

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 33
No. 2

Price \$2.00
\$15 per annum posted Australia

March-April
1997

Print Post Approval
PP331.9851 00013

FLUORIDE AND BRAIN DAMAGE

For many years scientists have been aware of the effect of fluoride intoxication of the brain.

Professor D.G. Steyne, Pharmacologist, a curriculum vitae covering four pages of world class scientific qualifications. In 1958 Professor Steyne stated:

"Fluoride is a neuro-toxin and the central nervous system tissues contain neuro-kreatin; it is known that some fluoride accumulates in these parts of the body where kreatin is located."

Gabovich and Ourutskiy, 1977, stated in "Fluorine in Stomatology and Hygiene" 1977:

"... it becomes evident that fluorine affecting metabolism in nerve cells and disturbing receptor function and the transmission of nerve impulses can influence the function of higher sections of central nervous system."

More current scientific investigation is recorded in a Research Paper, "Neuro-toxicity of Sodium Fluoride in Rats", Neuro-toxicology and Teratology No. 17, 1995, (Mullenix et. al):

"Because humans occasionally are exposed to high amounts of fluoride and plasma levels as high as those found in this rat study, neuro-toxic risks deserve further evaluation."

Dr Paul Cornett, Professor of Chemistry and Environmental Studies, St Lawrence University, Canton, New York, published the following data November 1996. ("Waste Not")

In a 1995 article published in **Neurotoxicology and Teratology**, Phyllis Mullenix and co-workers reported on an experiment investigating neurotoxicity in rats treated with sodium fluoride. They found that fluoride accumulates in the brain and that it caused "sex and dose specific behavioural deficits with a common pattern. Males were most sensitive to prenatal day 17-19 exposure, whereas females were more sensitive to weanling and adult exposures. After fluoride ingestion, the severity of the effect on behaviour increased directly with plasma F levels and in F concentrations in specific brain regions." In their conclusion, they point out that this is the first laboratory study to demonstrate that CNS (central nervous system) functional output is vulnerable to fluoride, that effects on behaviour depend on the age at exposure..." When they warned that, "this study can be indicative of a potential for motor dysfunction, I.Q. deficits and/or learning disabilities in humans," they were unaware of ongoing studies in China which were finding an association between fluoride exposure and the lowering of I.Q. in children. Nor were they aware what consternation their paper would cause in Washington D.C.

At the time Mullenix's paper was accepted for publication, she was the head of the Department of Toxicology at the Forsythe Dental Center in Boston. The administration at the Forsythe Dental Center informed the

National Institute of Dental Research (NIDR) in Washington, D.C. of the paper's acceptance. In June 1994, Pat Bryant of the NIDR set up a televised conference to allow members of the NIDR and others to question Mullenix and her co-workers on the results of their report. Included in the televised conference which took place at Harvard University and Washington, D.C. were Tom Sobotka (of the FDA's neurobehavioural Toxicology Laboratory in the Bureau of Food), several members of NIDR's public relations group and others. (The NIDR paid for the televised conference.) Despite this obvious interest, Mullenix has not been able to get further government funding for her work.

Subsequently, Mullenix has discovered that the U.S. government knew about the potential for fluoride's impact on the central nervous system as early as 1944. Toxicologists working on the Manhattan Project (large quantities of fluorine are used in the form of uranium hexafluoride in the separation of the uranium isotopes) had been asked to investigate the effects of fluoride on the central nervous system after an accidental release of large quantities of hydrogen fluoride at a facility in New Jersey. The toxicologists were later told to drop the study. Ironically, it was the chief pharmacologist in the Manhattan Project, Harold C. Hodge, who many years later suggested to Mullenix that she investigate the issue. Hodge worked with Mullenix at the Forsythe Dental Center on a day-to-day basis, and encouraged her in her research, until he died in 1990. Long term curiosity or guilty conscience?

We have just been informed that Dr Phyllis J. Mullenix has been "fired" from Forsyth Dental Center Boston! Dr. Mullenix follows many others who "blew the whistle on Fluoridation", the greatest sin against the real evil of fluoridation.

