

# **FIRE WATER**

## **Australia's Industrial Fluoridation Disgrace**

**Exposing the systematic industrial waste poisoning of Australian drinking water supplies**

### **Malcolm McClure – Interview Transcript**

**Interview conducted by  
Jaya Chela Drolma & Anna Michalik**

**Transcribed by  
Rosemarie Zalec**

**September 2010**

**[00:00:33]**

**Malcolm:** Hi, I'm Malcolm McClure. I'm the National Coordinator of V.O.I.C.E. of Australia, which is a voting organisation for individual and collective empowerment. I'm also the National Coordinator of UPMART and... which is a human rights movement. The matter of fluoride is something I'd put on hold while I was doing many other human rights matters. Because I thought for myself that the issue of forced medication without consent was so simple, and had been taken up in other countries that have thrown forced medication out; forced fluoridation out. And I thought well surely the advocates here in Australia would be able to handle this particular issue, so I stayed out of it while I was doing other human rights issues and for many, many a year and then Anna rang me up and asked me to come down and do a presentation in Geelong, which I did and... that presentation was well received and as a consequence of that, the Geelong people commenced a referendum on fluoridation. **[00:01:46]** Now that referendum was of the people, by the people, for the people, founded within their original jurisdiction, so the people have an authority in their original jurisdiction as the Creators of the State, as the constituents of the State, of the Parliament. The Creators. We are above the statute law, we are above the constitutions, when we collectively stand and voice our will at the poll because we the people are the ones who dissolve Parliament by our Will. And then elect a new Parliament by our Will: by the collective consensus. So the collective consensus in a democratic country is all-powerful and the constituents within the communities have not fully realised the power that they have within their vote. **[00:02:47]** When they get the full nature of the power that they've got, then they'll be chomping at the bit to stay on the electoral roll, to make sure they use their vote in ways that they've never ever before used. We have the authority to create mandates. We have the authority to do referenda within our original jurisdiction. Note, I say original jurisdiction. We're quoting... we're using law and authority that is above the constitution because we are the creators. We build things. We build law. We make law. We can dissolve law. We can do whatever we want when the people stand together. So following this presentation, we then did a referendum in Geelong. **[00:03:38]** We didn't get the quorum of people as required, but the referendum was taken up in two

other jurisdictions down in Warrnambool and then again up in Mildura. In Mildura we got the requisite ten percent. Now why ten percent? Because it was only ten percent of the population or thereabouts at the turn of the century that voted for the creation of the federal constitution and for the amalgamation of the states into a federal commonwealth and for the colonies to become states. [00:04:11] It was the single most important event in our political and legal history. That event is echoed down the ages through other referenda and of lesser importance of course, until matters like this arise. And when a matter such as fluoridation arises then we can step back into our original authority that is vested with us. It hasn't gone away. Just because we haven't used it doesn't mean to say that it is not there. Now over a hundred years ago it was the landowners that voted. Well now, it's we, the people who've got a franchise for over the age of eighteen who are entitled to vote. And those people voted up in Mildura. [00:04:54] And one of the things they voted for was to exercise a sanction and that sanction was that they not pay rates in protest, not only water rates but land rates as well. So they've created for themselves a legal entitlement to not pay the rates. Now that's quite unique and of course that's radical. However this is a radical problem requiring quite a... as it were an appropriate response. Now when somebody forcefully medicates, it's a violation of a human right. A fundamental human right of consent. That violation cannot go unanswered. It's not for the government to decide for us what's right and wrong for us when it comes to our own bodies. It must be, we the people that have an informed consent and that consent even were the parliament or sorry... were the people to pass a law that sanctioned fluoridation, it would still fail because, it does not provide for the individual and we've seen how the individual is so held up when it comes to say the right to wear a Burka or the right to of... whatever. [00:06:27] There's so many individual rights that are coming into the fore where individuals are saying, ok I'm important. Well that's talking about a piece of clothing. How much more important then is something going into our bodies? You know. So, if these human rights are being upheld for other things that we on the outside might consider to be small, and only a small part of the community is a small separate few individuals, then how much greater is it for the collective to be forcibly medicated? That's a much bigger issue. [00:07:03] We're not talking about a small group, if the government goes to such extremes for different groups of other different issues you might think of some, ah... might be the right to... of a farmer to chop down a tree. Or it might be some of these other issues that come to the fore, you know, that I've been involved in. And so when I weigh up the pros and cons of which is the most important issue, I have to come to the fact that any violation of our body, like forced medication for example, is a violation of fundamental human right and the Constitution and our founding fathers speak to this, now if I can sight the Constitution and I go to a section in the Constitution that speaks to...

