THE AUSTRALIAN FLUORIDATION NEWS

Aqua Pura

ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION
IS WATER POLLUTION
www.fluoridationnews.com
afavaust@gmail.com
G.P.O. Box 935,
Melbourne, Vic., 3001
PLEASE PASS ON WHEN READ

Vol 28
No 2

Price $2.00
$15 per annum posted Australia

MARCH-APRIL
1992

Registered by Australia Post — Publication No. NBG0721

AUSTRALIA THE LUCKY COUNTRY

How lucky we are to have the "keepers of our health" telling us what is good for us, what we should ingest, and exactly what their chosen compulsory medicine will do for the community.

Since 1963 this Lucky Country has been dictated to by Prime Ministers in Canberra and State Premiers (with the exception of Queensland) guaranteeing to every citizen, that by adding a cumulative poison (fluoride) to our drinking water supplies via the kitchen tap, tooth decay will disappear.

The extent of the stupidity of these people and their cohort health ministers is illustrated in a statement by the Victorian Health Minister, Mr Scanlan, in the Victorian Parliament, 27th November, 1973 (Hansard, page 2583). He said:

> *"The intention (fluoridation) of the Government is to provide that future legislators will have teeth just as the children and the Victorian public will have teeth. If the Government accepted the proposal for a referendum as advanced by the Country Party, the position would be very clear. The legislators of the future, our children, and members of the community would have no teeth."*

That statement by the Victorian Health Minister was made in Parliament supporting the Fluoridation Act, and surely means the Minister and the Health Department think all politicians up to 1977 when Melbourne was fluoridated are toothless and indeed the whole community is toothless.

Fluoridation of Canberra

The Lucky Country experienced the disgraceful manner in which a decision was made to fluoride Canberra. The Commonwealth Parliament 1964 again debated fluoridation for Canberra, and all speakers were against it, but Prime Minister Menzies refused a committee of investigation and closed the debate after delivering a lecture on fluoridation to the Parliament.

On March 17, 1965 the Government was defeated on a motion that a referendum be held; the vote was 56 to 52 against fluoridation in Canberra without a referendum. The debate against fluoridation was led by Mr Jim Killen.

The question was asked, "What is there about fluoridation that brings the Prime Minister into the Parliament to stop the fluoridation debate?" What is there about fluoridation that brings Prime Minister Menzies rushing into Parliament with a prepared list of so-called endorsements and untrue statements to override the "will of the people" expressed by their elected representatives in the Parliament.

Who pulled the strings that activated Prime Minister Menzies in that atrocious act against the will of the Parliament and the will of the people of Australia? What about the grand promises made by our fluoridation politicians? Is this the Lucky Country, and does this luck run parallel with the elected politicians in Parliament on our behalf and our interests?

Their parroted words ran somethings like this:

Fluoridation is safe and effective.
Fluoridation will stop tooth decay.
The dental savings of the community will be enormous.
The dentists will be unemployed.

Examination of these official Government claims reveal some extraordinary facts.

The official Commonwealth of Australia publication, *Australian Health Expenditure Analyses,* September 1983 (100 pages) gives details of Commonwealth Government dental expenses. These have increased from $11 million in 1975/76 to $26 million in 1979/80, an increase of 136 percent.

The overall cost (Government and Private) of dental care throughout Australia increased by 63 percent.

The number of dentists in Australia have increased by over 60 percent since fluoridation was first introduced.

Just where are the promises of the Lucky Country made by our Prime Ministers, State Premiers, the A.D.A., A.M.A., N.H. and M.R.C.?

These costs are compounding year by year, plus the enormous increase in the cost of fluoride chemicals, plants and man hours in the fluoridation empires (mostly hidden from the official records).

Dental decay in school children

The Victorian Federation of State School Parents' Club reported in the Herald 6th December, 1985 that their school children have "dental cavities and unhealthy gums".

How dare parents be so bold as to make such statements about their children when people like Mr Roper, Minister of Health 1983 stated on TV Station BTV 6:

> *"It means that young children in Melbourne and in some towns now (after fluoridation) have very few caries at all — whole Prep Grades in Melbourne Schools now being seen by School Dental Services are not having any problems. They've got no caries."*

In the Melbourne Herald, December 6, 1985 Health Minister Roper said he saw no reason for further investigation into fluoridation, and he did not want "to re-invent the wheel", he also said.