The book "Brain Allergies" states:

"This is the first laboratory study to demonstrate that central nervous system functional output is vulnerable to fluoride, that the effects on behaviour depend on the age at exposure, and that fluoride accumulates in brain tissues.

"Experience with other developmental neuro-toxins prompts expectations that changes in behavioural function will be comparable across species, especially humans and rats.

"Of course, behaviour per se does not extrapolate but a generic behavioural pattern disruption is found in this rat study and can be indicative of a potential for motor dysfunction, IQ deficits and/or learning disabilities in humans.

"Substances that accumulate in brain tissue potentiate concerns about neuro-toxic risks, but the conditions leading to fluoride deposits in any species are still not clear such as that quantitative extrapolations are not possible at this time.

"Thus, conclusions concerning the neuro-toxic poten-

tial of fluoride requires further rat and human studies, both focussed on the relationship of plasma fluoride levels with the brain, behaviour and skeletal growth.

"In fact, the effects on behaviour related directly to plasma-fluoride levels and the fluoride accumulation in the brain."

In 1978 Professor Arvid Carlsson, Professor of Pharmacology University of Gothenburg, Sweden:

"... wondered what the massive overdose of fluoride received by bottle-fed infants (due to drinking the fluoridated water used to prepare their bottles) may mean for the development of the brain and other organs, and whether it would lead to 'specific permanent disorders in the learning ability'."

Lucas et al in 1992 wrote:

"Children who had consumed mother's milk in the early weeks of life had a significantly higher IQ at 7-8 years than did those who received no maternal milk."

In the publication "Brain Allergies, 1980, The Psycho-nutrient Connection", Philpott and Kalita, together with an introduction by Linus Pauling stated that in connection with studies of the brain:

"Water that is not chemically treated (i.e. spring, well, distilled or filtered) is used during testing since some people are known to react to chlorine and/or fluorine."

Author Moses Maimonides, the great 12th Century physician, repeated the hypocritic sentiment when he said:

"No illness which can be treated by diet should be treated by any other means."

"In essence Hypocrates and Maimonides were insisting that their students practice nutrient therapy."

One interesting quotation reads:

"We doctors, writes Dr. Alvarez, are the most stubborn lot in the world! Many doctors are so

stubborn as to think that a fact can't be true if they were not taught it in medical school."
Many will agree in 1997!

Rat Studies Link Brain Cell Damage With Aluminium and Fluoride in Water

A team of New York scientists said rat studies offer preliminary evidence that aluminium, when administered with fluoride in drinking water, may be linked with behaviour changes and damaged brain cells.

The study, presented at the meeting here of the Society for Neuroscience, is the latest of several studies hinting at some link between aluminium in the environment and Alzheimer's disease. Several controversial studies during the last four years found that Alzheimer's disease seemed more prevalent in areas that added aluminium sulfate (alum) to the drinking water to clarify it.

Robert Isaacson, professor of psychology at the State University of New York at Binghamton, said he dosed the drinking water of 40 rats with graduated levels of aluminium and fluoride for 45 to 50 weeks.

Rats fed the highest dose developed irregular mincing steps characteristic of senile animals, in contrast with the long and regular strides of animals in their prime. In addition, the rats lost their normal ability to distinguish the scent of banana, which is their favourite, from lemon. Performance of other tasks wasn't impaired.

The research revealed "substantial cell loss in structures associated with dementia, the neo-cortex and hippocampus".

Aluminium is used in many drinking water supplies together with fluoride chemicals, mostly by Government compulsion, so it is a **Government** induced health problem!!

Health ethics do not fit comfortably into commercial enterprises such as fluoride for dental care.

In 1940 the fluoride promoters were advised to tell the Government and the public that -

"The fluoride case should be regarded as proven!"

EDITORIAL

Where does all the Fluoridation Data sent to the Government Go? UNDER THE CARPET!

The political carpet must be lifted and the hidden fluoride sweepings examined and indeed preserved contrary to political planning by Political Parties in Australia controlling the fluoridation process in concert with medical and dental cohorts, not forgetting industrialists.

The original dogmatic guarantees and so-called scientific claims must never be destroyed, or lost to future generations as the history of medicine, and the character of those elected to represent the people and sit in Parliament.

