


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 43
No.4

Price \$5.00
\$25 per annum posted Australia

July-August
2007

Print Post Approval
PP331.985 00013
ISSN 1445-2847

IS THERE A CASE OF GOVERNMENT FRAUD?

By Glen S.R. Walker

Campaigning without question, the Australian States and Federal Parliaments are daily promoting compulsory fluoridation as a safe and particularly effective mass medication process that stops dental decay.

Communities throughout Australia are being ordered to fluoridate their drinking water supplies otherwise official punitive penalties by acts of Parliament will be imposed.

Booklets and data sheets are in abundance, even distributed to every house in unfluoridated places all regurgitating, parroting and guaranteeing the old cast-off worn-out propaganda that: just add fluoride to your drinking water supplies and in the hoax of conjurers, heypresto! No more dental decay and no further requirement of dentists.

Claims about fluoridation irrespective of their origin are for the simple-minded, naive, "follow the leader" population who do not understand that those claims do not require any evidence of proof, and with your safety ignored.

THE Daily Telegraph

29th JUNE, 2007

TOOTHACHE REVEALED: 200,000 on NSW dental waiting list

"More than 45,000 are children living with tooth decay and oral disease so severe it could turn life-threatening.

Exclusive waiting figures obtained by The Daily Telegraph show for the first time our decaying dental health industry.

This is the first time in three years the data has been revealed and it shows on May 31 there were 178,876 waiting in NSW for dentistry, including 45,339 children. At one Sydney hospital almost 60 patients were treated for dental infections so severe their airways were closed off.

The growing list reveals a country in crisis.

The Daily Telegraph understands up to 60 patients have been treated at Westmead Hospital this year with dental infections so severe their airways became closed.

Despite 650,000 Australians awaiting dental treatment, only 4027 in NSW have accessed the scheme in three years."

AND THEY DRINK FLUORIDATED WATER!

That is N.S.W. alone and follows the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Labor Party making their election budget promise to the people of Australia 2004 that each will plan \$500,000,000 to help 400,000 Australian people suffering dental diseases and having to wait up to five years for treatment.

To this day since dental decay became an Australia-wide epidemic (Prime Minister 1st January, 2007) the reason for the devastating position of community dental health has been hidden from the people.

The reason for the devastating position of community health has been hidden from the people.

The first original research study into the actual effects of fluoridation was by Dr. Philip R.N. Sutton, Doctor of Dental Science, Melbourne University, published in his book, "Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials 1959".

Sutton's study was on the original, first ever fluoridation plant in U.S.A., 1945, and his conclusions remain unchallenged today, as seen by the state of Australian dental health as perfect evidence of utter failure of fluoridating the Australian population.

Sutton published five books on fluoridation and he really left a legacy in his final book 1996 titled: "The Greatest Fraud, Fluoridation".

Reading Government Hansard Reports one immediately sees the fluoridation hoax theme pronounced throughout the non-existing real debate and on which totalitarian laws were

established compelling the Australian population to adhere, "or else", and punitive laws against any Council refusing to fluoridate or trying to close fluoridation plants, even though their community instructed the Council not to fluoridate and giving absolute legal and scientific reasons.

However, underlining all the so-claimed scientific, medical, dental, legal parliamentary and constitutional expertness and their democratic responsibilities, they documented the greatest endorsement for fluoridation and anyone in the House with differing views was collectively attacked with the original dental slogans.

The Minister of Health was forced to admit that none of the organisations promoting fluoridation had ever produced or performed an original study on fluoridation.

Hansard

It was discovered in the Victorian Parliamentary debate that the base on which they daily preached the wonders of fluoridation was the naming of organizations, local and international. To the public this seemed obvious proof of their claims until the Minister of Health was forced to admit that NONE of those named had ever produced or performed an original study on the subject of fluoridation. (Hansard.)

It was all a process of, He said, They said, Dean said, Tom said, (see page iii "*Fluoridation - Poison on Tap*" (POT) but their pronouncements were identical Parrot Prattle (POT p.iv).

The greatest lasting conclusion by the Governments were statements of immense interest both health wise and financial costs. They formed an Australian wide health conception that once children in particular drank fluoridated water not only would there be no more dental decay BUT dentists would never be needed (Hansard).

The great health utopia had arrived and dentists were acknowledged in Federal Parliament for forfeiting their livelihood as a principle of great perception of sacrifice to the Australian people. But since the commencement of

fluoridation dentists income has steadily increased to now be amongst the highest paid professionals.

