

Dare to think, and speak?

Many people have spoken out about the dangers of fluoride and / or water fluoridation. We present just five of them who put forward their arguments:

[1] Charles Eliot Perkins

The 'Perkins' story: myth or reality?

It is the end of World War II and the Allies have control of the German IG Farben factories and all of its technologies. Enter American Charles Eliot Perkins ("Perkins"). Perkins, so the story goes, was a researcher in chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pathology. He and other scientists were put in charge of the Farben industries shortly after the cessation of hostilities but it was Perkins who was informed that the German General Staff adopted the plan of using sodium fluoride to make prisoners-of-war more docile and easier to manipulate and control. There is no surviving evidence to suggest the Germans did actually do this though it was well within their doctrine to carry out such a practice. It is also claimed that the ultimate intention of the Nazis was to fluoridate every country that they occupied and this story, which the Pushers are desperate to ridicule, has gained credibility in recent years for a number of reasons.

So what did Perkins do with the information given to him? Like most other scientists who fear for their job, their future or even their lives, he could have kept quiet. Not Perkins. Even as early as the 1940's to 1950's Perkins realised that fluoride could have an undesirable effect on a certain part of the brain - the hippocampus. Before he died, he urged those who would follow him not to let the anti-fluoride cause fail.

This was done in part in 1987 by someone known as Harley Rivers Dickinson (An Australian Liberal MP) who raised the issue of fluoridation and its sinister implications in an "Address in Reply to the Governor's speech in Parliament." The 'Address' forms part of a document compiled by Ian E Stephens and is appropriately entitled the 'Dickinson Statement' ("the Statement"). The main thrust of the Address was as follows:

"At the end of the Second World War, the United States Government sent Charles Eliot Perkins, a research worker in chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pathology, to take charge of the vast Farben chemical plants in Germany. While there he was told of a scheme which had been worked out by them during the war and adopted by the German General Staff. This was to control the population in any given area through mass medication of drinking water. In this scheme sodium fluoride occupied a prominent place. Repeated doses of infinitesimal amounts of fluoride will in time reduce an individual's power to resist domination by slowly poisoning and narcotizing a certain area of the brain and will thus make him submissive to the will of those who wish to govern him. Both the Germans and the Russians added sodium fluoride to the drinking water of prisoners-of-war to make them stupid and docile." (Reference: Victorian Hansard of 12th August 1987). Also see Dr Phyllis Mullenix.

The Statement adds to this ...

"Farben was a German chemical manufacturing concern that supplied Chlorine Gas used by Germany during the first World War, but the eventual creation of the huge Farben Cartel began in 1924 when American bankers began to arrange foreign loans in what Professor Carroll Quigley terms 'The Dawes Plan', "largely a J P Morgan production." (J P Morgan: one of the Wall Street élite - Author). In 1928, Henry Ford merged his German assets with Farben to be followed by the American Standard Oil Company who, in concert with Farben, developed the coal to oil hydrogenation process. In a letter to Roosevelt from Berlin in the early thirties, American Ambassador in Germany, William Dodd, said: "At the present, more than a hundred American corporations have subsidiaries here or co-operative understandings. The DuPonts have their allies in Germany that are aiding in the armament business. Their chief ally is the Farben company, a part of the Government which gives 200,000 Marks a year to one propaganda organization operating on American opinion. Standard Oil Company ... sent \$2 million here in December 1933 and has made \$500,000 a year helping Germans make Ersatz gas (to convert coal to gasoline) for war purposes; but Standard Oil cannot take any of its earnings out of the country except in goods. The International Harvester president told me their business here rose 33% per year but they could not take anything out. Even our airplane people have secret arrangements with Krupps. General Motors and Ford do enormous business here through their subsidiaries and take no profits out."

The Farben assets in America were controlled by a holding company, American IG Farben which listed on its Board of Directors, Edsel Ford, President of the Ford Motor Company, Chas E Mitchell, President of Rockefeller's National City Bank of New York, Walter Teagle, President of Standard Oil in New York, Paul Warburg, Chairman of the Federal Reserve and brother of Max Warburg, financier of Germany's war effort, and Herman Metz, a Director of the Bank of Manhattan, controlled by the Warburgs."

