian "servants of the people" do their well paid jobs?

Perhaps H.L. Mencken put it into one small sentence that explains the actions of Government organisations. He said —

*"The urge to save humanity is almost always a false front for the urge to rule."*

Freedom of choice and the Australian Constitution is always at risk but never by the people.

# BAIRNSDALE REJECTS FLUORIDATION

## ONCE MORE INTO THE BREACH DEAR FRIENDS, ONCE MORE

(Shakespeare, Henry IV)

The Government fluoridation lobby is at it again, attempting to pressurise the Bairnsdale Council to fluoridate the town's drinking water supply.

The Council in its wisdom and democracy voted to arrange a formal debate on fluoridation, 29th July, 1993, with one speaker from the Government Health Department, and one nominated by those opposing fluoridation.

The Government was represented by Dr John Rogers (dentist), Manager, School Dental Health Unit, Department of Health and Community Services, and Dennis Stevenson, M.L.A. Canberra, spoke against fluoridation.

Dr Rogers seemed to concentrate on defending the indefensible. He agreed kids can get too much fluoride, especially from fluoride toothpaste.

---

*Before fluoridation is considered there should be a total intake study.*  
W.H.O.

---

He said an extensive research project was underway somewhere in Adelaide, investigating "level of fluorosis, how severe it is, and the study expected to be released in about a year".

The fluoride lobby should be known as "The Mirror". They are always "looking into it", in an endeavour to prove fluoridation is safe, even though that sales pitch, (not science) has been going on for the past 50 years and still they are unable to scientifically support their past and present propaganda (sales pitch).

From Dr Rogers' scientific logic that fluoridated water is "the predominant reason" for the condition of today's children's teeth, it should then follow that all unfluoridated places throughout the world, including many parts of Australia, can be identified by those chil-

dren's extremely bad teeth.

This of course is not true, therefore fluoridation of water cannot be a reason for good teeth.

Dennis Stevenson opened his remarks by stressing the importance of the democratic rights of the people and their freedom of choice especially against compulsory medication which is against their Constitutional and moral rights.

He spoke about the use of drugs without personal medical examinations by a doctor, especially when the Government experts cannot show any evidence proving the safety of fluoridation, let alone its effectiveness.

Dennis Stevenson discussed his involvement in his Government's (A.C.T. Canberra Assembly) eighteen months research into fluoridation and his 177 page dissenting report, printed in the Government Report of 1991. (309 pages)

He quoted the World Health Organisation description of the fluoride chemical used to fluoridate public water supplies.

### World Health Organisation

#### International Agency for Research on Cancer 1982

*"The major uses of sodium silicofluoride are . . . as a drinking water additive, as an insecticide, fungicide, bactericide and rodenticide (rat poison). The Commission of the European Communities (1978) requires that sodium silicofluoride be labelled as toxic by inhalation, in contact with skin or swallowed."*

He said the W.H.O. also stated, "that before fluoridation is considered there should be a total intake study", but that has never been done in Australia.

Dennis Stevenson concluded:

*"We are simply drugged by individual thirst with a compulsory medical treatment."*

On 2nd September, 1993 the Bairnsdale Health Committee met and after a discussion on the debate they voted 7/4 not to fluoridate Bairnsdale drinking water supplies.

---

# THE ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION

## "FOREIGN FACTOR"

The Oxford Dictionary describes Mafia "hostility to law".

As an English interpretation of "hostility to law" there is no restriction on which law or which justice, so the expression is often associated with a great diversity of groups and their actions, sometimes emphasising the secret, unknown or unpublished references and communications. In some parts of the world the expression "Fluoride Mafia" is used.

Fluoridation is an underground conglomerate network posing as dental and medical scientists.

Those in favour are completely ignorant as to where fluoridation instructions originate.

The fear factor is so evident, those in public authority doing as told and join the fluoridation solidarity asking no questions. (The Emperor's Clothes syndrome).

