

THE AUSTRALIAN FLUORIDATION NEWS



**ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION
IS WATER POLLUTION**

Box 935, G.P.O. Melbourne, Vic., 3001
Phone: (03) 9592 5088 Fax: (03) 9592 4544
www.fluoridationnews.com
www.glenwalker.net

PLEASE PASS ON WHEN READ

Vol 44
No.2

Price \$5.00
\$25 per annum posted Australia

March-April
2008

Print Post Approval
PP331.985 00013
ISSN 1445-2847

Fluoridation and the Illegal Disregard of Law

Glen S.R. Walker

The Truth, the Whole Truth and Nothing but the Truth

There is a basis of responsibility by Governments and their members individually and collectively to conform to Constitutional Law, standard Health Laws, Media Laws. Medical Law, Democratic Law and above all else, MORAL LAWS.

But when artificial fluoridation of public drinking water supplies are involved, all Australian Governments fail in accordance with the above Laws of Truth.

Immediately after World War II in Europe, a Court was assembled in Nuremberg, Germany 1945, charging top ranking German military officers and scientists with medical experimentation on people against their wish and knowledge of such proceedings. All were found guilty of atrocious medical misbehaviour - some were hanged.

The Court prepared a legal document of International Medical Law approved throughout the world including U.S.A. and Australia. Known as the Nuremberg Code it stated:

"A true scientist must be a moral and honest man in the highest meaning of those words.

PERMISSIBLE MEDICAL EXPERIMENTS

Certain basic principles must be observed in order to satisfy moral, ethical and legal principles.

THE VOLUNTARY CONSENT OF THE HUMAN SUBJECT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL.

The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that

determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment."

At the same time of these conclusions of Law by the International Nuremberg Court, the United States of America BROKE this new law they had drastically supported in the Court.

In complete indifference to the Nuremberg Court Code of Medical Behaviour, the U.S.A. installed the **first ever artificial fluoridation plant in the world** as an **experiment** on the people of Grand Rapids, without the voluntary consent of that population, completely contrary to the Nuremberg Code of medical experimentation on a community.

*The beginning of fluoridation in the world was an **experiment** on the people, disregarding the Nuremberg Code of Medical Practice.*

So the beginning of fluoridation in the world was "an experiment on the people of Grand Rapids, U.S.A." and their disregard of the Nuremberg Code of Medical Practice.

Such is the important part of the "grand scientific pedigree" of fluoridation in LAW and established medical ethics.

The Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) considered the action by U.S.A. as first class science and followed the U.S.A.'s "standard" of science and medical ethics by recommending to the Australian Federal Parliament in 1953 to introduce compulsory fluoridation in Australia.

This NHMRC "scientific health action" was at a particular time when there was **NO documented data in the world on the "first ever EXPERIMENT forcing a population to compulsory fluoridation 1944-1954, a ten year EXPERIMENT.**

There could not be a scientific report until completion of the experiment in 1954, after which detailed documented data was completed and could be studied, indeed until such

About the author:

Glen S.R. Walker is the former proprietor of a chemical laboratory with Australia's highest qualification - National Association of Testing Laboratories qualification. He and his staff pioneered the determination of trace impurities in electrolytes using the Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer, invented by the C.S.I.R.O. and now used universally throughout the world. With over 40 years experience with fluorides, when the chemical was first used in electrochemical formulations, he is very aware of the hazards and dangers in using fluoride chemicals. He is the editor of *The Australian Fluoridation News* and author of *Fluoridation - Poison on Tap*, as well as technical papers for Australian and overseas journals. He was the first Australian to be made a Fellow of the Institute of Metal Finishing, London, awarded for his work in that field, and is Emeritus Member (60 years) Electro Chemical Society, USA.

time, no person in the world could honestly or scientifically KNOW anything about the impact of artificial fluoridation of public drinking water supplies on human health or teeth.

The Australian fluoridation gravy train was off at full speed, without an experienced driver, without rails on which to run, or scientific evidence from the first ever experiment on humans, all without caution lights flashing at the fluoridation express.

Way back in the 1920's the Victorian Railway Commissioners commissioned a wonderful warning motto:

"STOP LOOK AND LISTEN", can also be useful and intelligently applied to science.

That motto is second only to, Truth, the Whole Truth etc., but is too embarrassing medically and financially for acceptance by the combination of hierarchies in relative responsible professional disciplines.

BILL OF RIGHTS

The Victorian Government has just released, 2008, their promised Bill of Rights document, titled, The Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities. (47 pages)

The Victorian Charter is in part a copy of the Nuremberg Code of Medical Ethics.

Section 10, page 11, of the Victorian Charter states:

*"a person must not be:
subjected to medical or scientific experimentation or treatment without his or her full, free and informed consent."*

That makes compulsory fluoridation illegal!!!