[00:07:54]

**Jaya:** This is existing Constitution?

**Malcolm:** This is the existing Constitution. This is the Annotated Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia. This particular Constitution here is much larger than the one that you buy from the Commonwealth.

[00:08:16]

**Jaya:** Just keep it up at the camera so we can just get a shot of it. Thankyou.

**Malcolm:** What one buys down at the bookshop is this Constitution (holds up the much thinner, "Australia's Constitution").

**Jaya:** Just come back in on that one. And that's by... who's that by?

**Malcolm:** The Commonwealth of Australia.

**Jaya:** Oh ok.

[00:08:37]

**Malcolm:** Yes, Commonwealth Government printers.

**Jaya:** Yep.

**Malcolm:** And this Constitution however is not the Annotated Constitution. This gives me a summary.

**Jaya:** Ah.

**Malcolm:** Ah.

**Jaya:** Perhaps for the audience, a lot of people don't know what 'annotated' is. What does that mean?

[00:08:54]

**Malcolm:** Annotated means that... a legal commentary, in this case by Quick and Garran in a... who were involved in the foundation debates that led to the enactment of our Constitution by the People. The founding fathers saw to it that the Constitution was to be interpreted in a particular way and that's what an annotation is. So we can buy annotated Acts of Parliament and so the Parliament makes commentary of how the Act is to be interpreted. [00:09:40] And so our founding fathers make a lot of commentaries on how the Constitution is to be interpreted and how it is to be read throughout the ages; so [unclear] put a little summary and then the explanation, as it were, like a big dictionary of how things are to be read. Well here they talk of the nature of our parliaments, and the nature of our structure, our political structure and it says here the Federal Parliament and State Parliament are not sovereign bodies. They are legislatures with limited powers and any law, which they attempt to pass in excess of those powers is no more at all. It is simply a nullity entitled to no obedience. Now this is our founding fathers speaking.

[00:10:43]

**Jaya:** Could you just for the camera give us a reference perhaps a page.

**Malcolm:** That's page 791 of ah... the Commentaries on the Constitution by Quick and Garran.

[00:10:53]

**Jaya:** Great. Thank you.

**Malcolm:** And further, we go to, into the Preamble. Now one wonders why there was such a fervent effort....

**Jaya:** Perhaps before you do just move on from that, um – because a lot of lay people don't... are quite simplistic in maybe the way they understand legal manners or phrasing – what does that simply mean for the general populous?

[00:11:26]

**Malcolm:** What that means is that when the Government passes a law that is fundamentally bad; that is fundamentally wrong, then it is *not* a law. It is not have to... it does *not* have to be obeyed. It is entitled to *no* obedience. Forced medication is such a law. It is *not* entitled to any obedience and yet it is being thrown upon us. Now the apathy of the population *is* at fault. [00:12:05] The people are at fault because they have not seen the thin edge of the wedge as it were and when some of these small little things happen that's the thin edge of the wedge. You know it's the I think it's called gradualism. They bring it in to one little area, then they bring it in more areas. And now they're working on the country regions, which have never to this point been medicated because of the 'country spirit' being so strong. [00:12:40] Geelong defeated the fluoridation at earlier times. Mildura is another, and other country regions that have so held out, ah, for such a long period of time, and thus they have not been medicated. Now we've gone away from it. But it speaks to the fundamental authority of the people to veto as it were a bad law and this is where the people need to be minded of their conscience and to listen to their conscience, their fundamental knowledge of what 's right and wrong. Even if fluoride *were* good for you, which I don't believe it is, even if it were good for you, the position to take legally is that the Government's got no right or authority to medicate me, an individual, against my consent.

[00:13:36]

**Jaya:** There is an analogy that goes around in certain circles, it's called the apple analogy. If I like apples but don't want an apple, is it your right to force me to eat an apple?

[00:13:49]

**Malcolm:** Exactly. I use a similar analogy with the banana. I said, just because I like bananas, there's no reason for the government to force me to... or anybody to make me eat a banana at a time when I don't want to eat it. You know I am over the age of 18, so therefore ah... or over the what we call sewejurous[?]. In 21 years of age common law, 18 years of age by statute, meaning that being over the age of 21 I can enter into my own contracts and look after myself the way I want to and even if I like a banana, I like bananas, nobody can make me eat a banana if I don't want to. It's a similar thing; this is a chemical rape. And this is what it is. It is a *chemical rape*. [00:14:43] And the *insanity* of fluoride is easily seen in the logistics. I mean if somebody wants fluoride tablets, then so be it. Get... go down to the chemist. If

somebody wants fluoride then let *them* take it. But for all of the rest of us that don't want it then this is *insanity* to actually make us have it or to expose us to it. We're going one step further in so far as the Government does not have a right to expose me to a chemical that may potentially injure me.

