

FIRE WATER

Australia's Industrial Fluoridation Disgrace

Exposing the systematic industrial waste poisoning of Australian drinking water supplies

David McRae – Interview Transcript

**Interview conducted by
Jaya Chela Drolma**

**Transcribed by
Rosemarie Zalec**

September 2010

[00:00:33]

David: I'm David McRae. I'm a health promotion professional in Geelong.

Jaya: Are you; you're a Naturopath?

David: I'm a Bachelor of Science in Medical and Biological Sciences, and also a Counsellor.

Jaya: Great; and how long have you been practising these...

David: I was a Naturopath in the old days too.

Jaya: Oh, okay. That's great; and how long have you been, like, practising these skills...

David: Ah, for the last twenty years.

[00:01:00]

Jaya: Victorian Health Authorities claim that governments and health professionals have a responsibility to make decisions that balance the best possible community health outcomes with individual choices. Water fluoridation, they claim, is an important public health measure, which merits mandatory implementation. In your view, David, what are the ethical implications of mandatory water fluoridation?

[00:01:28]

David: Public health officials who claim that are really getting it wrong. They like to link it with wearing seatbelts and helmets on bicycles. Now, nobody ever has to swallow a seatbelt or a bike helmet. Forcing the whole community, on the other hand – mandatory water fluoridation – forcing every man, woman and child to drink a potentially very toxic chemical, in fluoride; that's a completely different thing. And that's way outside of the scope of what's ethical for public health officials. See, fluoride added to water is a medication. They add it for the purpose of combating a disease. That makes it a medication. Now, not even a single doctor can force a single patient to take a medication; they have to get the consent of the patient. So, for example, for

Dr. Carnie in Victoria – the Chief Health Officer – to claim that he has the ‘right’ to force millions of people in Victoria to swallow fluoride medication every day via their kitchen tap – that’s way, way outside of his, what his ethical powers should be. It’s simply wrong.

[00:02:41]

Jaya: The National Health and Medical Research Council recommends three compounds for fluoridating drinking water: sodium fluoride; sodium fluorosilicate; and fluorosilicic acid. The latter two of these chemicals, silicofluorides, are the most widely-used in Australia. Have silicofluorides ever been proven safe for long-term ingestion by humans; and, where are they sourced from, and how?

[00:03:11]

David: The silicofluorides – that’s fluorosilicic acid and the sodium salt of it – they’re nowadays sourced from the phosphate fertilizer industry, down here in Geelong, from Incitec Pivot fertilizers. They’re a waste product from manufacturing the fertilizer – after the rock’s crushed and boiled up in sulfuric acid, the waste fumes that would normally go out the chimney stack and carry a huge amount of fluoride. But they capture it in the wet scrubbing system, the pollution scrubbing system, and those tanks of captured pollution effluent are then what’s sold to water authorities for putting into water supplies, as ‘fluoridation’. So it’s really a raw, unpurified pollution extract from industry, which is really unfortunate, because they’re contaminated as well. I mean, they’re 90% fluoride, but they also contain mercury, arsenic, lead and other very, very toxic heavy metal contaminants. But the other part of your question was about testing for safety. No, those silicofluorides have had, to the best of my knowledge, no safety testing at all. And by that I mean the kind of safety testing that’s required for medical drugs. They’ve never gone through that process. In the US, they’ve never been approved by the FDA for human administration; and in Australia, the TGA – the Therapeutic Goods Administration – has never undertaken any testing at all. So government relies on vague claims like, ‘oh, well, we don’t see people dropping dead in the street when we fluoridate a town, so therefore it must be safe.’

[00:04:55]

Jaya: But surely there’s a -- is it a cumulative toxin, or does it get eliminated out of the body?

[00:05:02]

David: Ah, fluoride – fluoride is cumulative. You can eliminate; a healthy person can eliminate about half of what they ingest per day. The rest is stored in bones, or effects thyroid gland, pineal gland and a few other body systems. But a person with poor kidneys eliminates less than half – almost none. So people with kidney disease are at especially great risk of toxic effects from fluoride.