The world's greatest evil "money" seems abundantly available to promote fluoridation, money that can control and develop policies, public, private, commercial and academic, political, local and international, all with small and large worldwide fluoride empires in the most surprising arenas, right under the very noses of the community, but mostly unseen by the average person, and **purposely unseen** by many in authority, especially those in government, semi-government and responsible and privileged positions.

Consider the government position in promoting fluoridation as set up by the elite medical intelligence.

Their endorsement, control, and final advice to the Commonwealth Government is written into legislation that governs and controls each and every person in the country without sustainable scientific evidence.

The National Health and Medical Research Council's fluoridation policy is clearly and dogmatically defined since their first recommendation and endorsement in 1953, an action that has produced reams of scientific evidence challenging that original endorsement, which was made before any studies of safety anywhere in the world.

Notwithstanding the false start before the safety gun was fired, the fluoridation recommendations continue year after year, committee after committee, endorsement by N.H. and M.R.C. conferences all confirmed for forty years and accepted without debate by the Government.

All that 40 years of fluoridation hype, and then the 1991 N.H. and M.R.C. Report of 194 pages on fluoridation stated:

*"Australia has, more than most countries, invested heavily in fluoridation as a public health measure and this has achieved beneficial results but it has contributed less to the fundamental body of knowledge which is, and will continue to be essential if water fluoridation is to continue as a national and regional preventive strategy. The issue is dynamic. It is a matter of concern that the*

*Vol. 29, no. 5, p. 2*

Working Group cannot point to a single on-going Australian study which monitors adequately the impact and **possible adverse consequences of this policy**, and that in its pursuit of the terms of reference the Working Group **has had to rely on indirect analyses of very inadequate data sets**, collected not only for the monitoring of this policy, but for other purposes, a limited number of Australian studies and upon overseas investigations of these matters."

And in their recommendations they state:

*"Those recommendations and conclusions (of fluoridation) must be qualified by emphasising the current dearth of an adequate evaluative Australian data base."*

They claim "invested heavily in fluoridation" but admit that investment is without any proper scientific research, only based on "foreign" propaganda (control). They then claim **"achieved beneficial results"** without any scientific data base! That is a crude and irresponsible attitude for a Government Medical Committee.

On the subject of the **"current dearth of adequate evaluative Australian data base"** they state:

*"There are no Australian reports which permit the Working Group to precisely estimate with confidence, the current intake of fluoride which various aged individuals are ingesting, nor the differential amounts of fluoride which is being stored in Australian skeletons, in fluoridated and unfluoridated areas"*

The N.H. and M.R.C. state there has not been an Australian study on dental fluorosis, but then "their" wonderful **safe drug fluoride** is described as:

*"A greater prevalence and severity of dental fluorosis is not only the first sign of toxicity, but has the advantage of being readily diagnosed and compared both over time and between groups. Hence a substantiated increase in dental fluorosis would be sufficient grounds for concern over total fluoride intake, and would suggest the need for altering the current pattern of exposure to fluoride vehicles."*

Again discussing their safe and effective chemical, they draw attention to the poisoning of babies with formula foods made up with fluoridated water and state:

*"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."* (Emphasis added)

How strange for the prestigious Medical Research Council to claim fluorides and fluoridation perfectly safe and yet admit that babies are being poisoned with this fluoridated water mixed in their baby formula foods, and stranger still they will not make public warnings accordingly.

If you were a teacher examining children or adults on fluoridation and found them claiming absolute safety, and yet quoting all the above health hazard factors, would you give them a pass in science and honesty?

Correspondence with the N.H. and M.R.C. during 1993 went through a cycle of claims by the N.H. and M.R.C. that they could prove fluoridation safety with scientific studies, published in refereed scientific journals, and in fact they claimed the fluoridation safety factor was published in their own 1991 Fluoridation Report. This is untrue. The usual fluoridation propaganda with no scientific substance.

This cycle of fluoridation propaganda and arrogance collapsed when asked to define such research.