[00:15:22]

**Jaya:** So what would you say to those authorities that are forcing this chemical upon them, especially when I personally have seen over the last few days some very sad stories of people suffering terribly because they can't avoid fluoride. They can avoid it perhaps in what they drink, but they can't avoid it from food supplies that are made with fluoridated water because fluoride concentrates when you when you boil it or cook it. How, you know that means that you basically your whole life becomes restrictive. What would you say to authorities that have made these decisions?

[00:16:00]

**Malcolm:** They have opened themselves up for claims of damages against them, *individually*.

[00:16:05]

**Jaya:** But there's both Victoria and Queensland have legislation that...

**Malcolm:** ... Protects the Parliament – hence what we have done is we've gone to vetoing rates and civil disobedience.

[00:16:16]

**Jaya:** There's one person that we have within these films, who has decided not to pay his rates and he is now being summoned.

**Malcolm:** We're ready for that.

[00:16:28]

**Jaya:** By court of law to pay his rates. Now he's been made a criminal because he chooses. He first of all thinks it's criminal to force-fluoridate his daughter who has severe allergies and has suffered from cancer, so he thinks it's criminal as a father to allow that to happen to his daughter, but the Government is making him a criminal because he doesn't want to pay for water that he considers a poison. So this is a bizarre point of situation for anybody. To be placed in that situation by your own government that is supposed to be caring about your welfare. That to me is heinous. There's no other word for it, to cause that much suffering to one family. Even one family by this jurisdiction to me is really ethically, morally, spiritually, just simply wrong. So I... we'll go back to the Constitution. We'll ask further questions. What has the results of the referendums been?

[00:17:33]

**Malcolm:** 96% of the people voted against fluoridation. 90...

**Jaya:** ... This is in....

**Malcolm:** ... In Mildura. 96%. And a similar percentage in Geelong, though that referendum is not concluded yet.

[00:17:51]

**Jaya:** That's pretty blanket isn't it?

**Malcolm:** Yeah, that's over 4,000 people voting, and 96% of those saying 'no'.

[00:18:03]

**Jaya:** Could you just for the camera very briefly explain the voting procedure that was required by law for that to be valid.

[00:18:11]

**Malcolm:** It was stringent. It was more stringent, the... our voting procedure is more stringent than that of the Federal Government. The people had to be marked off the electoral roll, then they had to fill out their claim, their entitlement to vote, in addition, and they had to produce identification, and they got a receipt for their vote. And the ballots were completed in pen and not pencil. So we did triplicate ballots. They were numerically sequenced. They were audited, which means that there's a proper audit trail for each individual vote whilst maintaining anonymity. [00:18:58] The standard that V.O.I.C.E. of Australia has gone to is way and above anything that the Government has ever been able to produce. (holding up sample ballot paper) The referendum ballot that's been in operation in Mildura, Geelong and Warrnambool and Mildura, did I say that? (Laugh) In Mildura, Geelong and Warrnambool. We see here that we've in question one regarding the will of the people with regard to fluoridation and in the next section to do with the Constitution and the interpretation of the Constitution and down here with regard to sanctions. Sanctions of the people. [00:19:50] And it's in these sections here with regard to the Federal Constitution and the sanctions that the people are going one step further than they ordinarily would in an ordinary referendum – and only a referendum of the people, by the people, for the people can do what we have done here. The first question says, in this referendum, are you against fluoridation of community water supplies? And 96% of the people said 'yes'. [00:20:26] And it said down here, the Commonwealth of Australia constitution pursuant to section 23 ah... 51 23A says, "the Parliament shall subject to this Constitution have power to make laws for peace, order, good government of the Commonwealth with respect to provision of medical and dental services, but not as so to authorise any form of civil conscription." [00:20:48] And the people, with response to the question, "do you claim that fluoridation is unconstitutional dental service", the, 96% of the people said – yes that it is an unconstitutional dental service and here is the flier... that's on the other side of the ballot of the sample ah, where we are inviting people to come down and vote to have their say, and so if there's a ref... a... V.O.I.C.E. of Australia referendum in your area, we encourage you to come down and have your say as well. We have a bit of interesting questions here and we hope for people to come down and enjoy a vote at the ballot.