[00:05:30]

Jaya: Yes, ‘cause surely – the teeth being the hardest surface – the teeth would be the last to show the effects of fluoride, and in the meantime the fluoridated water would be circulating through all the soft tissues; would that be correct?

[00:05:44]

David: That's right. Yeah. I mean it's especially stored in the hard tissues, but it's ridiculous to think that it can flow around the body and somehow bypass your thyroid gland or your stomach. It doesn't. It hits those areas as well. You get sensitive people get immediate stomach problems with damage to the lining of their stomach and intestines, and as we know, the thyroid is very, very much damaged by fluoride. It interferes with the use of iodine in the thyroid gland.

[00:06:16]

Jaya: Victoria's Chief Health Officer, Dr. Carnie claims that the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities allows for "reasonable limitation" of individual rights. He also claims that because of the public health importance of water fluoridation in reducing health – dental decay – the practice of fluoridation of drinking water supplies is consistent with the Charter. David, do you agree that mandatory water fluoridation merits "reasonable limitation" of individual rights?

[00:06:48]

David: Oh, no, no. Dr. Carnie's getting that completely wrong. The man's really a disgrace in the position of Chief 'Health' Officer. The Charter of Rights very, very clearly explains that, ah, medication should not be given to people without their informed consent. It's as simple as that. And he cannot claim that the benefits are so great when we for example look at Queensland – that was never fluoridated except for a couple of small towns – until 2009. And yet right through the 1980s, 1990s, and the early 2000s, the tooth decay rates, for all ages, in Queensland, were no different to Victoria and New South Wales that had been fluoridated for twenty and thirty years. So there is no evidence for benefits. And then look at Europe – Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium, Netherlands, Germany, France – all the countries across Europe that do NOT fluoridate their water, generally have lower tooth decay rates than these fluoridated states in Victoria. So, no – Carnie's got no grounds at all for saying that there's such a big benefit that it's worth overriding normal human rights. He's quite wrong about that.

[00:08:03]

Jaya: So, bringing back to Europe being non-fluoridated. Is that a banned product, or is it legal and still used as tablets, or is it completely banned as a neurotoxin?

[00:08:14]

David: Look, it varies from country to country. A number of countries in Europe did ban it and create legislation to ban it. Other countries – their official statement from the Health Ministry is simply that they don't use it; they believe it's too toxic to many unresolved health problems and that it does violate peoples' rights.

[00:08:38]

Jaya: So, why do you think Australia's gone ahead and fluoridated every water supply in the country?

[00:08:42]

David: Well, Australia got started back in the 60s when it was sort of a 'flavour of the year' in America, Australia and even in some European countries did start, back then, but those countries quit; none of them kept with

it for very long. I, I can't for the life of me work out – aside from the fact that the big industries that sell the stuff, they promote it very heavily – and in the early days of fluoridation they pumped a lot of money into supporting dental researchers who would come out with findings that fluoridation was 'good'. They would lose their funding if they didn't. But that's going back earlier in the history. What keeps it going in Australia now – I won't speculate on that.

[00:09:29]

Jaya: It's going against modern scientific thought, really, that fluoridation is no longer considered "safe" and "effective". Could you perhaps expand on the "safe and effective" clause that we're constantly hearing?

[00:09:41]

David: Well, I've just mentioned that it's not "effective", because you only have to look at comparisons of states that fluoridate and don't and countries that fluoridate and don't. But, as for "safe" – well of course it can't be safe when there's no control over the dose. Now, no one disputes that fluoride is very toxic. Dr. Carnie's defence of it is that the amounts you get through fluoridated water are small enough that they're not toxic. But think about it for a minute: Some people might only drink two glasses of water a day or not even any; other people will have higher thirst levels. They'll drink five, ten, fifteen glasses of water a day. Some people do a lot of fried and baked food, so there's no tap water in their food. Others do a lot of soups and stews and watery cooking. So the range of fluoride intake from fluoridated water can vary up to ten-fold. And can you imagine your doctor giving you a very dangerous drug and saying, take as much as you want – take one tablet one day, ten another day, I don't care? In fact, you're getting fluoride all day long, because it's not just the glass of water that you take from the tap, it's every time you cook rice, or a stew, or soup. Every one of those has fluoride in it. Every cup of tea or coffee from the boiled kettle has concentrated fluoride in it, so you're getting the stuff all day long. Yes. So if you're taking in a lot every day, you're accumulating a lot in your body.