However worse was to come. On page 24 under the title: (33) "Referral to Supreme Court". They state:

(1) "If in a proceeding before a court or tribunal a question of law arises that relates to the application of this Charter or a question arises with respect of the interpretation of a statutory provision in accordance with this Charter, that question may be referred to the Supreme Court . . ."

Just pause for intelligent responsible understanding of that "Human Rights" classification.

The Victorian Government outlaws its own Bill of Rights!

The same Victorian Parliament, 1993, voted unanimously to change the Victorian Constitution of Victoria (without reference to the people) and the Fluoridation Act of 1973 to read as follows:

"Section 12 - Supreme Court - limitation of jurisdiction

It is the intention of this section to alter or vary section 85 of the Constitution Act 1975 to the extent necessary to prevent the Supreme Court from entertaining an action of the kind referred to in section 4."

So, compulsory fluoridation is solely PROTECTED by the Victorian Government, the Victorian Constitution and **directing** the Supreme Court in its proper power of law as delineated in the Commonwealth Constitution that every person is entitled to access to the High Court of Australia BUT any such application **must first proceed through the Supreme Court!**

Democracy was "performed" in its political brilliant best in the Victorian Parliament on 28th October, 1993 when the Minister of Health stated: Hansard 1474 - Mrs. Tehan, Minister for Health:

"The reason for limiting the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in this way is that fluoridation of public water supply is so important to the interests of public health

that bodies performing this function in accordance with the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1982 should not be prevented from doing so by actions before the Court."

There was no debate on the matter and full support given by all members! Political "carers of fluoridation" are scattered around Australia in a manner of believing only everything favourable about fluoride in drinking water, but all built on faith, ignorance, or just the wantabees culture as members of "The Establishment".

So the Victorian Government surreptitiously changed the Victorian Constitution and Fluoridation Act to stop the Supreme Court from hearing evidence about artificial fluoridation, thereby preventing the High Court of Australia from hearing adverse evidence.

This is in defiance of the Bill of Rights and International Medical Law and as far as is known, applies only to the subject of fluoridation.

Protection of fluoridation conjures up questions of "why"?

TASMANIA

Tasmania is the first Australian State with fluoridation, 1956, and it becomes unbelievable that after 40 years of compulsory fluoridation and its claimed scientific-medically and dental success in Tasmania, praised scientifically to the limit, the Government of Tasmania passed a Bill **prohibiting meetings of more than three people discussing fluoridation (1995).**

The Upper House of the Parliament not only rejected the extreme and non-sensical Bill, but its Hansard reveals the members could not even follow any reason in its presentation. The Bill was defeated and buried accordingly.

"Truth, the whole Truth . . ."

Our beginning of this data - "Truth the whole Truth . . ."

After decades of artificial fluoridation, more dentists are needed to overcome the failure of artificial fluoridation of water supplies.

In 1993, the wheels of the "scientific - medical" Tasmanian fluoridation furphy gravy train started disintegrating. Now it is in tatters. Farms were infected with fluoride from Comalco Aluminium Smelter and "The Mercury" 14th May, 1993, reported the damage to cattle. Subsequently these "fluoride farms" were purchased by Comalco Aluminium Company and no longer a public place - very clever!

Then followed a report in 1995 stating 2800 people were waiting for dental service after 40 years of fluoridation.

Another problem for Tasmania, when Carmen Lawrence granted Burnie Council the sum of \$750,000 to research the reason for high cancer deaths in that artificially fluoridated area (1994).

Another less flattering article in the "Tasmanian Advocate" quoting the President of the Australian Dental Association saying:

*"There is a dental crises in Tasmania" -
AFTER OVER 40 YEARS OF FLUORIDATION.*

Lack of Truth and Logic

The general press statements by State Ministers for Health use interesting claims, such as, "the people living in fluoridated areas are enjoying the benefit of their fluoridated drinking water."

In their narrow-blinkered view of fluoridation plus a large dose of naivety in their cultivated pseudo-scientific knowledge and claims, sadly logic goes begging in the public

arena where daily newspapers throughout Australia are almost daily printing, with large headings, details of the atrocious state of children's teeth in Australia, after being dosed with fluoridated water for mostly over 35 years and the Australian percentage of the population on compulsory fluoridated water being almost 90%.

The Government, Medical and Dental "experts" plus great excitement by politicians and universities have all agreed that what is needed to solve the bad "state of children's teeth in Australia" is MORE DENTISTS!

Hansard 3 October 1989 - page 1210.

Dr Blewett, Minister for Health, stated -

"The dentists are speaking entirely without self interests because it can be clearly shown that they have lost a lot of their customers and clients as a result of fluoridated water."

Sydney and Brisbane University Dental Schools are now setting up dental school lectures, teaching in "shifts" to cover 24 hours per day dental classes! So may we believe the future of Australian children's and adults teeth will be saved by dentists, not by mass medicating the population with a toxic waste by-product from fertiliser factories, but more dentists?