The people must never fall for the fluoride lobby's slogan of "let bygones be bygones" (their admittance that the original studies are suspect) so as to cover up their scientific dishonesty relating to fluoridation effectiveness and safety and proper research.

Example: Australian Dental Journal October 1996

An article on "Caries experiences among South Australian School Children" stated:

"The observed pattern of caries provides the basis for continued use of fissure sealants as a preventive measure among school children." (Emphasis added)

The success of sealants (fillings) in the U.S. resulted in "endorsement of sealants as a public health measure".

A second article in the same Australian Dental Journal "The Place of Fluoride Supplements in Caries Prevention Today" stated:

"There is substantial evidence that supplements cause dental fluorosis when used in accordance with recommendations for infants and small children."

If the public becomes concerned about dental fluorosis as an aesthetic problem all fluoride may be put at risk."

The authors of that article concluded their Abstract with these interesting words:

"The fact that supplements have been recommended uncritically for many years on the basis of inadequate research raises questions about the standards of dental science." (and the validity of the N.H.&M.R.C. Fluoridation Records).

Let us examine the findings of the last Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council Report on Fluoridation 1991, and their "scientific claims" about fluoride supplements.

Printed under the imprimatur of the Australian Government the N.H. and M.R.C. document their official Medical Charter as follows:-

"The object of the National Health and Medical Research Council is to advise the Australian community on the achievement and maintenance of the highest practical standards of individual and public health and to foster research in the interests of improving those standards."

Their "major conclusions" (1991) include this medical statement which has NEVER been publicly challenged by the medical or dental profession **even though it conflicts with world wide medical evidence.**

"There is no evidence of adverse health effects attributable to fluoride in communities exposed to

p. 2

a combination of fluoridated water (1 ppm) and contemporary discretionary sources of fluoride.

There is no evidence to justify a change in the view that fluoride supplementation within the intended normal range of daily intake is safe in human populations. The recent equivocal evidence of increased risk of bone neoplasms in one species of experimental animals exposed to very high doses of fluoride indicates a need for a raised and on-going attentiveness to these and any other possibilities to adverse effects in human populations experiencing life-long exposure to fluoride supplementation." (fluoridation).

At the time of declaring the above fluoridation and fluoride, "research" data by the N.H. and M.R.C. medical and fluoride experts, other researchers proved an increase in "bone neoplasms" in young men living in fluoridated areas of the U.S.A. (New Jersey Department of Health, 8th November 1992, J. Lee, Fluoride 1993).

The Community Dental Health September 1996 publishes an article "Water Fluoridation in Australia" by A.J. Spencer et al, in which the authors state:

"Both the National Health and Medical Research Council N.H. and M.R.C. 1991 and the Consensus Conference on appropriate fluoride exposure for infants and children (Riordan and Hill in preparation) have recommended efforts to control exposure among Australian infants and children to discretionary fluoride by reducing fluoride levels in infant formula powder and additionally altering practices of preparing formula to avoid the addition of fluoridated water; limiting the use, delaying the starting age and reducing age-specific dosage of fluoride supplements; and, providing children's toothpastes with low fluoride

concentrations as well as increasing the awareness and compliance with recommended tooth brushing practices. All three measures for reducing discretionary fluoride exposure are specifically targetted to the age of development of dental fluorosis. **They could have substantial impact on the risk of fluorosis without more than a marginal reduction in the benefit of caries prevention.** However this area **requires monitoring and more purposeful research.**" (But the N.H.&M.R.C. stated - "there is no evidence etc.)

"The prevalence of dental fluorosis among children in two States appears to have increased the levels above those expected as a result of water fluoridation alone.

Exposures to discretionary fluorides are additional risk factors for dental fluorosis and are the subject of targetted changes in the preparation and use of infant formula, fluoride supplements and toothpaste for children." (emphasis added)

The authors of that article state in their introduction:

"Australia, like its North American and European counterparts, has witnessed these same stages of policy development with regard to water fluoridation."

Most people reading that final statement would consider that Europe is fluoridated and endorsed in a similar manner to Australia, but almost the whole of Western Europe is fluoridation-free (only two small plants exist). They rid themselves of the fluoridation of public drinking water many years ago after evaluating the process from a dental and health perspective.

