

FIRE WATER

Australia's Industrial Fluoridation Disgrace

Exposing the systematic industrial waste poisoning of Australian drinking water supplies

Frank Parsons – Interview Transcript

**Interview conducted by
Jaya Chela Drolma**

**Transcribed by
Rosemarie Zalec & Jaya Chela Drolma**

September 2010

[00:33:11]

Frank: Frank Parsons. I worked for years in the chemical field doing analytical work and plant management. The.... In later years though, I've specialised in the tissue analysis from human and other mammalian samples and looked at what was causing those levels. So formed opinions as to what causes changes in the human physiology.

[01:14:22]

Jaya: What are your scientific credentials?

Frank: I have a Diploma of Science from Deakin University and a Certificate of Applied Chemistry from the Gordon Institute of Technology.

Jaya: Thank you. What is your background and what is your involvement in the water fluoridation issue?

[01:24:23]

Frank: Only as an interested party in terms of the opportunity to analyse the population and discover what elements are essential and which ones are toxic and what effects they're having on the human race at present.

[01:52:12]

Jaya: Have you had direct involvement in water fluoridation?

Frank: No only in so far as it can -- I've analysed the water as it comes out of the tap.

[01:02:09]

Jaya: According to Vyvyan Howard, Professor of Bio-imaging, Bio Medical Sciences at the University of Ulster in Coleraine and foetal toxicology, expert, there is a particular danger to infants from fluoridated water. Now Professor Howard states that we are circumventing the natural defences provided by mothers' breast by putting fluoride into tap water. What has your own research shown in relation to infant exposure to fluoridated water? Is fluoride dangerous to infants; and why?

Frank: Well from an ordinary perspective, the first thing is that the mothers breasts appear to reduce the fluoride levels and she provides milk with them

approximately .013 milligrams per litre of fluoride in it. If you then think about the replacement of that with a formula and you use 1 milligram per litre fluoridated water from the tap and allow for a little bit of evaporation during the heating of that water in the formula, you're dosing the baby at a hundred times the natural level. Now that bothers me because there seemed to be no problem with the level that was in the female breast before fluoridation and in fact the New Zealand and Australian authorities accepted that the level in the female breast were at .013 milligrams per litre was suitable and the proper level. But when you go to the extremes of putting fluoride in everybody's water, then there are no exclusions to who gets it and in this case the infants get about a 100 times more than they would if they were being breastfed.

[04:19:04]

Jaya: Do you think that's a dangerous level?

Frank: The body certainly didn't evolve to be exposed to those levels so it would be my opinion that it was the wrong thing to do.

Jaya: Has the Australian, have Australian mothers been warned about this as far as you know?

[01:04:36]

Frank: Ah well, I was published on the subject in a journal but the likelihood of them getting that journal is pretty remote and apart from what you might pick up by Internet studies. I've never seen it advertised that such a monstrous step really was being taken to alter the natural course of things.

[01:05:05]

Jaya: So the American Dental Association recommends fluoride free water for mixing infant formula. Should Australian mothers be given the same warning?

Frank: Definitely and they should also be warned that fluorides at quite high doses are in antibiotics and other medications and that at present the average rate of fluorosis dental fluorosis in American children is 32%. I found this similar level of fluoride toxicity in the tissues that I've analysed. I think I've analysed 2000 now and at least 30% of those were what I considered toxic to fluoride.

[01:06:04]

Jaya: So 1 in 3 children are developing dental fluorosis in America from fluoridated water. You find that that's a similar example happening here in Australia?

Frank: I do.

[01:06:12:05]

Jaya: And would you in your opinion consider dental fluorosis to be a toxic dose of fluoride or a build up of fluoride that's become toxic?

Frank: Well children that aren't exposed to antibiotics or fluoridated water have no mottling of the teeth no hyper mineralisation so if you use that as a yardstick you've quite drastically altered the dietary uptake of fluoride if it produces fluorosis to that extent if I just wouldn't countenance.

[01:06:56:23]

Jaya: Your company, 'Alternative Health Sciences' has conducted extensive tests such as tissue samples on people in an attempt to discover possible fluoride toxicity. What have your results revealed?

Frank: Across the board there is about 30% fluoride toxicity before the addition of fluoride to their drinking water. This is because fluorides are in insecticides. They will be shortly used to kill the bugs that develop in silos

[01:07:36:01]

Jaya: I had to stop the tape here. Frank said, *what?*

Frank: Fluorides are in insecticides. They will be shortly used to ah to kill the bugs that develop in silos.