The Australian dental decay epidemic has been caused by the failure of fluoridation and the failure of naive ignorant politicians.

From the chimney tops of Parliament throughout Australia the cry is going out today to the public that the cause of the dental epidemic is the lack of dentists and we challenge any newspaper to come out with the real story of this disgusting health hoax.

In the words of Dr. Philip Sutton D.D.Sc., a dental doctor by proper academic qualifications, Melbourne University, quite different from most Australian dentists who call themselves Doctor with no such qualifying academic education.

Philip Sutton stated:

"Fluoridation is a failed medical concept."

The Australian Institution of Health and Welfare Report on Fluoridation 2007 stated:

"In general about 25% of Australian adults have untreated decay.

About one in five Australian adults have moderate to severe forms of gum disease."

A total of 6.5 million Australians with dental problems

The proof or otherwise of the effectiveness of artificial fluoridation is contained in those data from the Institute of Health:

One in five	=	3 million Australians
25%	=	3.5 million Australians
Total	=	6.5 million Australians with dental problems.

The waiting time for these 6.5 million Australians ranges from 2-5 years, a product of fluoridation and the only Government reason is we need more dentists - but that claim is made in the same place where the claim was made that in the future, dentists would not be needed.

No Choice for *CHOICE* Readers

By John T. Webber

The consumer magazine "Choice" promotes itself with details in "about Choice" which include:-

- "No bias . . . just reliable expert advice."
- "All the products we put through full testing . . ."
- "There are no hidden agendas and our recommendations are completely impartial . . ."
- We lobby on behalf of consumers to promote your rights . . ."

Despite these assurances, Choice published an article in March 2007, mainly promoting artificial fluoridation, under the heading "*The evidence for fluoridation*".

The article was not "put through full testing", but was "a round-up of the latest research . . ."

On the 27th February 2007, in the news media including **The Age**, Melbourne, Choice supported the lobby group The Australian Beverage Council, in its campaign to overturn the current ban and allow the addition of artificial fluorides to bottled water.

The spokesman for the lobby group, Mr Tony Gentile, in evidence to the NSW Legislative Council Standing

Committee on Social Issues Inquiry into Dental Services, (Report 37, March 2006, page 166) in answer to the question whether fluoride should be added to bottled water, stated:

"Compulsorily? Absolutely not! . . . Because some people do not want it . . . The people who do not want to consume fluoride at the moment, from Sydney tap water, have a choice. They can either distil their water at home and get rid of it through a filter, or they can buy bottled water . . . We are opposed to compulsory addition of anything to our beverages, because we do not believe that our beverages should be used as medicine. They are refreshment beverages."

The July 2007 issue of **Choice**, in an article "*Nothing to smile about - something's rotten in the state of Australia's health - our teeth*", also reports on the dismal state of dental health in Australians (despite near universal artificial fluoridation for decades for most Australians).

Choice also admits that it is a member of the *National Oral Health Alliance*,

"an advocacy group comprising various community and

welfare organizations, and dental and other health professionals.”

So now we know how *Choice* gets its “no bias . . . just reliable, expert advice” from - dentists, the promoters of artificial fluoridation!

So much for its “full testing” of products and “no hidden agendas”.

Choice is not “lobbying on behalf” of the majority of consumers, if the result of referenda on whether fluoride should be added to water supplies are considered - the latest at Tenterfield, NSW, with a “seven to one” vote against adding fluoride to the water supply. (*Australian Fluoridation*

News, Vol 42, No 3, May-June 2006)

The Safe Water Association of NSW (SWAN) wrote to *Choice*, on 28th February and pointed out the above statement by Mr Gentile, as well as the dental decay crisis in Sydney, in spite of **nearly 40 years** of artificial fluoridation.

The letter from SWAN suggested that in the future *Choice* consult associations such as SWAN prior to publishing future articles.

Choice did not consult with SWAN or, as far as we are aware, with any other organisations opposing artificial fluoridation before its article in July. - Editor

THE BLIND SCIENCE

There's none so blind as those who will not see.

By Glen S.R. Walker

Do politicians read newspapers? Do Prime Ministers, Ministers of Health, members of A.D.A., A.M.A., N.H.M.R.C. read newspapers? People all over Australia do read newspapers. What do they all have in common?

None of them seem to care about such a serious health problem and what really caused it to happen. The population of Australia should be ashamed! - and the media still torment all and sundry with another day's news of failed fluoridation.