Fluoridation and fluorides are like a corkscrew that never wants to be straightened out even for the sake of truth and honest science or the protection of public health.

TOXICOLOGICAL PROFILE

FLUORIDES, HYDROGEN FLUORIDE AND FLUORINE (F)

Prepared for Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Register, U.S. Public Health Service, April 1993.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Register, TP 91/17.

"Health Effects"

"The absorption of fluoride from the gastrointestinal tract of humans and/or animals is affected by the presence of several minerals including calcium, magnesium, phosphorus and aluminium." (Roa 1984).

"Populations that are usually susceptible"

"Existing data indicates that sub-sets of the population may be usually susceptible to the toxic effects of fluoride and its compounds.

These populations include the elderly, people with deficiencies of calcium, magnesium and/or vitamin C, and people with cardio-vascular and kidney problems.

Because fluoride is excreted through the kidneys, people with renal insufficiency would have impaired renal clearance of fluoride (Juncos and Donadio 1972). Fluoride retention on a low protein, low calcium, low phosphorus diet was 65% in patients with chronic renal failure, compared with 20% in normal subjects. (Spencer et al, 1980).

People on kidney dialysis are particularly susceptible to the use of fluoridated water in the dialysis machine (Anderson et al, 1980). This is

due to the decreased fluoride clearance combined with the intravenous exposure to large amounts of fluoride during dialysis. Impaired renal clearance of fluoride has also been found in people with diabetes mellitus and cardiac insufficiency (Hanhijarvi 1974).

People over the age of 80 often have decreased renal fluoride clearance (Hanhijarvi 1974). This may be because of the decreased rate of accumulation of fluoride in bones, or decreased renal function. This decreased clearance of fluoride may indicate that elderly people are more susceptible to fluoride toxicity.

Some people with cardio-vascular problems may be at increased risk of fluoride toxicity.

Fluoride inhibits glycolysis by inhibiting enolase (Guminska and Sterkowicz 1975, Peters et al, 1964). It also inhibits energy metabolism through the tricarboxylic acid cycle by blocking the entry of pyruvate and fatty acids and by inhibiting succinic dehydrogenase (Slater and Bonner 1952)."

The above is an authentic document on the poisoning effects of fluoride chemicals from the highest authority in the U.S.A., Department of Health and Human Services.

However, notwithstanding that their scientific data clearly illustrated toxicity, the same U.S. Department of Health and Human Services not only endorses but relentlessly attempts forceful daily fluoride dosing of all people throughout the U.S.A.

Their conflicting experts (sic) scientific claim for such

an evil based process overflows to many other world communities accepting this reverse action of established scientific hazardous evidence on fluorides and fluoridation.

The scientific problem with fluoridation is that the pushers keep resetting their agenda, completely lacking in science and publicise more of a face-saving exercise in futility, fully dependent on the unlimited financial support of involved commercial groups and their cohorts.

People should learn by heart the following:

"Those who ignore history are destined to repeat it."

The history of fluoridation illustrates from its unscientific and commercial beginning that it differs little from so many other commercially introduced drugs that today, after years of use, are producing all the health problems prophesied at their initial introduction and often without meeting statutory health laws and regulations.

It is a sad world history of "who's next" in the queue of health destruction under the eyes of governments and their politicians responsible for the protection of those they represent.

Consider the asbestos tragedy, after about 100 years

of knowledge that asbestos fibres in the atmosphere is a fatal experience, and still many more deaths are forecast.

People differ so greatly in their reaction and metabolism to toxic chemicals and compounds, drugs that intelligence should (if available) signpost the need for human respect by commercial pressure groups who sadly, usually display a political clout that changes politicians characters world wide.

Immediate reaction from fluoridated water is experienced by many people who could be classified as "the lucky ones" because they can quickly rectify the problem and not drink fluoridated water. Others can be harmed, but medical practitioners do not, cannot, or must not understand the long term poisoning effect of fluoride which is a cumulative poison clearly described by the U.S. Public Health Service 1993.

