

Dr. Katherine O'Donoghue,
Indigenous Oral Health Unit,
ARCPOH, School of Dentistry,
University of Adelaide,
SOUTH AUSTRALIA. 5005.

Dr. O'Donoghue,

We note your appointment to the Fluoride Reference Group, (FRG)

Our interest has been drawn to the:

NHMRC Expert Meeting – Water Fluoridation

Workshop Outcome Notes.

20 June 2013

“Expert discussion on the need to update the evidence on the harms and benefits of fluoridation to ensure the Australian community is receiving the best available advice from the NHMRC.” (Obtained through Freedom of Information). For copies of minutes of this meeting please confer with your colleague Prof Kaye Roberts-Thomson, Samantha Robertson, Prof Clive Wright who were in attendance.

Attendees at this meeting agreed that the **“dental benefits of fluoridation were not in dispute but we do need high quality epidemiological skills to assess the studies on this”**.

It is clear that the attendees at The Expert meeting have established a *predetermined outcome* for the new review “Health effects of water fluoridation”.

The NHMRC website states

“This call for published scientific articles is the first step in a comprehensive review process to ensure that NHMRC’s advice is based on the most current evidence.”

This is a lie and fraudulent because the attendees at the expert meeting have already agreed that fluoridation is beneficial. Current media release 25th February, 2015 from NHMRC Prof. Anderson:

- **“based on the work already conducted in the review, NHMRC is expecting to maintain its support for fluoridation of water supplies as effective and safe.”**
- **As members of the Fluoride Reference group your role was to guide the evaluation of evidence and consider the findings as experts in key areas of science.**
- **You have not completed your review and the CEO has already announced a predetermined outcome.**


Australian Taxpayers are being defrauded of their money which is granted to NHMRC to conduct a thorough, scientific, unbiased review. To further bias this research review:

- **“ it was noted that any new evidence would need to be significant and relevant to the Australian context (the recent Harvard/China paper on neurotoxicity was provided as an example).”This kind of trick in the research industry is called, “Clever selection of data”. Ref. Ioannidis.**

- NHMRC is well aware that there is no new research conducted in Australia, because NHMRC issues the grants for the research.

The current unfortunate outbreak of hepA from imported frozen berries, from China, poisonous fish from Thailand and a multitude of products in the supermarket “made in India, using quinoa from Peru or Bolivia and rice from Spain” highlights the fact that the Chinese and other international studies must be included because Australians are unaware of how many imported foods they have been consuming and what level of fluoride is in that food.

BIAS PUBLICLY  CLEVER SELECTION OF DATA  Stacked committees (MAJORITY

VOCAL PRO- FLUORIDATION COMMITTEES & RESEARCHERS (COLGATE UNI. FUNDED), (COCHRANE COLLABORATION- FUNDED BY NHMRC)  SUPPRESSED DATA.

Scientific integrity has been eroded over the years in regards to this subject and the public cannot be fooled any longer. When Government Health Authorities inform people that fluoride is abundant in soil, air, groundwater, food, toothpaste, medicines, and cigarette smoke and that all fluoride is the same, the taxpayer is left wondering why money is being wasted on fluoridation. NHMRC publicly announce that fluoride is safe and effective; a disenchanted public cannot believe this because all medicines come with side effects. The following information falls within your, “Terms of Reference”
Identify critical gaps in the current evidence base.

OVERDOSING BABIES = DENTAL FLUOROSIS = NEUROLOGICAL DAMAGE

The fluoridation issue locally:

- you will not find this factual data, in previous reviews of reviews of reviews of reviews.
- As taxpayers who fund this kind of review we feel it is necessary to share our disturbing facts, which have been deliberately suppressed by way of NHMRC Scope of.....
- As taxpayers and consumers of this chemical/medical intervention, we require that our findings be included and further research be commenced.
- We have test results which show fluoride concentration far above that which is recommended for babies. *(Please refer to the analysis report from Safe Analytical Laboratories). Baby Formula reconstituted using tap water in Moonee Ponds Victoria 15 June 2009 shows a reading of 3.1mg/L with fluoride.*