[00:11:08]

Jaya: In 2007, the National Health and Medical Research Council released a report titled, 'A Systematic Review of the Efficacy and Safety of Fluoridation.' According to Professor Paul Connett, Emeritus Professor of Environmental Chemistry, St. Lawrence, USA, ah, St. Lawrence University, USA, the NHMRC report, quote, "is being cited around the fluoridating world as the final word on the "safety and effectiveness" of water fluoridation. However, as far as addressing health concerns, a careful reading of this report indicates that at best, it is a work of professional incompetence, or at worst, an example of scientific fraud, in which scientific information is manipulated to support a preordained conclusion." End of quote. These are strong words. It would seem that not all scientists agree that water fluoridation is completely "safe and effective". What are your views on the NHMRC report; and do you believe it addresses all fluoridation health concerns adequately?

[00:12:16]

David: No, no. It doesn't. It was a report whipped up by two report writers in Sydney – small company who were contracted by the NHMRC. They made a number of very big errors and one of them was to leave out any studies on

fluoride's effect on kidneys, or the effect of fluoride on kidney patients. Now, they were supposed to include a section on that. I've seen minutes of meetings where kidney fluoride studies were to be included, but in the final report they were 'mysteriously' eliminated. When it came to the cancer studies, particularly Dr. Bassin's study of Osteosarcoma, and fluoride being responsible for Osteosarcoma. They dismissed that in about three lines, based upon a letter the editor written by Professor Chester Douglass, who said that there would later be other reports coming out of his office that will show that Bassin's study wasn't correct. Well, it's now five or six years after that time and Dr. Chester Douglass has retired and he never produced these reports. So the NHMRC relied on a very flimsy letter to the editor in order to make their claim that there's no link between fluoride and cancer. So to this day, Bassin's study, showing that young boys have a much higher incidence of Osteosarcoma if they're exposed to fluoridated water – that is the best science that's ever been done on the subject. Yet the NHMRC dismissed it, for no good reason.

[00:13:58]

Jaya: Unbelievable. When we see these rise in cancer rates and they refuse to look at perhaps a cause as being water fluoridation, as a toxic chemical, and like a neurotoxin, and yet they dismiss...

[00:14:12]

David: Oh, it is unbelievable because you'd expect a body like Australia's NHMRC to have the highest standards of scientific integrity. But it's become apparent from just the two examples I've given – the kidneys and the bone cancer – that they had a goal to whitewash fluoridation and not to do a proper fearless study of the pros and cons. Officials all around Australia who've hung their hat on fluoridation for twenty years or more, they're not ready to give it up now because they'll be exposed as having been wrong all these years; and once they're exposed as having been wrong, they're also liable then for all the health damage that it has caused people.

[00:14:54]

Jaya: What if health professionals actually re-looked at the science, admitted that perhaps there's new science – is there any way that people can actually, professionals, can move on without being liableless; so that we can all get on with getting rid of fluoridation and getting on with having healthy lives rather than possible effects of cancers and kidney disease?

[00:15:16]

David: Yeah, there should be, shouldn't there? And, individual scientists and professors of dentistry and toxicology around the world have come out and said, "look, I've re-examined this and fluoridation is harming people. But..."

[00:15:30]

Jaya: Do you think that would be wise thought that health professionals re-examine and look at new evidence and perhaps reconsider their past stances? Would that be wise?

[00:15:39]

David: I think it's very important.

[00:15:41]

Jaya: ‘Cause I think rather than taking the negative all the time, there should be, “okay, we may have made a mistake, we’ll revise our review”; wouldn’t the best outcome be that we stop fluoridating?

[00:15:51]

David: That would be the best outcome...