[00:21:41]

**Jaya:** And yet, despite this vote, fluoridation has been forced through.

[00:21:45]

**Malcolm:** The vote itself was filed into the Parliament, and the Parliament, the petition notifying the Parliament of the vote was rejected by the Parliament because it had too many pages. They wanted me to cut down the number of pages and I and how can I... *this is the result. This is the petition notifying the Parliament of the referendum result. We have to give information. Now*

previously, many years ago, I put multiple page petitions into the Parliament, like 20, 30 page petitions, of lots of information and facts. [00:22:34] Now the Parliament's saying we only want one sentence, one header, and the signatures underneath it. So all of a sudden the right of freedom of communication on government and political matters, which is a High Court ruling, has been vetoed by the State Parliament on a pretext that it only wants a short amount of paragraph so it can fit the signatures in underneath. Well I've got more to say than one paragraph. And how could the government previously have allowed multiple page petitions and all of a sudden arbitrarily say we're going to restrict the size of... petitions down to a mere one page with a signature underneath it? [00:23:16] There is serious violations of not only human rights, but violations of political rights as well. So this matter of fluoride is now brought up another corruption within the Parliament – namely the stifling of free speech and political communication. How bad is it getting when the Parliament restricts the size of petitions? How bad is that? Is my right to have my say, it's the right of the people to have their say, and the fact that the Parliament's gone this far is quite frankly... I'm a pretty level-headed bloke, but this is pissing me off. [00:23:53] This is really... the violation here, this is a High Court matter. We haven't had the time yet to take it there because we're too busy with other matters, but we are going there. This State Parliament of Victoria is *not* allowed to curtail our right to notify them of a legal binding referendum on the matter of fluoridation.

[00:24:15]

**Jaya:** Is there anything you wanted to add? I noted that you were about to turn the page to another section of the Constitution.

[00:24:22]

**Malcolm:** Yes, the Preamble of the Constitution – very important. The Preamble is the area of the Constitution that Johnny Howard wanted to change, if you recall. A referendum on the matter. Why were they so adamant to change the Preamble of our Constitution? What is so... and I am getting a bit 'suss' of the government now, whenever it wants to do anything, I'm questioning – every time they make a change it seems to be for the worse. Every time, they make a law, it seems to be for the worse. [00:24:57] Well an investigation of our Constitution reveals why the Government was so intent. Number 1: Our entire legal system, our entire Parliament and government bodies are based are reliant on the blessing of Almighty God. More than that, the people are upheld as sovereign, naturally, within the Constitution pursuant to that blessing. And I go here to the Constitution and the founders here who have also looked carefully into the American constitutions and other constitutions around the world, because we our Constitution came effectively *after* all those other constitutions. [00:25:46] So we have the benefit of hindsight and we're able to draw from the other constitutions, you know, such as the United States Constitution, the Canadian Constitution and the Swiss Constitution. Hence with Section 128 and thus it is written into our Constitution was these words, "I stated further that if the question was asked of some politician who had not considered subject with sufficient accuracy, where the supreme power resided in our government? – You would answer that it was vested in the state constitutions. This opinion approaches near the truth, but

does not reach it for the truth is the *supreme, absolute and uncontrollable authority remains with the people*. [00:26:36] I mentioned also that the practical recognition of this truth was reserved for the honour of this country. I recollect no constitution founded of... on this principle, but we've witnessed the improvement and enjoy the happiness of seeing it carried into practice." So we the people in Australia are the sovereign, supreme authority, the supreme, absolute and uncontrollable authority, and we can exercise that authority at referenda of and by the people and we have done this in our referenda ah... through V.O.I.C.E. of Australia.

[00:27:11]

**Jaya:** Great. Just before you move on, just go back one step and what you've just written in very simple speak, plain speak, could you just explain that to our audience.

[00:27:22]

**Malcolm:** In very simple speak, it means that 'we are the boss'. We the people are the supreme authority; and how do we get to live that authority? How do we get to flex that muscle? How do we get to do it? Well we can do it in many ways. We can do it with a mandate. We can do it with a political protest, people take to the streets. Or we can do it with a referendum, which is the way that we did it, and interestingly in our founding document, we have Almighty God referenced. [00:28:06] Now I mentioned this. Almighty God is very important in our founding principles, because our ah... Constitution acknowledges us individually as sovereign. Now it appears that we've got a little case of the 'Parliament versus God', because the Parliament is exercising arbitrary authority against sovereign individuals, against the blessing. Now it may be a little bit complicated to understand the full legal significance of what the blessing means, and we're looking at the Constitution, not only from a perspective of a legal document, but also from a perspective of a *ethical* document. [00:28:59] An ethical doctrine, where the sovereign individual is acknowledged. The Parliament in the passage of legislation that forcefully medicates us is not honouring us as the sovereign individuals that God honours us as. So this is pretty sad for the government to veto a fundamental right to do with our inviolability of person. Now inviolability of person is our sanction, as it were our 'holy ground', of our body where we can't be tampered with. What would happen if there's a... there's a case of violence or somebody gets attacked or assaulted. We say oh that's an assault. [00:29:55] That's a criminal offence. Well for the government to medicate me or to expose me to being exposed to medication against my consent, is a *criminal offence* against me. It's a crime. And fundamentally, against the very nature of our Constitution and the Parliament is actually way out of line.