30-6-07



Politicians argue as patient forced to pull out their own teeth

Tooth truth hurts



“LABOR WANTS TO PUT BITE INTO DENTAL CARE” (*Sun Herald July 1, 2007*)

“Kevin Rudd’s Labor Party will spend up to \$500 million over four years to fix the teeth of Australians too poor to go to the dentist.

Figures obtained by the **Sunday Herald Sun** reveal that about 140,000 Victorians are still waiting for basic dental care and dentures, often for up to two years.

Mr Rudd has promised to restore the Commonwealth Dental Scheme, which provided care for low-income people and pensioners.

Most Australians lost access to public dental care after the Howard Government scrapped the scheme in 1996.

Since July 2004, 1523 Victorians have been treated by the scaled back federal system - and 7000 across the country.

The Howard Government outlaid an additional \$377 million in the May Budget to improve dental care.

About 650,000 Australians are on waiting lists.

Labor’s health spokeswoman, Nicola Roxon, said yesterday Mr Howard’s decision to tip some money into a failing program was unlikely to help.” — Lincoln Wright

Kevin Rudd says he will spend (our money) up to \$500 million over 4 years to fix the teeth of Australians ‘too poor’ to go to a dentist.

A dishonest cover up of the failure of fluoridation in today’s dental health debacle.

He should know that his party all over Australia voted for compulsory artificial fluoridation because —

Fluoridation - Victorian Labor Party, Booklet titled - “Water fluoridation helps protect teeth throughout life”. Quotation from pages 2 and 4:

*“Water fluoridation helps protect against decay in people of all ages, from very young to the elderly. Fluoridation . . . allows **everybody** to benefit, regardless of age, education or **income level.**”*

Maybe some people still believe Prime Minister Hawke’s statement in 1987 that, “By 1990, no Australian child will be living in poverty.” If so, Kevin Rudd’s predecessor cancels out Rudd’s statement of, “too poor to go to a dentist.”

The effort, time, manpower, cost to the public is an exercise in futility with spin doctors attempting to cover up the past, similar to Hawke’s claim on “poverty children”, but in this instance the dishonest cover up relates to today’s dental health debacle having been discovered.

All political parties throughout Australia have voted unanimously to force fluoridation onto the population because they claimed (without scientific proof) this is the end of dental decay and the need for dentists, fluoridated water is the utopia of medical science.

One exciting claim by both Liberal and Labor is that fluoridation is especially directed towards disadvantaged children who will automatically get dental decay protection from their fluoridated drinking water delivered directly to their home by compulsion!

The Parliaments and politicians have this 50 year fluoridation question which in its heydays of presentation into Parliaments and members posturing as scientists of medical, dental and pharmacy experts.

One politician expressed, it seems, the opinion of all present:

"This is one time when honourable members can stand up and look like a Parliament."

The most interesting position of fluoridation is that when the Parliaments voted on their Fluoridation Bill there was no discord between the members and opposite parties, only rejoicing in unison.

The only other time such a vote in unison is when politicians vote for a wage increase for their positions.

Once again we warn everyone about fluoride false prophets.

Such as the present theme song of the Dental Association. "We need more dentists."

In conclusion, the enormous scientific nonsensical ballyhoo printed in the Victorian Government's booklet, page 14, on fluoridation 2007 stated:

"Water fluoridation has been endorsed by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as one of the ten greatest public health achievements of the 20th century."

Now there is a statement! It's like barracking for a football team from the one-eye stand.

Just imagine or please consider fluoridation, one of the claimed **"ten greatest health achievements of the Century"** is only used by 4% of the world population, and the 96% of world population not using this dictatorial process include all European scientifically advanced countries, also China, Russia, Japan etc. etc.

Fluoridation is not built on sand, its foundation is "in the paddocks speaking to the cows", to borrow the phrase from Sir James Killen.

"Toddler dental disgrace"

"■ Preschooler tooth extraction surge ■ Hidden sugar blamed"

The above heading in the Melbourne Age, 1st July 2007, is another example of the failure of artificial fluoridation of public water supplies after decades of adding industrial fluoride waste to community water supplies.

The Age article continued:-

"Thousands of Victorian preschoolers and toddlers - some as young as two - are undergoing radical dental surgery under general anaesthetic to remove several and sometimes all of their baby teeth."

"The oral health of Victoria's preschoolers is so poor that Dental Health Services Victoria says the average six-year-old starts school with three to four teeth decayed, missing or needing filling."

