



The Selling of Fluoridation In America* Americans' Health is Being Compromised for Industrial Profit

By John R. Lee, M.D.

***This article *may* be copied, reproduced and quoted in full in any media, as long as the text is not changed in any way, or edited out of context, and as long as Dr. Lee's byline above remains, and the copyright and contact information at the end of the article remains intact.**

Typical American citizens rarely think of fluoridation. If they hear of some debate or squabble about fluoridation they pass it off as insignificant, old news, nothing to worry about, nothing that competes with all the other anxieties and stresses of life these days. This laissez faire attitude is evidence of the success of media misrepresentation in the matter of fluoridation. Before your brain goes on autopilot and you lose focus, consider the following facts.

Within the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) there is something called the Food and Nutrition Board that, in 1997, attempted to include fluoride as an essential nutrient. The fact is that no study has ever found fluoride to be essential for any human metabolic need, and there is no such thing as a fluoride-deficiency disease state. Numerous respected and reputable scientists wrote to the Food and Nutrition Board to object to that classification of fluoride.

Now, the Food and Nutrition Board met again (21 January 1999) and, this time, acknowledges that, while fluoride is not truly an essential nutrient, it is a "beneficial element for humans" because of its supposed dental benefits. Therefore, they again put fluoride on their agenda that included four truly essential nutrients, calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, and vitamin D. They hope to raise the recommended upper limit (UL) to allow even higher concentrations of fluoride in our drinking water than those previously set.

There are a number of things wrong with the claim that fluoride is

a beneficial element for humans. I will not, in this report, recount all the evidence that demolishes the Public Health claim of fluoride's supposed dental benefit. It is not necessary. Even if it worked, fluoride's toxicity is sufficient to discontinue fluoridation. However, you should know that the majority of industrialized countries have banned or discontinued fluoridation because of their own studies showing (1) lack of effect and/or (2) evidence of toxicity. Their public health programs attempt to prevent, as much as possible, environmental public fluoride exposure.

You might find it interesting that, in 1981, the Rand Corporation performed an extensive review of the fluoride/dental health literature and found that the Public Health fluoride studies "suffer from poor experimental design and from analysis plans that largely ignore the possible effects of other factors of tooth decay." They stated that the studies are so poor that they "have no relevance to any criterion of public policy-making." It is a sad fact that the specific errors they identified have yet to be corrected.

It should be sobering to realize that low-concentration fluoride powder was once commonly used as a potent pesticide for chicken lice, to preserve important papers from earwigs and other insects, and also as a rodenticide (to kill rats). Because of fluoride's potent toxicity, such use is no longer allowed. The fluoride promoters do not want you to know of this history, however.

Further, it should be apparent that there is something truly bizarre about the Food and Nutrition Board's inclusion of fluoride on the basis of its being "a beneficial element for humans." By the same argument, one could include antibiotics, aspirin, and thousands of other agents, not to mention music, prayer, and clean cotton underwear. The Board's selection of fluoride raises the question of their motive in linking it to essential nutrients.

Consider the problem of the "upper limit" of safety. According to the Federal Code of Regulations, the concentration of any substance in drinking water must be no more than one hundred times less than that shown to be toxic in any manner. This is the normal safety factor allowed in water sold to the public. Only fluoride is an exception to this rule. The only problem the Food and Nutrition Board's panel had with defining the upper limit of safety for its four nutrients (calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, and vitamin D) is that the toxic levels are so much higher than optimal levels they are difficult to pinpoint. In the case of fluoride, however,

there is *no margin of safety*; the so-called optimal concentration of 1 mg/L is guaranteed to cause dental fluorosis in at least 10% of children. If fluoride followed the Federal Code of Regulations, the allowable concentration would be 0.01 mg/L. PHS authorities avoid this dilemma by redefining dental fluorosis as a mere "cosmetic" effect rather than a "toxic" effect.

Consider, on the other hand, another recognized toxic effect of fluoride - osteofluorosis (also known as osteosclerosis) – that results in calcification of connective tissue that holds bones together. Throughout the world, this is routinely found to occur with water fluoride at 4 mg/L. Under the Federal Code of Regulations, the allowable level would be 0.04 mg/L. Even though fluoride has been removed from the Federal Code of Regulations, the panel members are still confronted with the dilemma that the PHS-recommended fluoride level in water exceeds known toxic effects. The concept of an upper limit for safety for fluoride is an oxymoron; and the panel members are being asked to be the morons.