The truth, the Whole Truth etc. seems to be smothered in giving a reason, for young dentists just finishing their University Dentistry Course are the official (Graduates Careers Australia 2007) highest starting salaries of all University graduates! Not bad for a "dying profession" (Federal Parliament, Hansard).

Those "looking on" must be scientifically mystified that Australian Governments, A.D.A., A.M.A., NHMRC and Universities Dental Schools all promote compulsory fluoridation of drinking water as their medical ultimate in stopping tooth decay but at the **same time** dental students are the highest paid professionals like their seniors, who also top the income bracket of all professionals.

Fluoridation History - a Frightening Experience. The Yass example

Reading Fluoridation History is a frightening experience relating to moral and scientific ethics.

An example is the early "scientific" basis proving fluoridation effectiveness in the small New South Wales town of Yass, when in 1962 the Department of Preventive Dentistry, University of Sydney, with cooperation of the Director General of Education and the Archbishop of Canberra-Goulburn, examined the majority of the primary and infant school children of Yass.

The Yass water supply had been fluoridated since late 1956, a matter of about 6 years, but not all the children of Yass were life-long residents.

In the official Report 1963 by Professor N.D. Martin, Professor of Preventive Dentistry Sydney University, it is stated that 706 children aged from 5 years to 12 years were examined.

The question asked for a long time is for clarification as to who did the examinations, especially the numbers by the Archbishop and the Director of Education.

Martin admitted that out of the 706 children "examined that day" 403 only had lived in Yass all their life, but only 201 had used town water exclusively, 101 used tank water at home. (Many Yass residents still use tank water.)

It appears only 201 were exclusive users of fluoridated water, meaning 30% of the child population.

Independent separate studies were made by two other groups both finding about 50% of Yass homes had tanks which confuses the claimed outcome of this early so-called study on fluoridation.

The final paragraph of the Yass fluoridation study made

this claim:

"Only after 6½ years fluoridation in Yass, it is apparent that those children who have been fortunate enough to drink the town water supply have received considerable dental benefits since fluoride was first added."

Be your own judge on the Yass "Scientific Study" by the Sydney University 1963.

Lack of Honest Data - the NHMRC 2008 Review

All that Australian people "wish for" is honest data relating to the use of fluoridated water but that TRUTH FACTOR is missing, lost in the haze of unsubstantiated grossly exaggerated, misleading and dishonest propaganda, supported by world sources, Medical, Political and Media conglomerates with high financial support in the wealth industries that govern the Governments.

The NHMRC presented "their" latest promotion data on fluoridation 2008, a 200 page document titled:

"A Systematic Review of the Efficacy and Safety of Fluoridation."

Firstly, it should be understood that the NHMRC staff did not do this Review. It commissioned the H.T. Analysts to do the Review.

The Review was confined to data after 1996 which of course hides the original false propaganda on fluoridation effectiveness and protects fluoridation's real scientific character.

Some strange conclusions and scientific references exist.

"The most serious defects of the studies . . . was the lack of appropriate design and analysis."

The Review Company seems to publish opinion throughout their document using McDonough's similar Review in England.

Perhaps McDonough in few words unintentionally also damaged the NHMRC's adamant statements when she, Marian McDonough, stated:

"The most serious defects of the studies and possible beneficial effects of fluoridation was the lack of appropriate design and analysis."

Conclusion

Given the level of interest surrounding the issue of public water fluoridation, it is surprising to find that little high quality research has been undertaken.

Strangely the NHMRC Review did not make important references to that absolute correct statement above which of course dismisses practically all their propaganda claims in supporting fluoridation as an advanced health science.

The Review Company indicate serious ignorance on page 18 under Introduction, they state, incorrectly:

"In 1979 a submission was made to the Committee of Inquiry into the Fluoridation of Victorian Water Supplies (not sure what they mean). The Review provided further justification for the endorsement of fluoridation of public water supplies as a safe and effective method of control of dental caries. This finding was confirmed in a NHMRC 1985 Review of the safety and effectiveness of water fluoridation."

Note their statement that their research was "after 1996" but they use "1979 data" as well as older fluoridation data.

This is an outrageous misleading claim because for over 30 years the anti-fluoridation Australian organisations have been asking the NHMRC, A.D.A., A.M.A., Australian Prime Ministers and their Health Departments to present an official

document, printed in a top Medical referred Journal demonstrating scientifically that fluoridation is safe and effective.

The Victorian Committee of Inquiry into Fluoridation (1979-1983) was also asked for such scientific proof of safety but they could not supply such proof. Neither can pro-fluoridation cohorts in any other country of the world. Of course we always state, "no dental slogans" on which fluoridation was founded and continued.

IS FLUORIDATION A PROVEN MEDICAL SCIENCE?
The scientifically advanced countries of Europe don't think so!