"Hidden sugar in food and drink is the main culprit, oral health experts say."

"Of the 11,607 children aged six and under treated at the Royal Dental Hospital in the 11 months to June, 770 had a general anaesthetic before undergoing complex dental surgery."

"Of those "a very significant proportion" had all their teeth pulled out, a spokeswoman said."

"These figures do not include the thousands of Victorian children who receive dental care under the private system, which does not collate dental figures."

"A recent Sunday Age investigation revealed the sugar content of many standard grocery items has increased over the years despite marketers' claims of health and nutrition benefits."

"Consumers are being hoodwinked by misleading health claims," said Fiona Preston, the Dental manager of health promotion."

"Dental health statistics reveal that 42 per cent of six-year-olds treated by the School Dental Service in 2006 had at least one tooth missing, a tooth requiring filling or one so badly decayed it had to be extracted."

"Among 12-year-olds the figure was even higher, with 58 per cent having at least one tooth that had to be filled or removed."

"Dental Health Services Victoria's clinical director Dr Hanny Calache said there had been a noticeable increase in pediatric dental caries in the past two to

three years, and the main cause was the frequency and timing of sugar consumption, especially of sweetened drinks such as cordial, fruit juice and soft drinks."

"We are seeing increased rates of oral disease despite fluoride in the water and better education,"
Fiona Preston said.

42% of 6 year olds treated by the School Dental Service in 2006 with at least one tooth missing or that had to be removed or filled - despite fluoride in the water and better education.

Having comprehensively debunked the myth that artificial fluoridation radically reduces dental decay by documenting the dental crisis in the children which fluoridation was promoted to overcome, she then stated:

"But confusing nutritional messages on packaging, misleading marketing and the use of bottled water over fluoridated tap water are adding to the crisis."

The 550 million litres of bottled water used in Australia each year is less than 4% of the 2 litres of water per person recommended per person per day, so even if fluoridated water was beneficial to dental health, the impact of drinking artificially fluoridated water 96% of the time instead of 100% is negligible, compared to the extent of the documented dental decay crisis in children.

The Age Editorial on 1st July 2007 included the statement:

"These are serious health issues that need urgent attention from governments, food manufacturers and the public so that we all know what we're putting in our mouths, and we can make informed choices about our diet."

But don't hold your breath for governments to give the public the facts about the toxic nature of the fluoride waste chemicals which our governments add to water supplies, contrary to the wishes of the public.

Fluoridation Failed - Evidence Ignored for 60 Years

An example of the success of salesmanship over facts is illustrated by data documented by H.V. Smith in his paper *The Chemistry of Fluorine as Relates to Fluorosis*, published in 1962 in *Fluorine and Dental Health in McKay, F.S.: Mottled Enamel: Early History and Its Unique Features*, in F.R. Moulton, Ed.

An outright warning on the possible dangers of artificial fluoridation was given by H.V. Smith, who had made extensive studies on endemic fluorosis in southern Arizona, U.S.A.

"If extremely rigid control of the fluorine ingested could be had, if absolute control is not maintained or if an individual secures some fluorine from water, an additional amount from food, and still more from spray residues, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the toxic limit may be exceeded, when mottled enamel (of teeth) would result."

Smith also questioned the alleged benefits of fluoridation beyond the age of 12 years. In St. David, Arizona, where the water was naturally fluoridated (contaminated) at 1.6 to 4 ppm, he had found among 12 to 40 years old residents that:

"More than seventy percent of the individuals over 24 years of age had lost some teeth by extraction and after unsuccessful attempts at repair. Fifty percent of all individuals over 24 years of age had lost all of their teeth and now wear plates."

He emphatically added:

"In St. David, fluorine has not eliminated caries."

In collaborative work with M.C. Smith (his wife) and Isaac Schour of Chicago on experimental work with dental

fluorosis, they reported:

"Any plan to build caries-resistance into teeth by addition of fluorides to public water supplies as a public health procedure is extremely hazardous. The range between toxic and non-toxic levels of fluorine is of such small order as to make even the continuous use of fluoride dentifrices a probable danger."

The above 1942 publication by McKay also reported evidence of dental fluorosis by scientists from other countries.

R. Weaver found 21.2% mottling in South Shields, England (contaminated with 1.4 ppm fluorine), compared to the less contaminated North Shields, with under 1% mottling of teeth, (contaminated with less than 0.25 ppm fluorine).