The Statement says of ALCOA:

"In 1939, ALCOA, then probably the world's largest producer of sodium fluoride, transferred its technology to Germany (the Alted Agreement). The Dow Chemical Company transmitted it's experience and technology in that same period." Other Cartel companies mentioned in the Statement include the names of Kellogg and Proctor & Gambol (of Crest toothpaste fame).

NB. None of the Americans that sat on the Board of AIG Farben were prosecuted after the war though three "non-Americans" were tried and convicted as war criminals.

Part 2 of the Statement looks at the roll of 'Foundations':

"In Australia, the Dental Health & Research Foundation, which has such names as Colgate, Kellogg and other ex-Farben associates listed among its 'governors and contributors', has been irreverently but accurately dubbed "the Fluoride Mafia". Closely allied with this Sydney University 'Foundation', in its printed promotional claims for fluorides and fluoridation, is 'Foundation 41'. Unfortunately, the data of the "thorough investigations" said to have been carried out by the Foundation into fluoride, its benefits and its hazards, have never been made available, despite numerous appeals. A recent ABC Science Show's examination of the scientific integrity of Foundation 41 may explain the elusive data. America is literally bursting at the seams with such Foundations, but amongst the earlier names were the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation and the Ford Foundation. It is necessary to mention these specifically because they were the first Foundations to make grants in the population (control) field and the Carnegie family merged with the Mellon family Institute to create the Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh in 1967."

The Statement now returns to the ill-fêted Perkins. "In a letter abstracted from "Fluoridation and Lawlessness" (published by the Committee for Mental Health and National Security) to the Lee Foundation for Nutritional Research, Milwaukee, Wisconsin on October 2nd 1954, Charles Eliot Perkins said:

"We are told by fanatical ideologists who are advocating the fluoridation of the water supplies in this country that their purpose is to reduce the incidence of tooth decay in children, and it is the plausibility of this excuse, plus the gullibility of the public and the cupidity (meaning covetousness - to desire or eagerly wish for) of public officials that is responsible for the present spread of artificial water fluoridation in this country. However, and I want to make this very definite and very positive, the real reason behind water fluoridation is not to benefit children's teeth. If this were the real reason there are many ways in which it could be done that are much easier, cheaper and more effective. The real purpose behind water fluoridation is to reduce the masses to domination and control and loss of liberty... When the Nazis decided to go into Poland ... the German General Staff exchanged scientific and military ideas, plans and personnel and the scheme of mass medication was seized upon by the Russian Communists because it fitted ideally into their plan to communize the world... I say this with all the earnestness and sincerity of a scientist who has spent nearly twenty years research into the chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pathology of fluorine. Any person who drinks artificially fluoridated water for a period of one year or more will never again be the same person, mentally or physically."

The Russian connection is further enhanced by the statement of Major George Racey Jordan who was in charge of the shipment of sodium fluoride to Russia from Great Falls, Montana, via Alaska. He queried the shipment of considerable amounts of sodium fluoride to Russia and was told "frankly" that it was put into the drinking water in the prisoner-of-war camps to take away their will to resist. As for the CIA, who ultimately come into this story, the Statement further adds that the 'Rockefeller Report' to the United States President on CIA activities said:

"The drug program was part of a much larger CIA program to study possible means of controlling human behaviour."

NB. An earlier part of the Statement revealed that an advisor to the American Government on "hypnotism" or psychological behaviour control, Dr George Estabrooks, later became Chairman of the Department of Psychology at COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

The Statement also lists all the fluoridated tranquillisers that were on the market at the time (and no doubt some still are). Perhaps it is just coincidence, but the first fluoridation trials were about to begin in the USA in 1945, the year *Operation Paperclip commenced (*Operation Paperclip involved the movement of Nazi scientists to the USA). Until 1945, the US Public Health Service ("USPHS") had resisted fluoridation but that was all about to change, and rapidly so. The previous year, one Oscar Ewing was working for ALCOA as an attorney and on an annual salary of \$750,000 - an awful lot of money in those days.