[00:15:53]

Jaya: That would be [inaudible]...

[00:15:54]

David: ... And get back to treating *individuals* who have diseases like tooth decay. Treating each individual in an individualised manner of treatment. And the best preventive of course is all about diet and tooth cleaning. It’s nothing to do with dumping industrial chemical into the water supply.

[00:16:11]

Jaya: Section 4 of the Victorian Health (Fluoridation) Act states that individuals have no rights of action against water supply authorities with anything done in regard to water fluoridation. If water fluoridation is completely “safe and effective,” why, in your view, would such a measure be [a] necessary component of mandatory water fluoridation legislation?

[00:16:35]

David: Ha, ha. Yes – if fluoridation was “safe”, we couldn’t possibly need clauses like that. Ah, that clause protects water supply authorities and other people involved in fluoridation from any sort of claims from people who believe they’ve been harmed by it. But of course, it doesn’t protect the Government or the Health Department. So, ah, but of course, then those bodies have unlimited resources at their disposal to try to counter any action taken against them. But it does make a mockery of fluoridation, doesn’t it? It’s claimed to be “safe and effective,” but in the legislation, you have clauses that acknowledge that there’s likely to be damages claims.

[00:17:22]

Jaya: So on one hand the governments are happy to fluoridate, but they cover their backsides with legislation that allows nobody to seek any damages from water fluoridation – when they have perhaps blood samples or hair samples that show high levels of toxicity such as mercury, cadmium, arsenic, lead – that are found within fluoridation water.

[00:17:44]

David: Yeah, and I think the time’s coming when that legislation will be challenged in court cases. Personally I don’t think that’ll stand up. I think a good barrister would have a field day with a piece of legislation that tries to prevent poisoners from being responsible for their poisoning.

[00:18:05]

Jaya: But we haven’t had any barristers that actually have the courage to take on the governments, ‘cause everybody’s too afraid they’re going to lose their jobs. What advice would you give to these barristers?

[00:18:15]

David: Um, well, the barristers need doctors, too, who will stand up and testify on behalf of individual patients; and yet we had one in, ah, a Geelong person here who had a specialist in Melbourne who’d written reports that fluoride damaged her health badly. But when it came to the ‘crunch’ of her getting the

water authority to give her a separate, clean water supply, and he was best witness, he got, he backed down and wouldn't say another word. So I think your government authorities are still willing to come down very heavy on doctors that will supply the evidence that barristers need to run cases on fluoride in court.

[00:18:59]

Jaya: I know that Paul Connett has – Paul Connett being one person – has signed a declaration, amongst three thousand other, um, professionals, health professionals; could you perhaps expand a little bit on that document?

[00:19:15]

David: Yeah, the International Professionals Statement to End Water Fluoridation. And it's based on something like ten major scientific publications of recent years. And, that's signed by Nobel Prize-winning scientists. It's signed by dentists, by professors of dentistry, professors of many branches of the sciences, by many doctors, nurses and dentists. So, yes, it's well over three thousand now, and growing. So there is a band of professionals with integrity who've re-looked at the fluoride issue and are shocked by what they see.

[00:19:55]

Jaya: The freedom of choice concern about fluoridation – is that about communities having choice or is it at the level of the individual?

[00:20:04]

David: Ah, it's both. It's both. But ultimately, it's at the level of the individual, because the fluoride put into water supplies is put in their as a medication to treat the disease of tooth decay, or, to try to prevent it. So never mind for a moment that it's not a good medication. It's probably not effective, and it certainly can be harmful, but it is used as a medication. And, even a doctor can't force anyone to take a medication against their will. So, with fluoridation, every individual should have the right to say 'yes' or 'no' to whether they want it, but people don't have the option of supplying themselves with an alternative water supply. We all rely on the one water supply. So medicating the water with fluoride does violate every individual's freedom of choice. And yet, for some reason, governments take it on themselves to think they have the right to run a health program that overrides everybody's normal medical free choice and right to informed consent. So it's a kind of medical tyranny.