[00:30:21]

**Jaya:** I'll just pick you up on a point there. The government is actually saying that fluoride is, not a medication. They're saying it's a nutrient, for goodness sake, I don't know where in any of the scientific bibles it's ever said that fluoride is a nutrient, but they're basically saying it's a nutrient and it's not a medication.

[00:30:43]

**Malcolm:** The Parliament is changing its position. It's moving like a snake in the grass. Only a while ago, it was a medication. And now just for convenience, it becomes a 'nutrient'. Doesn't matter. The Government's got no right to force any nutrient into me that I don't want. I don't care which way they move it or shift it or shake it. A spade's a spade by any other name. They're forcefully giving me a 'nutrient' that I don't want? (Laugh)

[00:31:19]

**Jaya:** It's very simple isn't it?

**Malcolm:** It's very simple. It doesn't matter which way they colour it, it's a fundamental... a violation of my right.

[00:31:30]

**Jaya:** Do you believe that mandatory water fluoridation is ethical?

[00:31:35]

**Malcolm:** Ethical? (Laughter) Of course not. How could it be ethical? I mean you know, 'Durr'. What have I just been talking about? Ethics! You know. Ethics is where you honour somebody's rights. Ethics is where you say, ok, I honour that person's consent. That's *ethical*. What's *not* ethical is the government saying, I don't care what you say, I'm going to do it anyway. That's *not* ethical.

[00:32:05]

**Jaya:** In an online article titled, "Fluoride in drinking water" you stated, quote "the focus of debates on fluoridation is usually and cleverly turned to the ground of health benefits to teeth. For the anti-fluoridation campaigner, this ground of health, however, is not always the best ground to stand upon, though it is the most common ground" unquote. Can you please elaborate on this for campaigners who may be in a similar situation at the moment?

[00:32:38]

**Malcolm:** Well I don't believe for a moment that it's there for my health. See that little thing on my tooth there? That's from fluoride. There's no need to get a close up – it's there. (Laughs)

[00:32:54]

**Jaya:** I just want to show... just open. It's a little mark [Yep] on your teeth.

[00:33:00]

**Malcolm:** That mark there comes from fluoride, and fluoride hardened the enamel to a point where underneath it became soft. Ok, so it... fluoride is not a natural substance for our bodies. Our bodies want to throw out fluoride. There's no organ in our body that naturally uses fluoride. It's not found naturally in our body. [00:33:31] It's one of those substances that replaces iodine and is an antagonist to iodine and to our thyroid. It's so it cannot be a nutrient, when in fact the body has no need for it. I'm reading here a response from Dr. Carnie, who says, "the Australian Constitution gives the Australian Government the power to legislate for medical and dental services. It doesn't... and it does not preclude a State Government from passing legislation to protect and enhance public health. [00:34:14] Well, there is no protection and enhancement of public health with fluoride. There is no evidence to support that there is an enhancement to public health; and when it comes to weighing up public health, and the individual's right to choose and