**They admitted they could not show any published scientific evidence of safety, even though they have, and still claim fluoridation safe since 1953.**

Obviously reading the above statements by Australia's most prestigious medical organisation, the fluoridation message comes through loud and clear. They rely

completely upon overseas data so **the control** is obviously from outside Australia, from foreign lands in a manner that can and should be examined by groups such as Civil Rights, Law Institute, Constitutional Organisation and Conservation Groups, and not least of all, important heads of government, not forgetting all those 'do-gooder' groups that seem to be fronts for foreign controls of Australians and our country.

The fluoridation foreign control is knowingly accepted by the politicians in the Commonwealth Government and like many international policies, shrouded in secrecy and scientific deceit.

The U.S. send out American fluoride missionaries to foreign countries preaching a "faith in fluoridation".

This "faith in fluoridation" is heavily challenged in their own country and arguably a faith without substance, faith without science, and a faith that can only be introduced by compulsion.

The U.S. "faith machine" lacks any credibility because over 95 percent of the world population is fluoride faithless and will remain so. Also the U.S.A. can only claim about half their population drink artificially fluoridated water.

Fluoridation "faith" is baseless, having no honest scientific origin and certainly no real scientific base on which to build honesty and integrity, all resulting in fluoridation being baseless, and homeless, but extravagantly plunders with its very questionable financial backing, for reasons quite contrary to the promotion of medical morals, Hippocratic Oath, democracy, world public and scientific opinion and the well-being and freedom of the individual.

Fluoridation is based on the continuous "commercial faith" on a non-scientific product, but the world harvest has been poor, even with the inhumane aggressive nature of their promotion built on commercialised science, dollars for the boys, and wealthy empires built on a saleable "faith".

U.S. history, documents the old covered wagons of medicine men with their snake oil elixirs and surely the present fluoridation peddlers must be their descendants, their commercialized faith, their product, and salesmanship is identical.

In spite of the repeating history of being caught out and indeed run out of towns, they relentlessly continue year in and year out, town after town, conning the good, honest but naive people.

The principle has not changed with today's fluoride medicine men, selling on the same basis, but today, backed and protected by influential groups of financial and political cosy togetherness.

Fluoridation sales manuals set down directions, conditions and guidelines as general sales promotion to protect fluoridation from opposition scrutiny.

Continued on page 4

## "Fluoride: The Aging Factor"

Third Edition 1993  
By John Yiamouyiannis

Just released this Third Edition is an enlarged publication of 292 pages.

This book contains all the pertinent data on how the US Government protects fluoridation in the extreme.

Cost — \$12.50 plus postage  
Postage — Victoria \$2.50. All other States \$3.00  
Available from Freedom From Fluoridation Federation of Australia, Box 935G, GPO Melbourne 3001. Available January 1994.

Subscriptions: *The Australian Fluoridation News* — \$15  
• 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. 29, no. 5, p. 3

## THE ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION "FOREIGN FACTOR"

FROM PAGE 3

The International Rules for Government Fluoridation Inquiries set out that no member of such committee can be a person with differing views on the safety and effectiveness of fluoridation. There must be no opposition in Government officialdom. Democracy at its worst.

Never in Australia or indeed any part of the world, has a scientist opposing fluoridation ever been elected, invited or appointed to such an Inquiry about fluoridation. Why?

Obviously fluoridation promoters cannot stand scientific opposition or questioning so they investigate only themselves and those in the fluoride empire.

Polls all over Australia, even two this year and a Council's rejection, demonstrate the Australian people do not want their drinking water poisoned with fluoride chemicals, a democratic voice unheeded and replaced with a totalitarian and draconian compulsory "health" law.

The Victorian Water Board is bottling water untreated with chlorine, fluoride etc, labelling it "Pure Water", and exporting for foreigners to enjoy but the Victorian people are not permitted to drink that pure export quality drinking water, and by law they must only drink the polluted fluoridated water laced with chemicals unfit for export to other countries, but good enough for local people.