There is no fluoridation in the Western European countries, and at least 14 Nobel Prize scientists do not support fluoridation.

Are we missing something? Are the Australian promoters of fluoridation a rarity in scientific medical knowledge?

Who Governs the Governments?

Glen S.R. Walker

Fluoridation - "Compulsory mass medication of the population" is contrary to every relative Law in Australia, political, medical, pharmacology and above all else, the Australian Constitution, Part V, Powers of Parliaments, 1946, (xxIIIA), **"not so as to authorise any form of civic conscription."**

Forced compulsory mass medication with fluoridation is civic conscription.

Is the Parliament made up of citizens representatives? Do they really represent you and your Constitutional Right of "Your Will"?

Please attempt an honest, intelligent answer.

Were you ever visited by your Parliamentary Representative in your own home, doing the job of your Government Representative and asking if you wanted a fluoride waste by-product placed in your drinking water supply?

An unconstitutional undemocratic statement

Government statements, supported by Government Inquiries into Fluoridation, use this strange unconstitutional, undemocratic, unusual statement:

"The decision to fluoridate should not be left to local authorities." (Victorian Government Inquiry into Fluoridation 1979-80, page 214.)

The passion to regulate the lives of others is deep seated in many individuals.

Sir Arthur Amies

● Sir Arthur Amies, Dean of Melbourne's Dental School, Melbourne University, stated:

"The passion to regulate the lives of others is deep seated in many individuals. When this is based on political expedience, it is bad; and when it is inspired by an idealism which wishes to inflict benefits on others, it can become dangerous."

● The unheeded warning by Sir Edward "Weary" Dunlop in 1975, speaking from the platform of the Melbourne Town Hall:

"There is a slow and subtle process in which fluoride once put into the body is hard to get out."

● *"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the purposes are beneficial. Men born of freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil minded rulers.*

The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding." (U.S. Supreme Court Justice, Louis Brandeis.)

Dental Science regarding artificial fluoridation is mainly developed in part by repetitious pronouncements by so-called important people and groups in positions of TRUST.

The real original fluoridation science is purposely withdrawn from public publications and replaced with unsubstantiated data of commercial quality sales propaganda.

An example of a grand scale panic was and still is the danger of fluoride to pregnant women and babies, a case that is still covered up because of its scientific-medical reality.

The Victorian Government Report on Fluoridation 1979-1983 stated, p.205:

"The beneficial effects of fluoride are greatest when optimal intake commences early in life."

Firstly that great fluoridation promotional word, "OPTIMAL INTAKE" a pharmacological meaningless expressions of DOSE.

Recommendation for no fluoridated water for breed sows due to effect on unborn pigs - but no investigation of effect of fluoridated water on unborn children.

That beneficial claim recalls the medical claim being investigated in the U.S. Congressional Record, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, p. 1702, 1952.

Certain Government Agencies were concerned about possible harmful effects of fluoride but they were more concerned about safe-guarding pigs than pregnant women!

FACT: Making money is sometimes more important than keeping people alive and healthy. In 1952, certain government agencies were concerned about possible harmful effects of fluoride, but they were more concerned about safe-guarding pregnant pigs than pregnant women. The following testimony is taken from the U.S. Congressional Record, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, p. 1702, 1952.

Representative Dr. Miller (Nebraska):

The U.S. Department of Agriculture made some examination as to what happened in brood sows. They recommended to farmers that fluorine NOT be added to the water or feed of brood sows because it did something to pigs that were unborn.

Dr. Porterfield, U.S. Public Health Service:
Yes.

Rep. Miller:

Do you think it might be wise for the Public Health Service or some group of people to inquire what might happen to pregnant women, and the unborn child, when they are given fluorine?

Dr Porterfield:

I do not think there is enough money, Sir, from the Federal Government or any other source to pursue all of the possible hypotheses. We have to screen them from the point of view of greatest probability, and since we can find no cause from the physicians nor the dentists pointing to this, it would seem to us not of a high priority to devote money looking for something that has shown

no suggestive indications.

Rep. Miller:

Would you say that the Agriculture Department went off on a tangent when they investigated what might happen to pigs and brood sows?

Dr. Porterfield:

No, Sir, I think there is a difference.

Rep. Miller:

It is alright to do it with pigs, but you do not want to do it with women. Is that the attitude you take?

Dr. Porterfield:

They have different objectives in mind Sir. There is more money available for matters that have economic value than there is for health.

IN THIS SHORT BUT POWERFUL STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, FLUORIDATION IS LAID BARE AND DEMOCRACY LIKE THE PIGS SENT TO THE SLAUGHTER.

The Pig Mentality is documented in the Gippsland

Traralgon Journal, 12th November 1980:

"The memories of local farmer Bruce Ingle:

This substance, fluoride, would be very little different only in name to rat poison and pig dewormer, that would be put into the water supply.