Was Ewing happy working for ALCOA and receiving such a substantial wage? If so, why did he decide to leave ALCOA to become Federal Security Administrator in the American Government at a lower income. Ewing is reported to have said that "he wanted to serve his country".

Consider also that the USPHS, just prior to and possibly during, was part of the US Treasury at the time Ewing was employed. And who was the US Treasurer just prior to Ewing's appointment? It was no other than Andrew Mellon, of ALCOA fame. It is more than a coincidence that in his position he could exert his influence over the reluctant USPHS and arrange for 'favourable' research into fluoride to compel the USPHS to reverse its decision. It has certainly been claimed on more than one occasion that past experiments into fluoridation were not well designed - clearly indicating that such research was biased.

The scientists controlling the research programmes, instead of being unbiased, could be carefully selected to produce such favourable results and so the fluoride bandwagon began to roll. Therefore, appointments to influential positions under Ewing's control became a reality. So why did the Government appoint him if he was going to use his position to further the cause of fluoridation? Perhaps President Roosevelt ('Mr Wall Street' and I G Farben investor), also had an interest in fluoride's 'alternative use'.

Extra reading: WALL STREET AND THE RISE OF HITLER Pub. Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6TD. Tel: 01787 376374.

[2] Dr William Marcus

DOCTOR WILLIAM (BILL) MARCUS. Bill was the victim of one of the most sinister events you will ever hear about. The following story is taken from 'The Fluoride Report', April 1994 edition.

THE FLUORIDE REPORT, APRIL 1994.

VICTORY FOR THE TRUTH: LABOR SECRETARY REICH ORDERS EPA SCIENTIST DR BILL MARCUS REINSTATED. EPA Corruption Exposed.

On February 7, Secretary of Labor Robert B Reich ordered the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to reinstate whistleblower Dr Bill Marcus in his former (or comparable) position at EPA. Almost two years after being fired. Dr Marcus has finally emerged victorious over the unsavory individuals who tried to punish him for challenging the falsehoods propagated by his own agency and the Public Health Service about the safety of fluoride. He will receive back pay, legal expenses and \$50,000 in damages.

At a February 10 press conference hosted by the National Whistleblower Center, Dr. Marcus said: "I have finally been vindicated". He expressed his hope that this verdict " will serve as the first, albeit small step in bringing responsible science, science undaunted by fears about job security or other reprisals, back to the US Environmental Protection Agency".

Although Marcus was ordered reinstated by Administrative Law Judge David A Clark, Junior, on December 3, 1992, the EPA appealed the decision to Labor secretary Reich, delaying Dr Marcus' reinstatement for over a year. Mr Reich blasted the EPA's excuses for firing Dr. Marcus. He said, " the true reason for the discharge was retaliation". Specifically, Dr Marcus "authored and disseminated a memorandum criticizing a draft report concerning toxicology and carcinogenesis studies, which the EPA contemplated using in regulating fluoride levels."

Mr. Reich also noted that an EPA investigator was ordered by a superior to shred evidence gathered during the investigation, and that EPA withheld evidence that would have supported Dr. Marcus in court. Because these acts were perpetrated under the jurisdiction of EPA's Inspector General, John C Martin, the National Whistleblower Center has asked President Clinton to remove Martin from office.

Not mentioned by Mr. Reich but recorded in the hearing before Judge Clark, is clear evidence that the EPA tampered with witnesses, threatening EPA employees with dismissal if they testified on Dr. Marcus' behalf. EPA management also forged some of his time cards, and then accused him of misusing his official time. At the press conference Dr Marcus asserted that his boss, Margaret Stasikowski, committed perjury. Her superior, Tudor Davies, Office Director of Science and Technology, who made the final decision to fire Dr Marcus, was accused by Mr Reich of accepting the report of the Inspector General without validating any of the findings, contrary to accepted practice. Dr Marcus noted that all the officials who participated in his firing are still employed by EPA and " making decisions about drinking water that affect public health.

WHY BILL MARCUS WAS FIRED: the "May Day Memo"

As revealed in the decision by Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, the key to the firing of Dr Bill Marcus was the memorandum he wrote on May 1, 1990, to a superior at the EPA. The memo was a detailed analysis of the National Toxicology Program (NTP) Report #393, the long-awaited report of NTP's animal study conducted to determine if fluoride in drinking water causes cancer.