The nutrient reference values for Australia and New Zealand for fluoride are:

Population sub group	Adequate intake (mg per day)	Upper level (mg per day)
Infants 0-6mths.	0.01	0.7
Infants 7-12 mths.	0.5	0.9
1-3 years	0.7	1.3
4-8 years	1.0	2.2
9-13 years	2.0	10.0
14-18 years	3.0	10.0

What is the current concentration in a Baby bottle reconstituted with Moonee Ponds tap water? And what is the level of fluoride in the average baby's blood/urine.

Our data clearly shows that our babies are being overdosed with fluoride. In the "**Australian context**" this kind of result must be taken seriously and further explored in order to satisfy due diligence. *Please be advised some of our documents to you will be redacted to protect the identity of the client because we share all data findings nationally and internationally.*

History would indicate that "fluoride" has been known for its poisonous content as shown in this document called "Fluorine and its relation to dental health." Attached is an OCR rendition of a presentation to the ADA in 1945 by Capt. Beach of the U.S. Army. On the left is the article and on the right is a list of Bernard Needham's (Tas.) comments on the text with bracketed references so that you can follow what he is commenting on. To set the scene, WW11 is still raging and the American Government is so concerned for the teeth of Australian children it sent an officer to help out. The presentation was made to the Queensland Branch of the ADA and published in the April edition of the "Australian Dental Mirror." This document clearly shows that "fluoride" is best used in the refining of uranium and does not belong in our babies' drinking water.

Please refer to document Hexafluorosilicic Acid, Raw Materials, Manufacture, Toxicity and Public Health Concerns as an active ingredient in fluoridation of drinking water September 2012, Page 3 & 4. This document clearly shows that 1ppm of Hexafluorosilicic Acid (used in Australia as fluoridating agent) ingested orally is the equivalent of 25ppm of calcium fluoride.

Ioannidis tells us that:

"the scientific enterprise is probably the most fantastic achievement in human history, but that doesn't mean we have a right to overstate what we are accomplishing. We could solve much of the wrongness problem," Ioannidis says, "if the world simply stopped expecting scientists to be right. That's because being wrong in science is fine, and even necessary-as long as scientists recognise that they blew it, report their mistake openly instead of disguising it as a success and then moving on to the next thing, until they come up with the very occasional genuine breakthrough. But as long as careers remain contingent on producing a stream of research that is dressed up to seem more right than it is, scientists will keep delivering exactly that."

“Science is a noble endeavour, but it’s also a low yield endeavour. I’m not sure that more than a very small percentage of medical research is ever likely to lead to major improvements in clinical outcomes and quality of life.” **Reference: Ioannidis “Lies damned lies and Medical Science”** – www.theatlantic.com/magazine2010.

We, in the community, are disappointed disillusioned and disgusted that the Fluoride Reference Group as well as the Sydney University Team remain silent to the perceived bullying tactics that the NHMRC is using during this Health Effects of Water Fluoridation Review, unless of course you are complicit. This kind of behaviour illustrates the unscientific side of medicine.

NB: Ideology of forced mass medication with toxic wastes are protected by law. In order to have this protection, due diligence must be shown before an assurance, a guarantee that the statement can be relied upon and it is made from a position of knowing the facts and accurately reporting them. A person making any kind of assurance is accountable for those statements. If one is protected from prosecution, one cannot be held accountable and therefore cannot make statements of assurance. **The two concepts are mutually incompatible.**

This registered letter – barcode number,
document may be used as evidence against you.

puts you on notice and this

Independent Researchers
Victorian Chapter.

Sandra L. Camm. Stelmo7@tpg.com.au

Anna L. Michalik. Anna@mosaicview.com.au

Marcus Aurelius: Everything we hear is an **opinion not a fact**. Everything we see is a **perspective not the truth**. Roman Emperor 161-180