B.G. Bibby of the Dental School, University of Rochester, New York advised that:

"There is no reason to believe that fluorine therapy alone can produce a tooth which will resist decay regardless of the strength of the attack. It would therefore be unwise in our enthusiasm over the possibilities of fluorine therapy to lose sight of the necessity of continuing to seek improved methods of weakening the power of caries attacks."

The above details are extracted from *Fluoridation the Great Dilemma* by George L. Waldbott, M.D., internationally known authority on environmental diseases. He was the first to advocate an emergency lifesaving treatment for asthma patients; he reported the first sudden anaphylactic fatality from penicillin; the first description of a lung disease which lead to emphysema caused by smoking. He drew attention to the significance of the thymus glands in allergies. He was the world's leading medical expert on the clinical aspects of chronic fluoride toxicity and an authority on the health effects of environmental contaminants. (Editor)

Profits, Power and Corruption

Human economics and greed are a product of dollar profits, selfish, indeed dishonest approval of fraudulent actions, which are never in the true interests of the human race.

Quislings entering our culture and our health economics, with little power of opposition from those responsible to honestly serve the people in their lawful and constitutional privileged positions of trust.

They are able, even without constitutional opposition, to change the established structure of science, change poisons into toiletries (NH&MRC), change the most toxic fluoride chemicals into needed nutrients for human health and, without opposition, they endorse and sponsor such policies quite openly within the community.

They are the modern untouchables!

Those conquerors of Science and Truth will decide the future drug policies, usage, conscription and trading in the country. We are at the crossroads of tyranny or democracy. That situation draws attention to a very old warning of **"Divided we fall"** and those establishing splinter groups should pause and consider it accordingly.

The final chapter of our diminishing democratic constitution with honesty removed. **"All quiet on the Canberra Front"**.

The above is a possibility unless we disentangle ourselves from today's drug economics that overrides everything from

politics to human care.

The final steps of correction and hope are ultimately signposted to our Federal Parliament in Canberra, and in a secondary but important manner, State Parliaments, but without courage, honesty and endeavour, these steps will again falter into a permanent motionless abyss of human rights destruction.

Conquerors of Science and Truth - Official Decision Makers.

Perhaps the answer is particularly simple if viewed in an objective and honest manner, difficult in today's culture but still possible.

We desperately need an Accountability Control Law on all sections of our population, often documented in English speaking countries:

"Even the King is subject to Law, together with every member of our country, irrespective of 'important positions of trust'."

The official decision making on fluorides and fluoridation has been likened to legality, synonymous with electing juries from jail to decide criminal cases.

He who "pays the Piper calls the Tune". (Old proverb)

TOOTH-TRUTH

Fluoridation Truth Outlawed

By Glen S.R. Walker

Medical and Dental science has been taken over with unsubstantiated dental slogans fed to and accepted by politicians and Parliaments throughout Australia together with the dental industry in general.

To a disgusting extent, ad nauseum, the guaranteed cry of fluoridation professionals fanatics is simply a conjured up misleading claim that "Fluoridation has stopped dental decay."

This also was the guarantee of each State Parliament of Australia and the Federal Parliament joining in the dental claims, all without any scientific, medical or dental documented proof published in refereed scientific journals.

The rort of fluoridation is commercial from its beginning, all based on flummoxed fraudulent science, which has been admitted and corrected in documentary evidence but unheeded by those engulfed in the great rort.

At this present time 2007, the State Governments of Australia are parroting the old worn-out original claims that fluoridation "has" stopped dental decay throughout Australia.

Somebody is telling a dangerous public lie!

This lie disease has been permeating throughout the life of fluoridation presentation and promotion.

There is something intellectually dishonest in the absolute claims made on behalf of the Australian people.

If one cares to read the Parliament Hansard Reports from each State Parliament when introducing their Fluoridation Act, it will become clear to the reader there is something intellectually dishonest in the absolute claims made on behalf of the Australian people.

The emphasis in each Parliament was that fluoridation of drinking water supplies will improve children's dental decay rates by at least 60 percent and the need for dentists will decrease accordingly, but their publicity on fluoridation is a litany of scientific and medical errors.

The rort became a reality with some people as seen in Federal Parliament when Dr. Blewett, Minister for Health, October 1989 stated:

"Since fluoridation was introduced, Australian dental health record has changed from one of the worst in the world to one of the best, a recent Australian study has shown that decay rates in 12 year-olds decreased by 84% in 20 years since 1962."