"Fluoridation is supported by both political Parties."

This seems to indicate that scientists are unnecessary and unwanted by Labor and Liberals, because their own Party are the experts and support fluoridation.

Dr Oakley (dentist), Chairman of the A.D.A. Fluoridation Committee said it was rare to see dental decay in children. He also stated:

> *"Reports from dentists are unanimous that young children in age groups which previously suffered badly from dental decay now have perfect teeth."*

The above claims, suggesting all "Prep Grade children" are caries free, were found to be scientifically wrong.

Babies with decayed teeth

Now we start the year 1992 with the announcement from the Melbourne University Professor of Child Dental Health reported in the Age, 18th December, 1991 stating:

> *"Up to 15 Percent of Australian babies have decayed teeth."*

This brings up the question of where the Professor's 15 percent decayed teeth disappear to in the dental lobby that claims young children are free of decay.

You make your own choice of fact and fiction.

Why is it necessary for the State and Federal Governments to spend well over $100 million per year on free Dental School Services?

What is fluoride doing?

Why is it necessary for the Victorian Minister for Health, Mr White to proudly announce, 2nd December, 1985, that his Department had spent an EXTRA $2 million on School Dental Services for the dental treatment of 130,000 school children. Treatment for non-existent tooth decay? **Treatment necessary because of fluoridation?**

In the Lucky Country, maybe parents really do know more than the bureaucratic experts and highly paid politicians. Or is it all a con-job of the first order? Like the question — "Who pulled the strings in 1964 and made Prime Minister Menzies dance to the tune of the fluoridation establishment?"!

One must ask what and where do the strong "ties" come from that manipulate our politicians, our bureaucrats and the political parties? What makes Ministers of the Crown consistently go to such lengths in misleading the Parliaments and the people they represent in matters pertaining to fluoridation?

Complete disregard for "the people" is illustrated in Hansard where so many questions on fluoridation remain undisturbed and unanswered. This alone indicates the quality and honesty of our elected representatives, and their inability to act responsibly on behalf of their electorate.

If these problems were isolated and rare, one may find an excuse, but today it is the norm and a well orchestrated method of selling fluoridation by refusing to debate this evil matter, and finding ways of misleading the people and the Parliament with untruthful claims and statements.

Why do rational men of reasonable balance and character become excited to a degree of hysteria at the mention of fluoridation? Why do these characters play "follow-the-leader" and squirm when exposed to fluoridation questions, and in such silly childish and unprofessional way answer criticisms of fluoridation by saying "it's Party policy"?

If that is the criteria for a serious physiological and human rights problem, then we urgently need a change to intelligence, honesty and principle in place of the present idiotic and unreasonable Party policy ideology based on questionable sources.

THE QUESTION OF:
W.H.O. SAFETY CLAIMS OF FLUORIDES

One example is the final paragraph in the World Health Organisation (W.H.O.) book "Appropriate use of fluorides for human health" by World Health Organisation 1986.

Pages 124-125:

> *"This repeated emphasis by W.H.O. on community water fluoridation and in other methods of using fluorides to prevent dental disease (fluoridated toothpaste and other fluoride treatments) is an indication that there is not, and never has been, any question about desirable health policy in this area."*

"NO DESIRABLE HEALTH POLICY IN THIS AREA"?

From 1958 to 1986 much fluoridated water has passed under the W.H.O. "Bridge of Fluoridation Propaganda", since they published the above unsubstantiated fluoride statement in 1986, but W.H.O. is the "untouchable" in fluoridation and fluoride promotion and propaganda within the whole fluoride lobby.

"W.H.O. is duty bound to give immediate urgent warnings about the dangers of fluoride chemicals . . ."

W.H.O. through its extensive world-wide mailing list is duty bound to give immediate urgent warnings about the dangers of fluoride chemicals used in not only drinking water supplies, but also in toothpaste and other fluoride treatments, and report current reduction of this particular poison in these products.

This is the kind of action one expects from an international health organisation, especially one that dispatches its fluoridation literature to almost every country in the world, misleading those in authority that fluorides and fluoridation is safe.

Instead of promoting fluorides, W.H.O. should with the evidence available, recommend to every nation that children are at risk by the ingestion of this poison, and each and every country remove fluoridation from children's lives.