The medical profession for reasons best known to themselves, fail to understand or communicate that fluoride poisoning and its effect on the body relates to kidney efficiency, and as that efficiency reduces, fluoride increases in the body attacking bones and tissue.

Maybe there is little money in healthy people.

DEMOCRACY OR DEMOCKERY

Possibly the most common statement in developed countries is, "we live in a democracy", but few ask, "Are we governed by democratic principles involving LAWS by the people we elect to honour such a pledge?"

The Fifth Column to democracy is Fluoridation, performed so openly, arrogantly in the extreme, using Parliament as its headquarters.

In these democracies, communities are encouraged at times to debate any conceivable subject; science, abortion, euthanasia, immunisation, morals, religion, medicine, dentistry, law and indeed the government, but with one exception FLUORIDATION.

Fluoridation has been forced on communities throughout the world without consent from those compelled to ingest this poisonous fluoride chemical every time they use their kitchen tap.

Politicians, medical practitioners, dentists and government bureaucrats, see no moral interference into the inalienable God-given rights of man indelibly inscribed into every democratic constitution seen or implied.

As a rating, politicians get zero out of ten for fluoridation honesty, but ten out of ten for fluoridation persistence. They became part of the fluoridation game immediately on entering Parliament and forget their responsible and honest representation of their electorate and democracy in general.

Example -

The City of Forbes, New South Wales, in an official 1995 Council Poll, recorded over 60% voting to get rid of fluoridation and only 32% voted to keep fluoridation and the status quo.

The New South Wales State Fluoridation Act requires approval by the Health Department Secretary if a City wishes to discontinue fluoridation.

Following the referendum, the Forbes Council, on behalf of the people of Forbes, applied to the Health Department Secretary for permission to stop fluoridation.

The New South Wales Health Department replied in an undated letter to Council received 16th September, 1996 advising that the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Advisory Committee had **considered Forbes' request and "directs Forbes Water Supply remains fluoridated"**. They stated -

"The Government through the New South Wales Health Department will continue to promote fluoridation of water supply as safe . . ."

The Deputy Premier, Dr. A. Refshauge, wrote, 28th October, 1996 (letter to I.M. Armstrong, Member for Lachlan):

"I have nominated the Chief Dental Officer as Chairman and have appointed another five persons, four of whom are nominees of the New

South Wales Branch of the Australian Medical Association, the New South Wales Branch of the Australian Dental Association, the Australian Institute of Engineers and the Local Government Association of New South Wales."

"I am advised that the Forbes community voted on this issue in a voluntary poll in September, 1995. Although the concept of individual freedom is highly valued, the Committee has to take into account the Department's policy to endorse a public health measure that has proven benefits to society."

"The effectiveness and safety of water fluoridation as a public health measure has recently been confirmed by the publication of the National Health and Medical Research Council 1991 which encourages communities to fluoridate their reticulated water supplies in the interest of improved dental health."

"This view is supported by health authorities such as United States Public Health Service, 1990 and the World Health Organisation."

Perhaps Dr Refshauge should read the data supplied in the **Australian Fluoridation News** illustrating the warnings from the United States Public Health Service and indeed the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia, all of which goes unheeded. Why?

Would you consider that "specially" appointed committee to act in a moral unbiased and scientific manner when faced with the question of fluoridation when their policy is for compulsory fluoridation?

Someone suggested it's like putting a fox in charge of the chicken run.

Here we have an example of democracy and the will of the people being overridden by the whims and fancy and protectionism of those relating to responsibility in scientific matters such as fluoridation.

In a democracy there is an understanding of sharing information and giving equal opportunity and rights to all people, for legal and parliamentary laws, but in Australia, fluoridation is the exception. Never has an anti-fluoridationist been invited to join the Great Government Fluoridation Inner Sanctum of decision making! Why? The balance of justice is completely overloaded on purpose.

The Australian people are being asked to believe a scientifically balanced fluoridation debate existed between the N.S.W. Chief Dental Officer together with dentists supported by the solidarity of the A.M.A. and appointed by those promoting fluoridation.

Please can we have a full copy of that debate, the names and positions of all members together with enquiries made to genuine researchers who have different scientific views on Fluoridation, obviously necessary to establish FACT.