In the same Parliament at the same time, statements of great appreciation were extended to the Dentists of Australia for unselfishly giving up their livelihood by supporting fluoridation, the results so staggeringly great it was obvious the days of dentists were over.

Fluoride Consumption Unknown

Now let us look at these claims, made with hand on heart, firstly that fluoridation improves children's teeth by 60% even though the N.S.W. Minister of Health claimed 90%.

The N.H.M.R.C. book, "The Effectiveness of Water Fluoridation" stated, page 8, "Fluoridation appears to reduce the risk of caries by approximately 20-30 percent."

Then on page 101, the N.H.M.R.C. stated the actual truth about fluoridation claims:

"Human data are clearly more relevant than animal data, but the uncontrolled nature and variability of human exposures and poor quantitative definition of actual levels of exposure usually place severe limitations on their interpretation."

So they do not know how much fluoride is consumed by any person. Medicine at its worst!

The N.H.M.R.C. page 141 state:

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

So the whole medical, pharmaceutical "expertise" is a convoluted heap of dangerous scientific nonsense that fails their obligation to protect the health of the people.

Politicians with similar obligations as doctors to protect the health of the people ignore compulsory dosing the people with an unlicensed and unregistered toxic drug with dose unknown.

How can politicians cloistered in Parliament with similar obligations as doctors to protect the health of the people and yet ignore the real position of compulsorily dosing the people with an **unlicensed and unregistered** toxic drug with dose unknown?

The frightening simplicity is the N.H.M.R.C. statement page 147:

"Our concern is that fluoride at raised levels of intake may have adverse effects on health. The other is that water fluoridation encroaches upon civil liberties, since it entails an involuntary exposure."

Would the Australian Federal Government with its medical groups allow a Pharmaceutical Company to introduce a drug that has no known dose, where adverse effects on the consumer are unknown, and make public advertisements all over Australia making similar claims as those promoting fluoridation.

The N.H.M.R.C. continued their fluoridation fairy tooth stories. On page 148, they state:

"It is estimated (not good standard science) to confer an approximate (still poor science) 20-40 Percent reduction in contemporary Western populations including Australia. This estimate is inherently imprecise in part (which part) because of the limited data available, the reduction in caries in permanent teeth in

children is likely to be towards the **lower end of that range.**"

The above quotations are from the most senior medical group whose main position is the highest advisory institution in Australia to officially advise the Federal Parliament on Health matters, but it seems communications have faltered or been ignored.

Let us return to the beginning of this article where Governments are claiming fluoridation stops dental decay.

The Fluoridation Lie and Prime Minister's Confusion

The question was, who is telling a fluoridation lie?

At the same time as the N.H.M.R.C. was publishing the above data, all Australian State Governments through their Health Departments were publishing their claims contrary to the N.H.M.R.C. and claiming fluoridation was scientifically proven safe and effective, and stopping tooth decay, none of which is true.

As late as 1st January, 2007, the Prime Minister, John Howard, in his New Year message to the Australian people said:

"Dental decay has become an Australian epidemic."

However, the Prime Minister got fluoridation facts mixed up when he also advised parents to make their children drink a glass of fluoridated water every day, and went on to say that since fluoridation, dental decay had reduced considerably.

What hope has the Australian population with this mixed-up contradiction on fluoridation?

The Prime Minister gets his first statement correct - Yes, dental decay is in epidemic proportions in Australia, but where does the Prime Minister get the second part of his New Year message, that a glass of fluoridated water will stop what seems in his opinion the dental decay epidemic throughout Australia?

Politicians protecting their policies, but not the Australian People

The fluoridation situation in Australia is a convoluted, unreal, spin doctors sorcery, presented by the same hierarchy that govern the living standards of the Australian people.

What is the **real** situation in Australian Fluoridation?

Fluoridation - a despotic, totalitarian form of Government control over the people.

Fluoridation is a pure breed despotic, totalitarian form of Government control over the people, especially by politicians untrained in such a morally high standard of responsibility.

Consider the following facts and make your own judgment.

How would the Australian Parliaments act on the following?

If a pharmaceutical company (foreign of course) placed on sale in Australia for public use, a drug on the following basis:

(1) The drug is not Registered or Licenced anywhere in the world?

(2) The toxic dose is unknown?

(3) It can be fed to humans of all ages irrespective of the enormous unknown variables?

(4) There is no scientific evidence in the world proving the drug safe and effective?