Of special urgency, warnings must be made about the poisoning of babies from formula foods made up from fluoridated water. (Australian Fluoridation News November/December 1991, NH & MRC Report March 1991).

Here's your great opportunity W.H.O.; let's see how or if you handle it in a professional and scientific manner, and publicly warn the world countries and their people especially mothers with young children.

THE FLUORIDATION STAKES
PRIZE — CREDIBILITY AND HONESTY

To:

The Prime Minister of Australia
The Commonwealth Government Health Minister
The N.H. and M.R.C.
The Commonwealth Health Department
The Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania
The Chief Ministers of Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory (Canberra Legislative Assembly)
The A.M.A.
The A.D.A.
The Australian Fluoridation Bureaucratic Empire
Professors of Medicine, Dentistry and Toxicology in all Australian Universities
The Pharmaceutical Society of Australia
All doctors and dentists.

We invite you collectively or individually to submit on behalf of the Australian people to this publication, where it will be printed —

A CLINICAL STUDY, PRINTED IN A SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL, PROVING THAT FLUORIDE AND SOLELY FLUORIDE, STOPS TOOTH DECAY IN CHILDREN.

Your credibility rests on producing such a scientific study.

No answers have been received from the Prime Minister of Australia, and the President of the United States as to why all Australian and United States Defence Personnel in Defence Camps all over the world by draconian law, must drink only fluoridated water in their Defence establishments. (*Australian Fluoridation News*, Sept-Oct 1990).

Vol. 20, no. 2, p. 2

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The *Herald Sun*, 19th August, 1991 published an article "Fluoride Fights Old Foes" by "Michelangelo Rucci in New York".

Australian people would appreciate the U.S. President banning the export of such distorted fluoridation sales promotion to Australia, especially as the article is scientifically misleading and the message quite dangerous.

If we are to have proper scientific debate, let it be to a reasonable scientific standard. This is important and necessary when dealing with the health of the people, be it Australia or the U.S.A.

Two Australian papers published the article in question. A letter of ours in reply was sent to *The Mercury* newspaper, Hobart, Tasmania but was not published, even though it pointed out the dangerous fluoridation misinformation.

The U.S. article stated —

> *"The latest tests (the National Toxicology Program) shows there is no need to worry that the next drink you take from the kitchen tap could lead to cancer."*
>
> *"Only 4 of the 130 male rats tested with large doses of fluoride in their drinking water developed a rare form of cancer, osteosaroma". (the expert could not even spell the name correctly "osteosarcoma").*
>
> *To receive the same dose as the rats which contracted cancer, a person would have to drink 80,000 (eighty thousand) litres a day.*
>
> *Critics suggested that the rats developed cancer because of the toxic levels of fluoride they received, not from the fluoride itself."* (An example of clear thinking!)

FACTS

The rats were dosed with 11, 45, 79, ppm fluoride (F) in their drinking water. This was the original agreement between the U.S. Congressional Committee of Inquiry into the Fluoride-Cancer Link and the National Cancer Institute 1977.

However, the statement that a human would have to drink 80,000 litres of water (fluoridated) to ingest the same daily dosage given the rats, is not only farcical and ignorant in the extreme, it is totally dishonest material to present in Australian newspapers.

The use of fluoride in treating bones produces more fractures.

As one litre of fluoridated water contains 1 mg fluoride, or 1 ppm, it simply follows that 80,000 litres of fluoridated water contains 80,000 milligrams fluoride (F), or 80 grams, which will kill 80 people with that amount of fluoride in one dose.

It would seem the author already has been affected with fluoride and the dangerous incorrect data, a mistake of 7,000 times at 11 ppm, 1800 times at 45 ppm, and 1000 times at 79 ppm.

Not content with such fluoride nonsense, although excellent enough for Australian newspapers, the report says "the rats did not develop cancer from the fluoride itself, but from the toxic levels of fluoride"!!!!

Australians find it difficult to understand fluoridation experts and their science from the home of fluoridation in the U.S.A. and as the health of the Australian population depends on honest proper science, proper honest medical knowledge free from such dangerous propaganda, it behoves every citizen and their political representatives to protect us from this type of imported fluoridation promotion.