In the 1950's our family used pig dewormer which was labelled sodium fluoride. On the directions for use was a warning that stated: 'Do not administer to a pig more than three times in a lifetime.' Why? Because fluoride is a poison and builds up in the body of the pig. It escapes excretion. Why should it be any different in humans? If humans get it into their bodies, how do they intend getting it out? I wish to state that I have absolutely no objections to other opinions or to anyone ingesting as much fluoride as they like. What is repulsive is that I or anybody else is forced under compulsion, to accept without question nature's rainfall, adulterated, polluted and poisoned in a scandalous manner." (**Fluoridation - Poison on Tap**, p. 183.)

THE BULLETIN - Demise of an Australian Icon

The current Australian dental decay crisis, with hundreds of thousands of people on waiting lists, illustrates the danger of both governments and a profession imposing an experimental "quick fix" backed by commercial propaganda, on the Australian people, rather than genuine research, to partly solve a problem such as dental decay in the general population.

A letter in *The Bulletin* (1991) by the President of the Anti Fluoridation Association of Victoria, over two decades ago, showed the flimsy basis on which the artificial fluoridation of public drinking water supplies was based. **The letter concluded with the proposal that Australia follow the lead of European countries and abandon the scheme. The massive waiting lists for dental treatment in artificially fluoridated communities in Australia are a stark illustration of the dismal failure of the artificial fluoridation scheme.** The negative impact on the general health of communities created by daily consumption of a known highly toxic poison remains unknown.

As a tribute to the largely independent journalism of *The Bulletin* for 120 years, the letter is reproduced below.

The Bulletin 1981 "Confidence trick"

Your cover line, "What fluoride has done to your teeth" (B, December 16) appears to be the result of a confidence trick on your magazine and reporter.

To say fluoridation is the best thing since sewerage puts it in its proper class, with regret that the proverbial bull is missing. Fluoridation has the same texture of content.

It really is taking the intelligence of your readers as zero to suggest that because of fluoridation dentists now look for work instead of playing golf a few days a week and taking three-hour lunches, as in the past.

In short, if the fairytale were true, the over-supply of dentists would seem to have been created by their working only a few hours a week with excessive rates to save taxation and presenting a false image of the profession to university dental students.

As a service and humane profession it seems dishonourable to play golf while people wait for treatment,

on Dr Craig's description of "the bulging appointment book". What a country Australia would be if every business closed down to stop paying more tax, especially when one remembers it is the taxpayer who supplies the university education.

If dentists are too mean to give more tax to the government, please don't ask us to believe they also want to give their income away because of fluoridation.

In every fluoridated town in the world there are more dentists per head of population and higher annual dental costs to the community than there are in non-fluoridated towns. Since Sydney was fluoridated the number of dentists has risen by 50 percent and the population by only 16 percent.

As dentistry should be a service and humane profession, it seems dishonourable for dentists to play golf while people wait for treatment.

The dentists' answer to this is that if people keep their teeth longer, then they must have longer dental treatment. Does that sound like giving away their livelihood? Certainly not, because they work on the old adage of "if we miss you on the merry-go-round, we will pick you up on the ocean wave."

In other words, if your teeth last longer, you finish up with the examples shown in your article; crowns at \$500 a time. With these, Dr Craig says, "There is big money involved." Those requiring six crowns will agree: big money is definitely involved.

But don't trust your family dentist - he may be getting at you on charges. The article suggests you shop around these philanthropic characters who are giving away their livelihood for fluoridation, pricing their work on "some kind of guesstimate machine" and maybe over-charging you. At least dentist Craig said these things about his own colleagues, so we should take notice accordingly.

However, your action will probably finish up as just another fluoridation propaganda mistake because, as Dr

Craig said, "There are as yet no hard figures to show the decline in business." The Tax Commissioner and the Bureau of Statistics can prove there is no decline in dentists' income in Sydney, fluoridated for 13 years.

"If the design of an experiment is faulty, any method of interpretation which makes it out to be decisive must be faulty too."

Sir Ronald Fisher, famous statistician

The classic propaganda by Dr Craig is illustrated by his reference to Bacchus Marsh in Victoria, stating that 14-year-olds, drinking fluoridated water all their lives, had dental cavities halved. The Victorian Inquiry into Fluoridation, 1980, would not accept the Bacchus Marsh results.

It dismissed them on page 200 of its report because "The total population served in these communities is too small, and the dental and demographic records too incomplete, to satisfy a quantitative cost benefit study."

But the study is worth looking at because in 1975 only six 14-year-old children could be found who had been drinking fluoridated water all their lives. The 30 percent decay-free improvement Craig claims were deciduous teeth of five-year-olds and amount to less than half a tooth a child average even though compared with children of another decade.