(5) The World Health Organization in their book, "International agency for research on cancer, Evaluation of the Carcinogenic Risk of Chemicals for humans" 340 pages, classifies the drug as - "a fungicide, bactericide, rodenticide

(rat poison) a pediculicide, insecticide for sprays, lawns, shrubs, trees" - in all cases to kill irrespective of dose?

(6) Administration of the drug to animals can lead to a reduction of some enzymes?

(7) As in animals certain enzymes in human tissues are inhibited by this drug?

(8) Renal handling, tissue concentrations, and effects of the drug in renal patients are subject to need of further research? (*National Health and Medical Research Council publication statement.*)

(9) Actual drug intake for an individual depends on age, diet and drug content in water? (*National Health and Medical Research Council publication statement.*)

(10) Among the disease outcomes that warrant study are osteosarcomas and cancers of the buccal cavity, kidney and bone joints? (*National Health and Medical Research Council publication statement.*)

(11) The drug inhibits protein and DNA synthesis and has been reported to cause chromosomal aberrations in human cells? (*National Health and Medical Research Council publication statement.*)

(12) This drug is not used in any European country, and indeed is a prohibited use by an E.C. directive?

(13) Only 4% of world population use this drug?

(14) The Victorian Government by unanimous vote in 1993 changed the Victorian Constitution which now prohibits the Supreme Court of Victoria from entertaining cases against this drug?

(15) The harm from this drug and its use in Sydney resulted in **The Sydney Daily Mirror**, 9th October, 1989 printed a heading in large 2cm letters: SOMETHING ROTTEN OUT WEST.

(16) **The Herald Sun**, 19th January 2004, stated:

"About 228,000 Victorians are now facing an average two year wait for health care. Some wait 5 years after Government claim this drug heals the disease.

(17) And the list goes on, a litany of erroneous claims.

The question is: would the Government take proper action on the Pharmaceutical Company selling a drug under the above 17 qualifications showing its unacceptable scientific principles as required by LAW.

Well, the answer is: The Government would take no action against the drug company **because** those 17 qualifications are just a few of the exact actions of the Government on fluoridation. The 17 qualifications are actual realities of the standard of Government "science" and their apparent enthusiastic adoption of fluoridation together with the damning health evidence against its use.

There is no limit to Australian Governments, cast in stone, protection policy in their daily drugging of the Australian population with toxic fluoride chemicals, unlicensed, unregistered and unproven safety and effectiveness.

Consider and understand the manner of promoting the fluoridation racket that has no scientific basis of truth and embodies the questionable principles of Government, consisting of the person **you** voted into the Parliament.

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.

12 reasons to reject fluoridation

For over 100 years, science and medicine have understood the poisonous nature of fluoride. In the 1930's and 40's, giant US companies, e.g. ALCOA, were sued for millions of dollars due to toxic fluoride waste escaping from factory smokestacks killing crops and livestock. ALCOA's owners (Mellon) figured that if people could be persuaded fluoride isn't poisonous but is good for teeth, profits could be protected. So, to introduce water fluoridation, they hired the brilliant 'father of propaganda' Edward L. Bernays. Joined later by other fluoride polluting industries (e.g. nuclear) and the multi-billion dollar sugar, toothpaste, confectionary and soft drink industries, they became strong financial supporters of dental associations that promoted fluoridation. One such support group, the Dental Health Education & Research Foundation (DHERF), was founded in Australia in 1962. Its Governors, Members and donors comprised key representatives from Coca-Cola, CSR, Kelloggs, Colgate-Palmolive, Wrigleys, Arnotts, Scanlens, Cadbury Schweppes, etc.

The following 12 points require no expertise in fluoride toxicity, just common sense.

1. Only parents or individuals have the right to decide if they or their children take **drugs**. This point *should* end the compulsory fluoridation. (The U.S. Food and Drug Administration show fluoride isn't a food, nutrient or dietary supplement: "Sodium fluoride used for therapeutic effect *[e.g. water fluoridation] would be a **drug**, not a mineral nutrient." *F.D.A. 1963*)

2. Claiming fluoride is natural, as it is found in the Earth's crust or water, is misleading. So is arsenic, mercury and other poisons. The chemical used for fluoridation in Australia is untreated toxic waste captured inside fertiliser factory smokestacks.

3. Doctors have legal and medical restrictions in prescribing drugs. A patient's medical history, age, weight, sex, allergic reactions, other drugs taken and illnesses must be determined. After an adequate medical exam, scripts must be for a specific person, drug, duration and dose - never 'take some whenever you're thirsty'. Harmful side-effects must be explained. You have the right to refuse! These 14 safety requirements are vital. All are ignored with fluoridation.