Failure of fluoride treatment for osteoporosis

The U.S. author went on to suggest "bones may also benefit from fluoride which may reduce the risk of osteoporosis . . ."

That is fluoridation propaganda garbage.

The use of fluoride in treating bones produced more fractures, and is no longer used by responsible doctors in such therapy, although thousands of women are still suffering from that dangerous and wrongly prescribed use of fluorides by medical doctors.

Current studies the world over show more hip fractures in fluoridated cities that non-fluoridated areas which questions what these people are up to in their reporting on fluoridation.

For those interested in our factual statement on the dangers and failure of fluoride treatment for osteoporosis, the following references from world leading medical and scientific journals support our claim.

> *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, December 1986 Somers et al.; Journal of Bone and Mineral Research Vol. 4, No. 2 1989; New England Medical Journal Mayo Clinic, Lawrence Riggs et al; A.A.P. 22nd March, 1990, "Fluoride shown not to be effective or safe for Osteoporosis"; J.A.M.A., July 25, 1990, "Regional Variation in Incidence of Hip Fractures"; Jacobsen et al; The New England Journal of Medicine, Vol. 322, No. 12, "Fluoride and Bone — Quantity versus Quality"; New England Journal of Medicine, Vol. 322, No. 12 page 845 — "The inescapable conclusion from this study is that sodium fluoride in the dosage used is not an effective or safe treatment for post-menopausal osteoporosis". Prevention, Medical World News, November 13, 1981, "F.D.A. Committee spurns fluoride."*

Where is the world going in science and freedom of the press?

The above are a few documented research papers explaining the dangerous and erroneous treatment given to thousands of women around the world. This treatment was introduced as a prop to the fading public acceptance of fluoridation, hoping that "if fluoride is so good in healing osteoporosis, it must be wonderful in drinking water supplies".

Science and freedom of the press

But that dangerous whim of the medical fluoride lobby was not scientifically sound, and its exposure is the forerunner of other medical and dental fluoride whims that will also be found medically and scientifically unsupportable.

Where is the world going in science and freedom of the press? A slur is promoted on those opposing compulsory ingestion of chemical fluorides, and as the U.S. author pointed out it was "ONLY four of the 130 male rats . . . developed cancer."

Australians become quite concerned when four of 130 rats develop cancer; transmitted into simple language, in every 130 people, four may also develop cancer.

The U.S. author failed to report that most of the rats and mice in the test also developed other symptoms of disease.

However, the U.S. author failed to report that most of the rats and mice in the tests also developed other symptoms of diseases, most of which are recorded in the data but were hidden in the Government Report and have since been identified by independent researchers.

The matter is too serious to gloss over, and we really can do without this kind of fluoridation promotion being imported into Australia and published, without recourse of any kind in daily newspapers.

Anti-Fluoridation letters and articles submitted to Australian daily newspapers still rate less than 1% accepted for publication, but unlimited space is given to the above kind of propaganda!

Vol. 20, no. 2, p. 3

FLUORIDE WARNING

The Commonwealth Government and all State Governments are aware that the National Health and Medical Research Council Report 1991 makes clear warning about the overdosing of children with fluoride from toothpaste, and most importantly baby formula food made up from fluoridated water. (*Australian Fluoridation News*, November/December 1991).

We are advised by the Government that children's toothpaste has now been made available with 50 percent reduction in fluoride content. No action has been taken on the high fluoride baby formula food.

Childrens toothpaste has now been made available with 50 percent reduction in fluoride content.

What a sour note for those dentists, doctors and politicians who over the years have dogmatically stated fluoridation and fluorides are perfectly safe, and no person young or old has ever been harmed, indeed many have gone so far as to claim fluorides have a very wide range of safety. (Canberra Water Supply reduced 50 percent fluoride, new toothpaste reduced 50 percent).

Now they are forced to admit their past ignorance and deceit because they were told about fluoride toxicity which was not scientifically assessed by them in the past, but based on the "fluoride parrot syndrome".

Public statements can only make fools out of their past silly fluoride and fluoridation claims.

Questions to governments have been asked relating to why no Public Notices have been put through the media advising and warning parents about the past overdosing of their children with poisonous fluoride chemicals in toothpaste, fluoride tablets, fluoride medication and in particular baby formula foods.