Twenty years ago, the PHS turned to a different scheme to solve the fluoridation problem presented by osteofluorosis. They floated a new diagnosis – the DISH syndrome. DISH was an acronym for disseminated interstitial hypercalcinosis. Whenever an X-ray showed calcium accumulation in connective tissue, the physician merely diagnosed it as the DISH syndrome, presumably of unknown etiology. The idea that fluoride was the cause was never considered. Later, when better X-rays showed excessive bone calcification, physicians were taught to interpret this as a bone benefit rather than an abnormality.

The inclusion of fluoride in the present meeting of the Food and Nutrition Board strongly challenged by many top-flight scientists. As examples I will list four of them who are actively challenging the Board's action.

Professor of Chemistry Dr. Albert Burgstahler (U. of Kansas), an active researcher on the toxic effects and chemistry of fluoride for over thirty years, planned to report the errors in the NAS's arithmetic and reasoning on the subject. He also planned to point out the inherent bias of the NAS panel members involved – their professional life depended on pleasing the NAS program.

Professor of Chemistry Dr. Paul Connett (St. Lawrence U.)

planned to discuss the mechanisms of fluoride's toxic effects, including recent information of fluoride-induced suppression of the pineal gland and its effect on aging and adaptation. He also planned to point out the present over-dosing by fluoride throughout in America.

Dr. William Hirzy, representing the scientists at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), planned to explain why his union, the National Treasury Employees Union, Chapter 20, voted to endorse efforts to ban water fluoridation. He would give examples of how fluoride has been treated as a "protected pollutant" by the EPA, and explain how the union is trying to change that situation.

Professor Lennart Krook (Cornell U.) planned to summarize his years of work on the toxicity of fluoride on bone in animals as well as the work of other researchers and epidemiologists who have reported on the bone-weakening effects of fluoride, work that has been virtually ignored by the NAS. His work includes seminal studies of the massive damage to cattle herds in upstate New York by industrial fluoride emissions.

At the Food and Nutrition Board meeting, these scientists were told that, despite their signed intention of speaking at the public section of the meeting, they would not be allowed to do so because they had not submitted a summary of their planned remarks. After extensive argument, they were told they would have only a total of 15 minutes to do so. Fifteen minutes for four reputable scientists, all experts in the field! By common consent, they selected Professor Paul Connett to be their spokesman. He astounded the panel members by his mastery of the subject. He challenged them to use the same criteria of safety for fluoride as they did with the essential nutrients. He educated them on the biochemistry and mechanisms of action of fluoride toxicity. He revealed to them the errors of PHS fluoridation trials. He awakened in them the concept of the deception to which they were being asked to subscribe. When he finished, an NAS "manager" (to use the euphemism employed by the Clinton impeachment prosecutors) rose to announce that the fluoride upper limit of safety was a product of NAS policy, not the panel's judgement. It would have been fascinating to know the thoughts of the panelists at that announcement.

Dr. Hirzy, having been denied the opportunity to speak, brought his videocamera to record Professor Connett's talk. He was told

that this, too, was denied to him. What is the Board trying to hide?

Don't you wonder why reputable scientists, without any financial gain, put their careers on the line to oppose fluoride and fluoridation?

On the other hand, don't you wonder why fluoride is so heavily promoted and so protected by government denial of its toxicity despite all this scientific opposition?

How did all this obfuscation and deception come about? The true genesis of the fluoridation deception occurred during World War II. From records derived via the Freedom of Information act, we now know that our atomic bomb program created fluoride waste in the use of fluoride flux to produce uranium 235. The waste fluoride that piled up resulted in run-off that entered local waterways and resulted in "dead" lakes. The fluoride killed animal and plant life in the lakes. Also, the synthesis of uranium hexafluoride, used in atom bomb manufacturing, added to the problem.

By ignorance and carelessness, chemical industries in New Jersey producing bomb-grade uranium allowed an escape of waste fluoride into the air, severely damaging fruit trees and animal life downwind of these industries. A legal suit for damages brought by folks in New Jersey was silenced by payoffs to the plaintiffs. Our government's motive at the time was a desire for secrecy of our atomic bomb making. The problem of disposal of fluoride waste had to be resolved in a manner that disguised its true nature. Thus arose the fluoridation concept. Without evidence or adequate testing, a campaign was mounted to trickle away the waste fluoride into multiple community water supplies for the supposed benefit of dental decay prevention.