to have choice, then clearly the public health must take a second place, even at the most altruistic of level. We know that certain religions, say for example Jehovah's Witness, they won't even allow certain of their people to have a blood transfusion and so this is at the individual level on the ground of conscientious objection. So likewise if such individuals are upheld then the government has no right, even if... they hide behind the political correct term of "protection and enhancement of public health." [00:35:26] That's a politically correct way to hide behind the injustice that they're perpetuating. No amount of political correctness can fix up the harsh damage that's being done to individuals who are sensitive to... individuals such as myself that have been damaged by way of just mere having a shower against it. I don't want to infuse it through my skin, even something as simple as that. I don't have the sensitivity of some of the others, but my right has been violated on the ground that they're wanting to "protect and enhance" my public health. What a facade! They're abusing political correctness. [00:36:16] We'll go to the next sentence. "The restriction placed on the Commonwealth so that it cannot legislate in a way that authorises civil conscription, Section 51a, is a recognition of the importance of the right to professional independence of health practitioners and the right to exercise a choice in doctrine"... sorry... "in doctor-patient relations. This does not relate to nor restrict," says Carnie, "the capacity of the Victorian Government to make laws which ensure that all Victorians have access to the best standards of community health by way of water fluoridation." [00:36:55] That's a gobbledegook Doublespeak. That Doublespeak is an abuse of a government official in his administrative office. Now the fact that he'll beguile the average Joe out there who won't get his Doublespeak, is a violation and an abuse of his office. I get his Doublespeak. And water fluoridation is nothing other than a forced medication and if it's... and you can't cut it any other way. It is not there for the best interest. And if we open up the door to fluoridation, then we've opened up the door to all other substances going into our water supply. It's the thin edge of the wedge and I don't want to see that wedge get any bigger and it's gotta be stopped at fluoride. [00:37:54] It is the thin edge of the wedge and that's what it comes... and this gobbledegook of Carnie and his Doublespeak is simple and, and easy to tear down by the likes of those who know it, but he puts two active clauses within the one sentence, which you can't do in a in a legal context. For example "this does not relate to nor restrict the capacity of the Victorian Government to make laws which ensure that all Victorians have access to the best standards." He's not ensuring that all Victorians have access to the best standards. "All Victorians" includes me! I'm a Victorian. I'm one of those "all"... "all." Everybody? All Victorians? Well hello! What about those people that have been affected? Hello! What about all those that have got rashes and have got ah hypothyroid problems or thyroid... or problems because of this? I mean this is all Victorians, clearly then the policy is failing because we've got one or two Victorians, and in fact thousand Victorians, that are getting an adverse effect from fluoride, so clearly this statement by the Government is going against its own... it fails. [00:39:19] It's just so blatantly stupid that you'd have to be a fool to even for him to actually say something like this. So he says here, the capacity of Victorian Government to make laws to ensure

that all Victorians have access to the best standards of community health.” Now ok, let’s go to the next part of it. “Best standards.” Well world best practice promotes that an individual’s got the right of free choice. That’s the world best practice. Oh a doctor asks you, do I, is it ok that you wanna take this medication? I’ll give you some information about the contraindications of this medication. Well the government hasn’t given us information about the contraindications of fluoride. And that’s their duty of care to give us that information. They have failed to give us that information.

[00:40:07]

**Jaya:** They... It is ‘commonly known’ that fluoride is quote “safe and effective”. What would you say to that?

[00:40:17]

**Malcolm:** It’s not safe and effective to those people who have been damaged by it, to those people who have got rashes because of it. For those people that are clinically diagnosed as sensitive to fluoride. It’s *clearly* not good for them.

[00:40:33]

**Jaya:** And what would you say to the government on their lack of providing any alternatives as in filtration or free water tanks, because they can’t avoid fluoride?

[00:40:45]

**Malcolm:** The government’s got a duty of care to provide to those people that don’t want the fluoride, water tanks, filtration, just as it’s got a duty of care to ‘do the public health thing’, it’s also got a duty of care to uphold our rights. So, it can’t have its cake and eat it too. It can’t just poison us and throw the fluoride in the water and expect those people that are sensitive to it to just cop it and take it sweet in order that the rest of the people, those few people that might get a benefit from it, get that benefit. [00:41:24] Even, they’re actually asking the majority to suffer or a minority to suffer to benefit somebody else. That’s a false economy. That’s a false... legally it fails. Ethically it fails. Every way it fails. It’s a madness. And then we go to the last sentence there... by way of water fluoridation; and we don’t call it fluoridation, we call it fleddication. Fleddication. It’s not fluoridation, it’s fleddication. (Laugh)

[00:41:59]

**Jaya:** Explain fleddication.

**Malcolm:** A forced medication. They’re flagellating us as it were, fleddication, (laugh) say no to fleddication (Laugh)

[00:42:13]

**Jaya:** Something like that.

**Malcolm:** Exactly.

**Jaya:** But on legal grounds people can feel confident that they have the right and duty to uphold the Constitution, which the government seems to be ignoring completely.

[00:42:24]

**Malcolm:** Exactly... Commonwealth of Australia Constitution.

**Jaya:** Yep.

[00:42:31]