Millions of dollars are spent by the Victorian Government on media, especially TV advertisements, but the publishing of anything to do with the "F" word is officially "taboo". Never mind the damage to our children, the protection of fluoridation and fluorides together with their endorsers is much more important.

The Lucky Country with such "caring and honest" politicians.

Is there a baby in your family ingesting formula food with fluoridated water?

A FLUORIDATION QUOTE TO START 1992

"Toothpaste is usually spat out and not swallowed. However, young children do swallow toothpaste."

(Dental Health Services Victoria, November 6, 1991 also Minister of Health 30 December 1991).

THE FLUORIDE MOCKERY

Fluoridation is a mockery of science.

Fluoridation is a mockery of medical professionalism and ethics.

Fluoridation is a mockery of democracy and political representation of the people.

Fluoridation is a mockery of University Dental and Medical teaching.

Fluoridation is a mockery of all political responsibility in respecting the "will of the people", and the Australian Constitution.

Fluoridation is a mockery of human honesty in high places.

But the greatest mockery of all is the lack of "care" by the Australian people for their children and the future health of the country.

Silence is NOT a virtue!

MORE DENTISTS IN THE DOCK

Parents Sue Over Fluoride Children

The *Mail on Sunday (U.K.)* 24th November, 1991 gave details by their Medical Correspondent, Lorraine Fraser, that Midlands parents of two young girls have legal aid to Court Action for fluoride damage to their children's teeth.

They say:

"The girls' teeth have been damaged because they ingested too much fluoride",

all without proper warnings of the dangers of fluoride ingestion.

They also state in The Mail:

"Dentists agree too much fluoride can severely disfigure the enamel on teeth."

They also suggested that more families will be taking similar court action.

IT'S HAPPENED AGAIN

Tasmanian farm animals poisoned with fluoride emission from aluminium smelter.

The Tasmanian press announced in November 1991 that cattle in a farm near Bell Bay Comalco Aluminium Smelter had elevated levels of fluoride.

This fluoride problem was confirmed by the Comalco general manager.

Although all relative Tasmanian Government Departments are involved with this "discovery" no real public statement has been made. No details are made available, even the name of the farm owner is restricted, but information obtained elsewhere suggested the farmer was compensated with a secret clause of no public statement.

More to follow.

INFORMATION GUIDE

FOR THOSE WHO WISH TO OBTAIN FURTHER INFORMATION OR WHO WISH TO JOIN IN THE BATTLE FOR PRESERVATION OF PERSONAL LIBERTY

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

- Australia (excluding Victoria) and overseas:— Box C9 Clarence Street, Sydney NSW 2000 — $15 per annum
- Victoria:— See Anti-Fluoridation Association of Victoria Membership Form which includes Australian Fluoridation News Subscriptions.

NEW SOUTH WALES: Safe Water Association of N.S.W., Box No. C9, P.O. Clarence Street, Sydney 2000

NORTH COAST, NSW: J. Gow, 27 Beach Ave., Sth Golden Beach, New Brighton 2483

VICTORIA: ANTI-FLUORIDATION ASSN. OF VIC., P.O. Box 935G G.P.O. Melbourne 3001. G.S.R. Walker, 4A Manor Street, Brighton Victoria, 3186

QUEENSLAND: ANTI-FLUORIDATION ASSOCIATION (Brisbane), Colin A. Phillips, Curators Residence, Griffith University, Nathan, Qld, 4111

TASMANIA: Mr. J. Crawford, 71 View Road, Burnie, Tasmania 7320. Phone: 313 617.

NEW ZEALAND: Nw Zealand Pure Water Association, P.O. Box 3070, Tauranga, New Zealand.

A.C.T.: ACT Pure Water Association, Jim Arnold, P.O. Box 741, Jamison, ACT 2614

ANTI-FLUORIDATION ASSOCIATION OF VICTORIA
BOX 935G G.P.O. MELBOURNE, 3001
NEW MEMBERSHIP/RENEWAL FORM

I enclose:
full membership — $15.00 per annum $.....

Student & Pensioners — $10.00 per annum ...$.....

Donation for Fighting Fund $.....

TOTAL $.....

NAME (Please print) .....

ADDRESS (Print).....

.....

.....

Printed by Allans (Printing) Pty Ltd, 70 Mary Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010

Vol. 2?, no. 2, p. 4