[01:07:54:15]

Jaya: Fluoride is being sprayed in silos? Where food is stored? I did some research and came up with these astounding facts. Sulfuryl fluoride is a colourless odourless liquid gas fumigant that has been used since the 1950's to kill bugs and rats that attack wooden structures. On January 23rd 2004 the United States EPA passed new regulations granting Dow Agrichemicals permission to use Sulfuryl fluoride gas with a tradename, *Profume*, as a post harvest fumigant for use in storage facilities such as silos or warehouses fumigation chambers food handling and commodity processing facilities with a withholding period after fumigation at a minimum of 24 hours. [01:08:48:23] Then, on the 1st January, 2008, the government of Australia passed legislation that allows Sulfuryl fluoride to be used in warehouses replacing methyl bromide which is an ozone depleting chemical that Dow also produces. Note these two names: *Dow Agrosiences* and *Dow Agrochemicals* are the same company, and the applicant who lobbied hard to get into Australia. That is, *Dow* got what they wanted in US, then Australia soon after despite existing Australian legislation of over 50 years standing. Sulfuryl fluoride is an odourless, tasteless chemical, odourless, tasteless. There are currently no labelling requirements worldwide for foods fumigated with Sulfuryl fluoride. I must mention that in Australia, quote, "The Australian Pesticide and Veterinary Medicines Authority are satisfied that the proposed use of *Profume* gas fumigant would not adversely affect trade between Australia and places outside Australia", unquote. And quote, "The proposed use of *Profume* gas fumigant will not be an undue hazard to the safety of people using anything containing its residues", unquote. [01:10:15:07] Not an undue hazard to the "safety of people". So by this, I presume they mean that Sulfuryl fluoride is completely safe. Remember this is what the NHMRC and others say about fluoride in drinking water and these bodies have presented reports that fall far short when it comes to adequate long term safety testing. But in stark contrast, according to the Californian Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the OEHHA, Sulfuryl fluoride's affect on animals' tested is, quote, "Vacuolisation of brain sections", unquote. This means holes in the brain. [01:11:06:01] OEHHA quote, "believes infants and children should be regarded as potential sensitive subpopulations due to the neurotoxin effects of Sulfuryl fluoride. The brain is the primary target for Sulfuryl fluoride toxicity.

We are concerned that younger populations may be especially sensitive to Sulfuryl fluoride exposures”, unquote. And following a lot of scientific terminology regarding the brain, the OEHHA concludes, quote, “Sulfuryl fluoride exposures can have profound effects on all of these neurologic developmental processes”, end of quote. So how on earth can this chemical be considered safe in human terms? How irresponsible was this decision that the Australian Government passed the legislation in 2008 to allow this fumigant to be used around food without taking into account, the research data conclusively showing Sulfuryl fluoride’s effects on the brain that were done by OEHHA in 2001 -- seven years prior? How irresponsible was this decision, made without ordering any human testing? [01:12:33:12] Politicians must be held accountable for the decisions they make on behalf of the Australian people and future generations. Will people still choose to eat products if they know they were fumigated with Sulfuryl fluoride? Sulfuryl fluoride’s potency cannot be detected, making this chemical even more insidious. That is, Sulfuryl fluoride is a colourless, odourless chemical. The dose cannot even be measured by the eyes, or nose; and remember, fluoride in drinking water is still accumulating daily at the recommended safe RATE, not dose, at one part per million per litre. We are being dosed with fluoride from so many sources each day. Now back to Frank.

[01:13:29:03]

Frank: So, even too many of our teas have a - quite a high level of fluoride and one has to be very, very careful. An extra one here where I’m located Geelong is there are fluoride emissions from fertilizer factories. There’s fluoride emissions to the atmosphere from aluminium foundries, and also from the burning of materials in some of the power generation and cement works.

[01:13:08:04]

Jaya: Hmm. So what advice would you give to people drinking fluoridated water?

Frank: Just that I wouldn’t drink it. The difficulty is that with fluorides is that they are accumulative and when I analyse tissue such as teeth that have been extracted there can be very high levels of fluoride in the teeth. The same can be true of what’s in the bone and we find this in wildlife, in areas where there’s high aerial emissions of fluoride that the likes of kangaroos and that, are showing skeletal fluorosis. So I think it’s a very dangerous substance and that we should minimize this uptake, not be maximising it.

[01:15:02:10]

Jaya: What would you say to governments that continue to force fluoridation onto communities?

Frank: That they should do what I did and do tissue analysis and as a precautionary principle they shouldn’t add it to the water until they have done that for the areas where they’re proposing to do it. But notwithstanding that, I see no argument to put it in, and it’s in my view, quite an aggressive ah approach to ah, to provide for the welfare of the community.

[01:15:48:01]

Jaya: If fluoride is supposed to be 'safe and effective', which is that we've had that touted for so long - if fluoride is so 'safe and effective' - why do you think governments then provide legislation that protects the government from any, suits that might be put against them for damage from fluoride?

[01:16:07:17]

Frank: First of all to stop the avenue as a lawful means to stop the government from putting it in. And secondly, there ARE accidents in terms of its addition; and whilst the government members may completely believe the literature that suggests that fluoride is safe, they are largely ignorant to the information that showed up in my analysis - being that there's so much fluorides now used, that 30% of the population are naturally fluoride toxic.

[01:17:00:00] The reason that I hold the views I do is I've analysed in excess of 2000 human samples routinely and correlated that with the symptoms that I was seeing. And when you get a high proportion of particular symptoms, coupled with a high level of fluoride, it is -- an opinion can be drawn that the fluoride IS involved. So I speak from my own experience in the field of analysing samples.