The studies at Tamworth, NSW, and Bacchus Marsh come under direct criticism by W.J. Beveridge in his classical study, "The Art of Scientific Investigation", in which he states: "A common fallacy, for instance, is to compare groups separated by time - the data of one year being compared with data obtained in previous years. Evidence obtained in this way is never conclusive, though it may be usefully suggestive." The late Sir Ronald Fisher, a famous statistician, said in 1951: "If the design of an experiment is faulty, any method of interpretation which makes it out to be decisive must be faulty too."

Tamworth and Bacchus Marsh qualify under these conditions because they had no control towns and compared children of different times, which is scientifically not acceptable.

The study by Lawson and others, published in February, 1978, in the Medical Journal of Australia, proved children's teeth in northern Sydney had improved 60 percent without fluoridation between 1960 and 1968. Sydney was first fluoridated in 1968 and only 2 percent improvement was recorded in the first four years of fluoridation. This rose to 20 percent in six years, but this was

qualified by stating special samplings took place on a selected group of children.

In Tamworth, continuous resident children seemed to be questionable. In 1972 only one-third of the children qualified but they were not identified by numbers or age groups. Also, the 1972 survey showed 66 percent of 12-year-olds required fillings, which seems to discount Dr Craig's claims.

In the *Port Macquarie Express*, August 19, 1980, an advertisement said that Professor P.D. Barnard of the Preventive Dentistry Department, University of Sydney, confirmed those facts relating to the 12-year-old children in Tamworth and the advertisement stated that R.B. Cocks, Principal Dental Officer, Health Commission of New South Wales, North Coast Region, said: **"Mrs - is quite correct in her statement that fluoridation does not prevent tooth decay."**

Tamworth - decay rate of 975% after artificial fluoridation, nearly double the decay rate of 538% before fluoridation.

The Tamworth survey, 1963-1973, shows children six years to 12 years on fluoridated water as having a decay rate of 975 percent against only 538 percent before fluoridation. One must question Dr Craig's desperation in trying to qualify his many questionable statements on fluoridation when he must use places such as Tamworth and Bacchus Marsh as examples. One would expect it reasonable to prove his case in Sydney, where there is a more reasonable population and possibility of their sampling, but as he chose to pick a small-child community in Tamworth and the disqualified town of Bacchus Marsh for his support of fluoridation, it would seem he was scraping the bottom of the barrel.

The Bulletin could do worse than run an article on **"What Fluoridation is Really Doing to the Health of the Population"** and forget all about the erroneous, unsubstantiated dental propaganda until Dr Craig can produce just one clinical study showing fluoride, and fluoride solely, at one part a million, is effective in reducing tooth decay. Until then, the matter should be left accordingly, **with Australia following all the scientifically advanced countries in Europe that have either refused to fluoridate or have discarded it after many years of experimentation.**

G.S.R. WALKER,

Chairman, Anti-Fluoridation Association of Victoria.

The Bulletin, January 13, 1981.

The Government's Spin on Fluoridation

Glen S.R. Walker

The Geelong Advertiser, 8th February 2008, presented official Victorian Government data on fluoridation under a large 20cm heading - "IT'S SAFE".

The authors, Dr. John Carnie, Chief Health Officer, Department of Human Services, Victorian Government, Dr. Mark Kennedy, from the G.P. Association of Geelong, and Dr. Michael Smith, Director of Dentistry, Barwon Health. They stated:

"No convincing scientific evidence exists that fluoride, when supplied at the optimum level of one part per million, causes any harmful effects to people of any age, apart from dental fluorosis."

Then follows their next scientific - medical equation of just

commonsense!

"Since mid-1980's, the prevalence of dental fluorosis in Australia has markedly reduced, mainly attributable to the use of low-fluoride toothpastes in young children."

Here we have the scientific evidence from the Health Department of Victoria stating without any equivocation of any kind that fluoride in standard fluoride toothpaste was poisoning children's teeth by killing the natural cells in the teeth, discolouring the teeth to be called mottling, the common word for dental fluorosis. The American Medical Association has stated:

"Dental Fluorosis is the first sign of fluoride poisoning."

Documented Danger of Toxic Fluoride Toothpaste

The Australian Fluoridation News, 1995, documented the real facts about the danger of toxic fluoride toothpaste, a fact that reduced the poisoning of children with fluoride toothpaste.

The Government requested fluoride toothpaste manufacturers provide a children's toothpaste with 50% less fluoride. That "scientific formula" proved ineffective in stopping dental fluorosis so the Government health experts recommended parents control the amount of fluoride entering a child's mouth and make another of their gigantic discoveries applying to fluoride in toothpaste for children.

They finally agreed, in the hope to hide their original claim to the people that fluoride toothpaste was, using their favourite wording relative to fluoride, "SAFE AND EFFECTIVE", and made the public statement that, "Parents supervising children cleaning their teeth with fluoride toothpaste should make sure they only use a pea-size amount of toothpaste on the brush."