Dr. Marcus called the report "disturbing". Why? Because the NTP termed the results "equivocal", while the actual data indicated a causal relationship between fluoride and bone cancer in male rats, according to Dr Marcus. In his memo, he pointed out that fluoride accumulates in bone, and this is where the cancers occurred. He noted that the rats had less fluoride in their bones than humans would accumulate in their bones at the EPA's approved "safe level" of 4 mg/l. He stated, "This is the first time in my memory that [test] animals have lower concentrations of the carcinogen at the site of adverse effect than do humans". He also criticized the Public Health Service (referenced in the NTP report) for misrepresenting the results of the Yiamouyiannis / Burk study showing 10,000 excess cancer deaths a year from fluoridation.

Animals used as controls are not supposed to receive any of the chemical given to the treated animals, Dr Marcus' memo continued. In the NTP study, however, the control animals were given six to seven times more fluoride than humans receive from fluoridated water. When the number of cancers in the controls were plotted according to the amount of fluoride in their feed, they fitted nearly into the dose response relationships seen in the treated group, adding weight to the claim that fluoride is a probable carcinogen.

Commenting on the genetic toxicology studies included in the back of the NTP report, Dr Marcus stated that "There were three different short-term in vitro tests performed on fluoride and all these tests proved fluoride to be mutagenic. EPA's own guidelines require that in vitro tests be taken into consideration when positive. In this case, the mutagenicity of fluoride supports the conclusion that fluoride is a probable carcinogen". One other study was mentioned, the Ames test, which was negative. Dr Marcus dismissed these results because the inventor of the test, Dr. Bruce Ames, has gone on record stating his test is inappropriate for chemicals such as fluoride.

Dr Marcus then raised the possibility that some of the test results had been altered by a review panel. He cited data showing that a rare liver cancer, hepatocholangiocarcinoma, was found, but then dismissed. There was evidence that other types of tumors were found but were downgraded by a review committee. Consideration of all these factors, Dr Marcus' memo concluded, changes the 'equivocal' findings of the [NTP] board to "at least some evidence, or clear evidence of carcinogenicity". He asked that an independent panel be convened to re-evaluate the raw test data.

Dr. Marcus, a senior science advisor, received no response to his memo from EPA management.

[3] Dr Hans Moolenburgh



Hans is a shrewd and very cool customer. Having spoken to him on the telephone I can also vouch for his very friendly personality and charm. Hans wrote a book ('Fluoride: the Freedom Fight', 1987) about the struggle to defeat the fluoridation campaign in Holland and on this occasion the anti-fluoridation lobby were successful.

The path to glory was littered with difficulties and the tactics employed against Hans and his band of trusty friends were typical of a lobby determined to force through fluoridation at virtually any cost. You will have to read the book for the full story and I recommend any cynic to do so to more fully understand what the anti-fluoridation movement has to put up with.

In the mean time, you can watch a video of Hans talking about his experiences. [LINK HERE](#).

[4] Dr John Yiammouyiannis



"We've got a network of evil in this country that we can't hide from any longer"

John passed away some years ago, but an obituary that appeared in the Australian Fluoridation News summed up John like this:

John Y, as he was known to so many throughout the world, passed away at his home in Ohio, 8th October, 2000. John was a world-class Biochemist with a record of progressive intelligence relating especially to fluoridation, a record difficult to replace, but his scientific work will be well established in present day history.