4. The World Health Organisation's (WHO) International Agency for Research on Cancer, reports sodium silicofluoride [as used for fluoridation in Australia] as, "... an insecticide, fungicide, bactericide and rodenticide [rat poison] ... [and] a fluoridating agent for municipal drinking-water. ... The Commission of the European Communities (1978) requires that sodium silicofluoride be labelled as toxic by inhalation, in contact with the skin or if swallowed." *I.A.R.C. Monograph on the Evaluation of the Carcinogenic Risk of Chemicals to Humans*, 27-4-82, p 250.

5. Fluoride deaths. In a 5 month court case of world experts (Pittsburgh 1978), Dr Burk, a National Cancer Institute founder and Chief Chemist (35 years) and other scientists proved fluoridation kills over 10,000 yearly (cancer), **admitted by opponents under cross-examination.** In Brisbane, 2 year old Jason Burton died after eating 6 fluoride pills. His death certificate states, 'Fluoride poisoning'. In New York, 3 year old William Kennerly died from a 'fluoride rinse' at a dentist. The Court awarded his parents US\$750,000.

6. Fluoridation is undemocratic. We've rejected it in over 90% of referendums, with votes as high as 98% against. Now, referendums are usually denied us.

7. Fluoridation does not reduce decay. Few countries are fluoridated yet nearly all have decades of falling decay rates, including all 10 (unfluoridated) in west continental

Europe. WHO (www.whocollab.od.mah.se) Also, decay was reducing decades **before** fluoridation, e.g. NZ school records since 1930 show steep decay reductions for 25-35 years before fluoridation.

8. Fluoride is so toxic, the disease fluorosis is named after it. Fluorosis is caused by constant fluoride poisoning of the body. Its first visible sign is chalky white to dark brown mottling of teeth, called dental fluorosis. This irreversible, disfiguring **tooth decay** shows the break down of the tooth's cellular structure. Australia's three major government fluoridation inquiries (Tas 1968, Vic 1979, ACT 89-91) all reported that up to 10% of children will get mottled teeth if water is fluoridated. In practice, mottling is as high as 48% (UK Govt. *York Report*, 2000). Dentists make \$600-\$1,200 **per tooth** to hide (cover) fluorosis.

9. Fluoridation aside, most decay is caused by a poor diet with lots of processed carbohydrates, e.g. we average 22 teaspoons of sugar a day. The only reason teeth get **badly** decayed is they weren't filled early enough as parents often cannot pay the high costs charged by dentists (earning up to \$500,000 a year).

10. Australian authorities often make mistakes. Fluoridation is claimed to be safe, but so was Arsenic, DDT, Thalidomide, Dioxin, Asbestos, Agent Orange, Dalkon Shield, Deildrin, Mercury and more recently - Vioxx - all shown later to harm or kill people. But at least they weren't compulsory. Fluoridation is!

11. Among experts, the controversy rages over fluoridation. Regardless of who's right, if the safety of any drug is so hugely controversial, doesn't common sense demand it not be used at all? Certainly not forced on millions of people for their whole life!

12. If someone tried to force us to take a pill every time we drank a glass of water, we'd suggest they go where it's eternally hot. The only real difference with fluoridation is that the pill is dissolved in the water before they make us take it.

* Comments in square brackets [] are Mr. Stevenson's.

If fluoridation is forced onto any State, deaths and tooth decay will increase (search 'fluoride deaths', 'dental fluorosis' on the internet) and the ecosystem, other life forms and our rights will suffer.

ACTION: 1. Copy this page - as is. 2. Form a team. 3. Letterbox your electorate. 4. Display on notice boards/shops. 5. Tell Councillors and MP's of your will. For a digital copy email nofluoridation@aonet.com.au

©2006 Dennis Stevenson (07) 5594 2023 can help with fluoridation interviews, debates, talks, humour, workshops and campaign plans.

Dennis is a former Parliamentarian and Member of the ACT Legislative Assembly 'Fluoridation Inquiry' (1989-91). The majority of inquiry members refused to report the scientific, medical, dental and Court evidence received in worldwide submissions proving that fluoridation causes disease, deaths, tooth decay and is useless and environmentally destructive. Dennis put this evidence in a 177 page *Dissenting Report*, part of this major government report, but longer than the 131 page section which attempted to suppress the evidence.