Hallelujah! the great fluoride experts had corrected their original recommendation on how to poison their children.

They had reduced the "safe" amount of fluoride entering a child's mouth from fluoride toothpaste by over 90%.

The Country took it all in quiet accord.

But it did not finish with the fluoride being reduced by 90%!

In a quiet cover-up to their next method of admitting toxic fluoride toothpaste was dangerous for young children we were faced with directions on fluoride toothpaste tubes with a direction to "**USE ONLY A SMEAR**" on toothbrush for young children.

Quantity of toxic fluoride toothpaste reduced by 99%.

The whole matter created no anger from parents being misled by Government and dentists remembering the fluoride toothpaste TV nightly advertising its safety and showing children being instructed to fill the toothbrush with at least 25mm of fluoride toothpaste.

The fact is fluoride toothpaste was reduced from 25mm (1 inch) to a smear, a reduction of 99%! (**Fluoridation News** November/December, 1995.)

Research apart from knowledge is the missing link with fluoride toothpaste.

In 1988 the Washington Post reported statements by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on fluoride toothpaste claims and stated:

"The companies (making health claims) had not submitted evidence to the Agency proving toothpaste or mouthwash was either safe or effective in dealing with those early-disease conditions."

That brings up the eternal question in Australia, show us the scientific studies published in world refereed medical journals proving fluoride toothpaste, fluoridated water and fluoride mouthwashes are perfectly safe for humans of all ages and conditions.

We do not make unsubstantiated statements without our **own** knowledge and research which proves the amount of fluoride ingested or absorbed into the body from normal brushing but with standard fluoride toothpaste.

Our own **practical** and original research indicates fluoride can be easily measured in the urine hour by hour after a subject cleans their teeth with fluoride toothpaste indicating the amount cannot be beneficial to the subject under discussion especially as that measured in the urine is only half of that ingested and the other half left in the body and

distributed accordingly in bone and tissue via the blood. (High Court of Scotland, Edinburgh 1983)

Laws relating to the use and sale of fluoride chemicals are abandoned, knowing Australian Governments are saturated with fluoride promoting members and departments.

As an example, the Law relating to fluoride toothpaste specifies the maximum amount of fluoride in toothpaste is 1000 parts per million (ppm), but not a word of concern or question about Colgates Neutra Fluor 5000 Plus Toothpaste (5000 ppm).

What are the rules of Government?

The Rules are clearly documented in a Book of Rules known as the Australian Constitution, a sacred "Set of Rules" under which we live, and expect to be protected.

Baseless Propaganda and the strange Involvement of Politicians

Open your eyes and see (intelligence) the baseless fluoridation propaganda by Australian Governments, openly supported by their cohort groups of questionable ability to preach "their" message on the use of such a toxic fluoride chemical forced on to every person irrespective of the seriousness of the known POISON RATING of fluoride chemicals. An unknown daily dose is forced on each person, where the human variables are not understood, or even of an interest to the medical profession hierarchy who promote mass medication, unconstitutional, undemocratic, which does not conform with principles of pharmacology, completely immoral, all without even medical evidence of its safety to humans.

The strange involvement of politicians who on entering Parliament in Australia become "instant coffee like" fluoridation experts with all the arrogance of a dentist, but in reality without any original research into FACTS according to Government compulsory fluoridation but with **unequaled power to vote on the issue!**

All quiet on the Fluoridation Front.

What keeps politicians hidden from their electorate and the people who voted them into their positions of TRUST?

How can FACTS and TRUTH be so annihilated even in public, by the same groups that voted the Fluoridation Act into LAW?

Bill of Rights and Ethics

The Victorian Bill of Rights - called - **Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.**

"10. Protection from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.

A person not be -

(c) subjected to medical or scientific experimentation or treatment without his or her full, free and informed consent."

The AMA "Code of Ethics" stated - Standard of Care, *"Evaluate your patient completely and thoroughly."*

(Has that happened in accessing the AMA approval of compulsory mass medicating the population with fluoride chemicals?)

"Maintain accurate contemporaneous clinical records. Treat your patient with compassion and respect for human dignity." (See Bill of Rights)

The NHMRC in their publication "Ethics in Medical Research":

"We also recognise that judgements must be subject to revision in the light of new evidence and further thought developed against a background of full and free discussion."

Therapeutic Trials

"The difficulty in this, as in other fields, was to

distinguish matters of ethics from matters of experimental design - indeed they overlap, because it could be regarded as unethical to undertake a poorly designed trial." (We agree.)

(1) Monitoring should be done by an independent person or small committee. Independence is necessary because it is often important, in order to minimise observer and patient bias.

(5) In therapeutic trials involving drugs (fluoridation) the protocol should contain precise information on dosage, formulation, frequency of dosage and methods of accessing safety."