The fluoridation crusade John followed, captured countless friends world-wide, so many admirers, but unfortunately his superior knowledge also established a distinct government opposition where the lowest form of scientific behaviour was employed to counter him. The pressures under which John worked on fluoridation were enormous. Most of it was of a personal nature, because the fluoride disciples could never match John's ability to debate and present matters of true science compared with the ragtime unscientific opposition from other countries of the world. John visited Australia in 1977 at our request. The main sponsor, Mr Don Heggie of Port Kembla, was concerned about a referendum on fluoridation to be held in his area. John did not take home a very good impression of Australian politicians, doctors, dentists and bureaucrats in general. During his 1977 visit we proposed to those fluoride people to grasp this important opportunity to publicly debate fluoridation with John Y, and discredit both him and our Australian Association supporters and our scientific evidence. The Government hid behind "press releases", but John gave lectures on fluoridation, especially relating to his research with Dean Burk and their Attorney, John Graham. The "unofficial debates" were in Nowra, Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne, where the Government's kindergarten scientific knowledge of fluoridation was exposed. There was a referenda for fluoridation at Nowra, and the Government sent their "top guns" not to debate the subject with John, but to con the public into believing all their fluoridation propaganda. In the Nowra Town Hall we forced a "debate". The "expert" from the Government was Dr William McBride, enough said. We then went to Canberra for a hurried "debate". A professor was John's opponent. The professor opened his address by saying, "I don't know much about fluoridation," and that proved he was telling the truth. Same day John lectured in Sydney, where we had an agreement with the A.D.A. that their President would debate, but at the very last moment, at the start of the meeting, the A.D.A. President refused to come on stage. It was my problem as Chairman of that meeting to (1) quieten the audience who were getting dangerously restless at the delay, and (2) get a speaker on behalf of the A.D.A. fluoridation experts present. Finally, Professor N. Martin agreed to debate. I remember speaking to both men and setting the rules for the debate. Only one followed the arrangement, because they had no evidence to counter John's fluoridation/cancer studies. The same followed in Melbourne, where abuse was the main purpose of the fluoridation supporters who came to the meeting. The kind of abuse by fluoridationists before the lecture caused me to request the presence of police, and just as well. Close to a fight broke out between a dental idiot and one of those who came to hear John Y. The police officer told me he was watching carefully and about to pounce on the dental agitator. How they treasure and guard their fluoride hoax. John Yiamouyiannis is a hero in Australia, a very respected scientist, a man who could not be bent, not uncommon in the fluoridation racket world-wide. At my request he submitted to the Federal Government's N.H. and M.R.C. Fluoride Investigation 1993, a 200 page Submission which was completely ignored. John left a legacy in this country that has stood the test of time through true science. Fortunately, John published his book, "Fluoridation the Ageing Factor" in 1993, but his scientific monument will be forever cast in the legal history of fluoridation, where other scientists and politicians were bought for "30 pieces of silver".

[5] Dr Phyllis Mullenix



January, 1998.

Phyllis Mullenix, Ph.D., formerly of Harvard University experienced the wrath of the industry when she walked blindly into the fluoride fray as part of her research program with Harvard's Department of Neuropathology and Psychiatry. While holding a dual appointment to Harvard and the Forsyth Dental Research Institute, Dr. Mullenix established the Department of Toxicology at Forsyth for the purpose of investigating the environmental impact of substances that were used in dentistry. During that undertaking she was also directed by the institute's head to investigate fluoride toxicity ...

For her toxicology studies Dr. Mullenix designed a computer pattern recognition system that has been described by other scientists as nothing short of elegant in its ability to study fluoride's effects on the neuromotor functions of rats.

THE "MIRACLE OF FLUORIDE" -or- A DIRTY INDUSTRY?

"By about 1990 I had gathered enough data from the test and control animals," Mullenix continues, "to realize that fluoride doesn't look clean." When she reviewed that data she realized that something was seriously affecting her test animals. They had all (except the control group) been administered doses of fluoride sufficient to bring their blood levels up to the same as those that had caused dental fluorosis [a brittleness and staining of the teeth] in thousands of children. Up to this point, Mullenix explained, fluorosis was widely thought to be the only effect of excessive fluoridation.

The scientist's first hint that she may not be navigating friendly waters came when she was ordered to present her findings to the National Institute of Dental Research (NIDR) [a division of NIH, the National Institute of Health]. "That's when the 'fun' started," she said, "I had no idea what I was getting into. I walked into the main corridors there and all over the walls was 'The Miracle of Fluoride'. That was my first real kick-in-the-pants as to what was actually going on." The NIH display, she said, actually made fun of and ridiculed those that were against fluoridation. "I thought, 'Oh great!' Here's the main NIH hospital talking about the 'Miracle of Fluoride' and I'm giving a seminar to the NIDR telling them that fluoride is neurotoxic!"