On what scientific and medical basis does the Australian Government through the National Health and Medical Research Council unequivocally endorse fluoridation as safe? Consider this following quotation from their latest Report of 1991:

*"The Australian dental community has shown a tendency to rely on international research community for the answers to questions on water fluoridation. Comparison and analogy are not always possible due to differences in disease levels, risk behaviour, personal preventive measures, and the organisation and delivery of dental services.*

**Research is required within the Australian environment."**

The Foreign Factor — the N.H. and M.R.C. admit they rely on international data which indicates foreign control of their fluoride conclusions even after 40 years of compulsory experimentation on Australian people with fluoridation.

Now comes the Achilles Heel of our elected government representatives, the bureaucrats, the Dental Association and the N.H. and M.R.C.

We have "foreign control" because Australia, for some peculiar reason, best known to the Government fluoride establishment, never bothered to use some of the expended money to discover Australian scientific evidence, in the interest of the health of Australian people.

They reported:

*"Dental fluorosis is a sensitive indicator of storage of fluoride in teeth during the developmental stages of tooth formation, but does not indicate the amount of fluoride which is being incorporated into bone throughout adult life.*

*It is desirable to explore in a rigorous fashion whether the vague constellation of symptoms which are claimed to result from ingestion of fluoridated water can be shown to be reproductively developed in these 'susceptible' individuals. These claims are being made with sufficient frequency to justify well designed studies which can properly control for subject and observer bias."*

Under "Cost Benefits", the N.H. and M.R.C. make this final statement:

*"The final judgement about the value of a fluoridation program cannot be made exclusively in economic terms. However, a comprehensive review of the economic consequences of maintaining fluoridation is required and the Working*

*Group believes that an updated approach using more conservative assumptions about the level of protection which water fluoridation now provides should be attempted as an adjunct to decision making on this matter."*

Under the heading of "Major Conclusions" they state:

*"In the assessment of the Working Group, the aggregate evidence establishes that fluoridation of water at around 1 ppm has in the past conferred a substantial protective effect against dental caries."*

That statement smacks of shades of the unscientific statement by Lord Jauncey, the Judge at the Edinburgh Court, where, he said, he was influenced by the **quantity of data** claiming the benefits of fluoridation, which of course is quite unacceptable if quantity is accepted rather than quality. Also one wonders where this accepted evidence comes from **without an Australian data base** — strange scientific conclusions.

Then their conclusion:

*"There is an urgent need to upgrade substantially our monitoring of dental health to include older children and adults, and to monitor the levels of fluoride exposure and the occurrence of dental fluorosis in Australia."*

Therefore, without normal monitoring neither the A.D.A., A.M.A., the Government or the N.H. and M.R.C. can substantiate their claims of fluoridation safety or indeed effectiveness; **they all stand small** in their contribution to science and the democratic rights of Australian people.

---

CANBERRA TIMES, 5.8.93

## Fluoride can damage children's teeth: dentist

"Parents have been warned not to let their children use too much toothpaste because excess fluoride can damage their teeth.

"The Australian Dental Association and NSW Health Department have warned that children under two should not use toothpaste at all and older children should be given children's toothpaste which has less than half the amount of fluoride of adult toothpaste.

"Children up to the age of seven should be supervised while brushing their teeth to prevent them swallowing the toothpaste."

It is of great interest that not a word of these official warnings are published in Victorian newspapers, Radio or TV. Are NSW children more important than their cousins in Victoria? or is the Victorian Government too afraid of the truth?

---

NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 4.9.1993

## Legal battle on fluoride

A Whakatane man is taking legal action against the Whakatane District Council for fluoridating the town's water supply.

Mr James Hilton, a writer on holistic and alternative medical treatment, has filed papers with the Whakatane District Council claiming the mayor and council had broken New Zealand law and an international treaty.

He is concentrating on a section of the Bill of Rights Act which says every person has the right not to be subjected to medical or scientific experimentation without that person's consent.

Mr Hilton contends that, because there is no conclusive proof of the safety of fluoride, any further use of the chemical should be stopped immediately because it constitutes "an experiment on the population".

Mr Hilton is suing the council for \$50, his estimated expenses for bringing the case to the disputes court.

Printed by Allans Printing Pty Ltd. 70 Mary Street, Surry Hills. (02) 212 2633

*Vol. 29, no. 5, p. 4*