Have our Governments taken heed of that NHMRC statement on "dosage" relating it to the unknown dose of toxic fluoride to humans via the fluoridated drinking water supplies?

Great concern is recorded in fluoridated areas where the only claim of safety is that the water is presented with 1 ppm fluoride.

The NHMRC statement on dosage, relative to fluoridation, fails to explain the expert health authority's safety claim that the dose is 1 ppm fluoride.

This is the humbug of political and other groups not understanding the simple procedure of medical dosage and with fluoridation the dose is absolutely controlled by each person's natural thirst that only relates to dose by the amount of fluoridated water any person can freely drink because of his/her state of thirst, which differs enormously throughout the whole population of Australia.

The fluoride dose is a medical scientific misnomer of a serious degree of intellectually dishonest propaganda.

Questionable Claims

In Australian media reports on fluoridation by Governments and their Health Departments make questionable claims of the effectiveness and safety of fluoridation.

The expression of "questionable claims" has two different but tight interconnections that not only question their data but what prompts such data.

The Geelong Advertiser 13 February, 2008 published an article by the Head of the Department of Human Services, Dr. John Carnie, Dr. Mark Kennedy and Michael Smith under the heading - "Geelong Deserves Fluoride".

These medical specialists commence with the old worn out unproven statement, "Water fluoridation is safe and effective".

The problem is that the above health specialists cannot and do not present a scientific documented proof of its safety, with the proof documented in top medical scientific refereed journals.

For over thirty years this information has been literally demanded from Health Departments in The Federal Parliament and State Parliaments plus the World Health Organisation, the AMA and ADA and Councils all over Australia.

They all use the same claim without scientific proof except what they use are mostly Dental Slogans of no scientific value.

These medicos stated -

"No convincing scientific evidence exists that fluoride, when supplied at the optimum level of one part per million causes any harmful effects to people of any age apart from dental fluorosis."

As explained above the RATE OF FLUORIDE IN WATER is not a pharmacological dose and as a fluoride dose it is uncontrollable and indeed unlicensed or registered as safe for humans.

Regarding all the groups named as supporters of Dr.

Carnie's claims we invite each and every one to send us an official document agreed to by their organisation membership and giving us the scientific evidence on which their organisation pledges their scientific credibility.

You will be proud to read Dr. Carnie's claim that dental fluorosis in Australia has been markedly reduced, mainly attributable to the use of low fluoride toothpastes in young children.

That indicates that the fluoride experts had been in reality poisoning children for a long time before lower fluoride in toothpaste was needed or perhaps forced on the fluoride pushers who previously recommended standard fluoride toothpaste as harmless.

Remember the nightly TV advertisements and Mrs Marsh showing kids using unlimited fluoride toothpaste on their toothbrushes.

So there is an admittance that fluoride toothpaste was not safe which questions if the present low fluoride toothpaste is safe.

Which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Dr. Carnie claims fluoridated water "repairs tooth decay" but he also claims fluoridated water stops tooth decay, making it difficult to understand where the decayed teeth came from in a decay-free fluoridated area.

"Geelong deserves fluoride" because Dr Carnie states on behalf of the Victorian Parliament that it stops tooth decay.

What are the real FACTS about fluoridation success?

Sydney was fluoridated in 1968.

With all the claims of Dr Carnie, compare his data Geelong Advertiser 13 February, 2008.

The Sydney Daily Telegraph 11 February, 2008, printed an article: **DENTISTS ALARM UNDER-5s LOSE TEETH.**

The article opened with these words:

"More than 5100 children under 5 in NSW were forced to endure tooth extractions. Of the 5130 tooth extractions, the highest number in the age group were in the South West Sydney area where 1590 teeth were removed."

Sydney, the areas referred to above was fluoridated in 1968, so after 40 years of fluoridation the children's teeth in that fluoridated area are in drastic conditions.

The article also stated:

"Official Health Department figures for its publicity funded dental programme also showed 775 pre-school youngsters had teeth problems so severe they required root-canal therapy in the 2006-2007 financial year."

"Crown and bridge-work, usually not needed until adulthood, were required in 63 cases for children."

Do the FACTS begin to register? And is our earlier reference to QUESTIONABLE data from Dr. Carnie beginning to rid the haze of fact or fiction?

Subscriptions: The Australian Fluoridation News,
\$25 per annum posted Australia. Box 935, G.P.O.
Melbourne. VIC. 3001.

- The Anti-Fluoridation Association of Victoria, Box 935, G.P.O. Melbourne 3001
- GPO Box 369, Sydney NSW 2001

The only Australian Publication by Australians for Australians on Fluoridation (since 1963)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Authorization to mechanically or electronically copy the contents of this publication is granted by the publisher to approved persons and organisations, provided acknowledgement is given to the author and publisher.