What keeps the deception going? World War II is history. Everyone knows fluoride is used in the making of atom bombs. Why does the PHS continue the pretense of fluoridation safety? Read on.

Since fluoride waste also accumulates in the process of extracting aluminum from bauxite ore for the business of airplane manufacturing, this disposal plan was a great boon for the aluminum industries. In 1947, Oscar Ewing, chief legal counsel for Aluminum Corporation of America (ALCOA), was named head of

Federal Security Administration in charge of the Public Health Service (PHS). It was he who changed the Federal Code of Regulations to remove fluoride from the regulations that control food levels of other potentially toxic materials and placed all control of drinking water fluoride concentration in the hands of the PHS. He then made fluoridation promotion an official policy of the PHS. This, of course, led to subversion of science in order to maintain the fiction of fluoride's dental benefits and supposed safety. Scientists willing to go along with the deception were rewarded with secure positions within the PHS and other government agencies. Scientists unwilling to do this found their careers halted or destroyed. The climate of the times dictated the rise of the pseudo-science that persists today in the fluoridation scam.

The climate is now changed but the beat goes on. We are in an era of liability litigation. To admit to fluoridation-caused dental fluorosis and other toxic fluoride effects at this time would instigate a huge volume of liability legal suits. The fiction must be kept alive. When Dr. Phyllis Mullenix published her research on the brain-damaging effect of fluoride in rodents, she lost all funding of future, planned research projects. Dr. Harold C. Hodge was one of her senior advisors on this research. During the early days of atom bomb building, he had a leading role in the medical surveillance of the project during which he observed brain damage in workers exposed to fluoride. He initiated a study to investigate it. This study was aborted after 6 months by orders from the War Department. In 1965 he (with Frank A. Smith) wrote his magnum opus, *Fluorine Chemistry*, and never mentioned a central nervous system problem from fluoride. While senior advisor to the Mullenix research in the 1990's, he also never mentioned it. He kept his professorships and his silence on this matter to his grave.

When Dr. Grey, senior public health dental officer in British Columbia, published his report showing no fluoridation dental benefit among British Columbia school children (and publicly questioned the usual claims of fluoride dental benefit), he was sent off to an exile in the bowels of the national public health offices in Ottawa. When Dr. Colquhoun, senior public health dental officer in New Zealand, published his report showing no dental benefit to the schoolchildren of Auckland, he lost his post, was demoted, and was forced to accept a lower retirement benefit than his due. Many other examples could be provided.

Since so many countries have chosen not to fluoridate their drinking water, potential markets for that mode of fluoride disposal have literally evaporated. Therefore, sites here in the U.S. become even more important to the fluoride-generating industries. The underlying motive for the Food and Nutrition Board is merely an attempt to "validate" fluoridation. Industry needs fluoridation as a dumpsite for their toxic fluoride waste. Without it, industry suffers. With it, the people suffer. Who has political power in America? The people should, but the reality is that industry has the political clout in America today. Only an educated and aroused citizenry will get our government back on course to safeguard and serve the people as it is intended to do.

Final thought. On 21 January 1999, another important governmental agency was engaged in a matter of pesticides and artificial hormones in food. The US Department of Agriculture (USDA) reversed its previous position and now plans to issue rules prohibiting the label "organic" for any food that is irradiated, genetically engineered, or treated with pesticides or antibiotics. It took 280,000 letters to get the government's attention on this matter. If the USDA can decide to help people choose food that is not contaminated with a pesticide, why doesn't the PHS and the Food and Nutrition Board help people to drink water that is not contaminated with the pesticide, fluoride?

We now await the decision of the Food and Nutrition Board panelists.

This article may be copied, reproduced and quoted in full in any media, as long as the text is not changed in any way, or edited out of context, and as long as Dr. Lee's byline above remains, and the information below remains intact.

John R. Lee, M.D.

info@johnleemd.com

Copyright Hormones Etc. Inc., 2000 All rights reserved.
Reproduction of any kind is prohibited without express written permission of the author.

[Back To Top](#)

| [Return Home](#) | [E-mail](#) |

Web Site Designed and Managed by Tainet