What Dr. Mullenix presented at the seminar that, in reality, sounded the death knell of her career was that:

"The fluoride pattern of behavioral problems matches up with the same results of administering radiation and chemotherapy [to cancer patients]. All of these really nasty treatments that are used clinically in cancer therapy are well known to cause I.Q. deficits in children. That's one of the best studied effects they know of. The behavioral pattern that results from the use of fluoride matches that produced by cancer treatment that causes a reduction in intelligence."

At a meeting with dental industry representatives immediately following her presentation, Mullenix was bluntly asked if she was saying that their company's products were lowering the I.Q. of children? "And I told them, 'basically, yes.'"

The documents obtained by authors Griffiths and Bryson seem to add yet another voice of corroboration to the reduced intelligence effects of fluoride. "New epidemiological evidence from China adds support", the writers claim, "showing a correlation between low dose fluoride exposure and diminished I.Q. in children."

Then in 1994, after refining her research and findings, Dr. Mullenix presented her results to the Journal of Neurotoxicology and Teratology, considered probably the world's most respected publication in that field. Three days after she joyfully announced to the Forsyth Institute that she had been accepted for publication by the journal, she was dismissed from her position. What followed was a complete evaporation of all grants and funding for any of Mullenix's research. What that means in the left-brain world of scientific research, which is fueled by grants of government and corporate capital, is the equivalent to an academic burial. Her letter of dismissal from the Forsyth Institute stated as their reason for that action that her work was not "dentally related." [Fluoride research - not dentally related?] The institute's director stated, according to Mullenix, "they didn't consider the safety or the toxicity of fluoride as being their kind of science." Of course, a logical question begs itself at this last statement: why was Dr. Mullenix assigned the study of fluoride toxicity in the first place if it was not "their kind of science"?

Subsequently, she was continually hounded by both Forsyth and the NIH as to the identity of the journal in which her research was to be published. She told The WINDS that she refused to disclose that information because she knew the purpose of this continual interrogation was so that they could attempt to quash its publication.

Almost immediately following her dismissal, Dr. Mullenix said, the Forsyth Institute received a quarter-million dollar grant from the Colgate company. Coincidence or reward?

Her findings clearly detailed the developmental effects of fluoride, pre- and postnatal. Doses administered before birth produced marked hyperactivity in offspring. Postnatal administration caused the infant rats to exhibit what Dr. Mullenix calls the "couch potato syndrome" - a malaise or absence of initiative and activity. One need only observe the numerous children being dosed with Ritalin as treatment for their hyperactivity to draw logical correlations.

Following her dismissal, the scientist's equipment and computers, designed specifically for the studies, were mysteriously damaged and destroyed by water leakage before she could remove them from Forsyth. Coincidence?

Dr. Mullenix was then given an unfunded research position at Children's Hospital in Boston, but with no equipment and no money--what for? "The people at Children's Hospital, for heaven's sake, came right out and said they were scared because they knew how important the fluoride issue was," Mullenix said. "Even at Forsyth they told me I was endangering funds for the institution if I published that information." It has become clear to such as Dr. Mullenix et al, that money, not truth, drives science--even at the expense of the health and lives of the nation's citizens.

"I got into science because it was fun," she said, "and I would like to go back and do further studies, but I no longer have any faith in the integrity of the system. I find research is utterly controlled." If one harbors any doubt that large sums of corporate money and political clout can really provide sufficient influence to induce scientists and respected physicians to endorse potentially harmful treatment for their patients, consider the results published in a January 8th article of the New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM). The Journal revealed their survey of doctors in favor of, and against, a particular drug that has been proven harmful (in this case calcium blockers shown to significantly increase the risk of breast cancer in older women). "Our results," the Journal said, "demonstrate a strong association between authors' published positions on the safety of calcium-channel antagonists and their financial relationships with pharmaceutical manufacturers."

When The WINDS asked Dr. Mullenix where she planned to take her research, she said that she is not hopeful that any place exists that isn't "afraid of fluoride or printing the truth."

The end result of the dark odyssey of Phyllis Mullenix, Ph.D., and her journey through the nightmare of the fluoride industry is, essentially, a ruined career of a brilliant scientist because hers was not "their kind of science".