**Malcolm:** And on reading from Section 51 in our Constitution, and it says “the Parliament shall have shall... subject to this Constitution, have powers to make laws for the peace, order and good governance of the Commonwealth with respect to: the provision of maternity allowances, widows pensions, child endowment, unemployment, pharmaceutical, sickness and hospital benefits, medical and dental services”, but in brackets – and this is the all important part – “but not so as to authorise any form of civil conscription.” The Federal Constitution says there cannot be a civil conscription with regard to dental services. [00:43:32] Conscription is nothing other than a forced medication. If I were to substitute forced medication with subscription[sic], then they’re equivalent. And so we’re seeing here that the government is forcefully giving us civil conscription by way of forced medication. Civil conscription, forcefully medicating us. What I interpret this very clearly, and others have interpreted this to mean, that the Constitution is being violated by the State Governments. Of those 4000 plus people who voted, 96% said... 96% voted and said that the government is violating our rights pursuant to the Constitution. [00:44:31] 96% of the people said the government is forcefully medicating us against the spirit of the Constitution. Thousands and thousands of people interpreted the Constitution and said the government is violating this section of the Constitution. We didn’t need the High Court to make a ruling that the government is violating our rights pursuant to the Constitution. The people have already said it. 96% said the government is violating our rights pursuant to the constitution. That says it! And the people quoted that section, they read that section and they said the government is wrong. They’re breaking our rights pursuant to the Constitution.

[00:45:15]

**Jaya:** In an online article titled “Fluoride in drinking water” you stated, quote “the focus of debates on fluoridation is usually cleverly turned to the ground of health benefits to teeth. For the anti-fluoridation campaigner this ground of health however is not always the best ground to stand upon though it is the most common ground” unquote. Can you please elaborate on this for campaigners who maybe in a similar situation at the moment.

[00:45:43]

**Malcolm:** I *would not* stand alone on the ground of health benefit. It’s much, much easier for a fluoride... anti-fluoride campaigner to focus on the simplicity of human rights, the simplicity of my inviolability. The government has *no right* to medicate me. Even if it was good for me. Putting all that aside, and not withstanding, how crazy is it to put all this waste product into [the fluoride] into our water, all this waste product into our water supply, when it’s only targeted specifically to a small group of children. [00:46:40] Mostly they’re targeting children, not adults, and not people with false teeth, and you know there’s this is madness, the modality of medication is madness, you know ah (laughs) what I mean there it would be similar to saying ok we think that iodine might be good for everybody, so we’re going to put iodine into the water supply, we’re going to give *everybody* iodine. Well it might be a good thing, we will

need a little bit more iodine – but there are some people out there that are hyper-allergic to iodine.

[00:47:24]

**Jaya:** So there's some areas in the community where for instance they take bread, and they'll put iodine in bread, but at least still fundamentally you have choice where you go buy the bread with iodine in it, whereas with mandatory water fluoridation, which is across the board in Australia now, you have no choice, you can't escape the water supply, a most basic and fundamental need.

**Malcolm:** Yes.

[00:47:50]

**Jaya:** And it's literally changing and manipulating DNA. It's going right down to the very DNA of our bodies.

[00:47:56]

**Malcolm:** Correct. And as you said, it comes down to choice. My right to choose is taken away. When I go to a small country town, I'm on the road and I am at a hotel room and then it's got all this fluoride coming out of the water. Now, I use tank water, so I don't have showers in fluoride water. The difference for me is huge. I can smell it. I can taste it. I don't like it. But while I'm on the road I don't have a choice. [00:48:33] The choice is more or less taken away from me, and for the government to take away my choice. It is what it comes down to. You know so we have the matter of like they're violating me, it's a crime, it's a chemical trespass, it's a medication against my consent, that's you know a point; and the taking away of my choice is another point; and the fact that, does the federal or actually do state governments have jurisdiction to medicate us against our informed consent? The fundamental jurisdiction. Do they have authority to do so? The Constitution says no.

[00:49:20]

**Jaya:** In recent years you've been involved in facilitating a citizen's-run referendum, I'm just repeating. I'm having to repeat this again. In recent years, I'll tie it all together. Sorry...

**Malcolm:** I don't mind, saying things twice.

**Jaya:** ... I'll tie it all together nicely. In recent years, you've been involved in facilitating a citizen's-run referendum in the issue of water fluoridation under the banner of V.O.I.C.E. of Australia. Could you please explain how this referendum works and how it came about, maybe just briefly?

[00:49:51]

**Malcolm:** It came, the referendum came about because of individuals within the community who approached V.O.I.C.E. of Australia and asked us, "what can we do"; and in response we gave them what they could do we said well we can show you how to legally facilitate a referendum such that that referendum creates a legal entitlement – and that's what we did. We showed the community how to do a referendum, because you there's a right and wrong way to do it and there was a training process ah... the polling officials

went through an induction they had to sign the pledges, they had to take various affirmations as it were in order to become qualified to be a polling official.

[00:50:42]

**Jaya:** So would you consider the referendum so far a success?

**Malcolm:** Yes the referendum has been a success, in Warrnambool, Geelong, Mildura and Swan Hill.

[00:50:56]

**Jaya:** In your view, is the policy of mandatory fluoridation of drinking water in the spirit of the Australian Constitution?