[00:21:15]

Jaya: Yes, and the point there too – I've heard people have written to various politicians and stated they don't want water fluoridation and they're very tritely being told go and get a water tank. That's fine for those that can afford a water tank and who have the space to actually have a water tank. What about the millions of people that live in apartment buildings and you know, blocks where you can't actually have tanks? And, I believe, in Australia it's actually illegal to drink out of your own tanks these days.

[00:21:45]

David: Yeah, and like you say, so many people either can't afford it or don't have the space for a tank. Many people couldn't afford to buy the amount of bottled water you would need for all of your cooking and even showering – some people get quite harmed by showering in fluoridated water. Sensitive

people get prickly rashes and absorb that water. Bathing in it – you absorb a lot of fluoride from bathing in warm fluoride bath. No, it's *ridiculous* to think that people who need to escape fluoride can go and organise their own water supply. We all pay our water rates for a proper clean water supply, and in fluoridated towns, we're *not* getting it.

[00:22:25]

Jaya: Do you think the question of fluoridation should be decided by communities as a whole?

[00:22:31]

David: Well, not really. Ultimately, it's an individual choice and fluoride just *should not* be put in the water. But, even at the community level where governments have sometimes sort of pretended to run a community consultation, people have still not even been given the vote. For example, in Geelong, at the 2006 Victorian State Election, the Victorian Government promised the people of Geelong that *they* would make any choice there was to be made about fluoridation. But then after Mr. Bracks won that election and handed over to Premier John Brumby, they forced fluoridation on Geelong with no vote and no say by the people at all. So, even where they talk about having a community consultation, it doesn't happen. There's a, there may be a few town meetings like there were in Geelong. All the people at the town meetings said 'no' to fluoridation, right down to the last person in those meetings, but the Government then claimed, "we've done our consultation, now we're going ahead with fluoridation."

[00:23:33]

Jaya: Has the government actually ever released any reports or anything on consultation they've done with the community?

[00:23:40]

David: No, no. Just in press releases they'll claim the community has been consulted, when it's been this bogus consultation.

[00:23:49]

Jaya: So, how should people feel about this? I mean, our rights as individuals have been completely stamped.

[00:23:55]

David: Utterly stamped. And, I think people around my city of Geelong are very angry about it. People should be *outraged*. Because medical tyranny, where health authorities 'know' what's best for people and can force it onto them in the form of toxic drugs – that's a very dangerous and slippery slope.

[00:24:17]

Jaya: We need a summary of your personal thought as a naturopath and what you've seen through your clinic, to do with water fluoridation, symptoms you may have seen or people that are suffering. What you've actually seen in your twenty years of experience, and perhaps then just summarise what needs to be done in Australia.

[00:24:36]

David: Okay. I've seen a number of people who get acute, immediate reactions to fluoridated water; people who are getting skin rashes from consuming even small amounts; people with stomach pains; more than one person whose asthma attacks are made a lot worse if they accidentally use

some fluoridated water. But I'm *really* concerned about the things you *don't* see, and that's the long-term damage. And there is enough scientific evidence – more than five hundred scientific papers were included in the USA's National Research Council report – talking about long-term damage of using fluoridated water. And, that's what concerns me the most and that's what our health departments around Australia are doing nothing to deal with, and the NHMRC is doing nothing to deal with it. So I think we need communities to get angry. We need communities to be contacting their premiers and their local state members of Parliament, and their federal members of Parliament, and lodging their objections loudly and clearly. I'm very excited to see that there are people who refuse to pay their water bills now when their water becomes fluoridated. And that's an extreme step, but I think it's a very valid and reasonable way of taking non-violent, but very strong action to show that you won't tolerate being poisoned by water authorities and by governments.

[00:26:06]

Jaya: But, apparently these people are now 'criminals' because they're not paying their water bills. Haven't they got a right to refuse water that they don't want to drink or bathe in?

[00:26:14]

David: Ah, yes. They should have that right and we should not have to *pay* for water that we're trying as hard as we can not to *use*, and having to spend a lot of our *own* money to organise our filtration systems and alternative supplies of water.

[00:26:32]