[00:51:04]

**Malcolm:** No, the compulsory fluoridation without a consensus is against the spirit of the Constitution. Fundamentally the Constitution speaks to a Parliament that's responsive to the will of the people. In this case when the Parliament passes a law that is clearly out of kilter with the will of the people, then it is clearly not acting in response to the will of the people, but is acting pursuant to another agenda. [00:51:41] Now, what is that other agenda? Clearly we've got a vast majority. 96% of the people vehemently opposed to fluoridation and only 4% of the people say they want it. Well that ratio is not being echoed and mirrored in the Parliament. The Parliament is not being responsive to the will of the majority, which is 96%.

[00:52:10]

**Anna Michalik (O/C):** All these other organisations recommend it; that the World Health Organisation recommends it. So they're saying that they're acting *for* the people and that they've got a majority of professionals who are saying this has been official for us in the best interests of the people.

[00:52:29]

**Malcolm:** The World Health Organisation evidently hasn't been listening to the nations that have rejected fluoridation. There's only a small number of nations that continue to embrace fluoride. So that means the vast majority of nations have gone against the World Health Organisation's protocol that it's so-called 'good for you'. So what does that say? That means the World Health Organisation is out of kilter with the majority of the nations.

[00:53:03]

**Jaya:** In recent years you've been involved in facilitating a citizens-run referendum on the issue of water fluoridation under the banner of V.O.I.C.E. of Australia. Can you please explain how this referenda works and how it came about?

[00:53:20]

**Malcolm:** Our forefathers provided for us a authority over Parliament. The people have not been living that authority. What I did was merely facilitate the authority that our forefathers gave to us. It's actually we the people, that created the Federal Constitution. We voted for it at referendum over a hundred years ago. And thus we the people chose to change the states or which as... it were the colonies, into states and the states to federate in a federal Commonwealth.

[00:54:04]

**Anna Michalik (O/C):** Who do you think the World Health Organisation is? Who, when we talk about the World Health Organisation, AMA, ADA, DHS, all of these letters, who *are* those people? Are 'they' just 'they', a university of "they" or are they real people? How do we then hold the World Health Organisation to account for what they're saying and how they're stating it?

[00:54:35]

**Malcolm:** We can't at this early stage, hold the World Health Organisation accountable. The best way to hold them accountable is to do as those other nations who have rejected fluoride have done. Simply reject fluoride and we don't care what the World Health Organisation says. We're just going to reject it. We don't care what they say. We know what we want. We're a nation in our... of our own right. So we know what we want, so and we don't want fluoride.

[00:55:06]

**Jaya:** So what would you say to people watching this, doesn't matter where they are in what strata and field of society in Australia. What would you say to the people of Australia?

[00:55:16]

**Malcolm:** Simply say no. Simply recognise what is happening. See what is happening. And when you see what is happening that there's this medication against our informed consent. That there's this removal of choice. When you look at those simple things. Then you say I don't care whatever the World Health Organisation says. My job now is to fix this wrong. [00:55:48] This fundamental wrong. This violation of my political and individual rights. So I would say to the people out there, come and join us. Join the movement that's already afoot. Have a look at the class actions that are afoot and you can see the scroll at the end of this film and join into these movements that are showing you how to live your political, your legal rights, your moral and ethical rights. Join those movements that are showing you how to live and exercise your rights.

[00:56:30]

**Jaya:** And would you suggest research?

[00:56:33]

**Malcolm:** Yep. Do your own due diligence. Find out for yourself why it is that people such as myself have taken such a firm position against fluoride and read... and look at it for yourself. There is a percentage out there, about 4% who want it, but the vast majority, 96%, once they're informed, they don't want it.

[00:56:56]

**Jaya:** Mm. And, what about... what would you say about the erosion of our rights, to the government?

[00:57:00]

**Malcolm:** I would say, that if they don't 'pull up their socks,' so to speak, then they run the risk of civil disobedience and a breakdown within our political structures. History is testimony to what happens when the sleeping turtle, as it were, awakens. Now this particular issue of fluoride is a gamble on the part of those *few* who actually want to push it through. There's a few who want it through, and the vast majority don't. Now, when that vast majority stands

together, watch out. You know. There is a potential for ah... unravelling as it were of autocratic systems of government because this is not democratic. This is autocratic.

[00:57:54]

**Jaya:** What would you say to all the sufferers out there? And I've personally been interviewing a few and through research and such I know lot of people are suffering, physically a lot of pain and severe illness, cancers, diabetes, kidney disease, skin rashes, you name it and fluorosis, as simple as fluorosis. Now, fluorosis is the last symptom because it's the hardest tissue. What's it doing to our soft tissues? That question must be asked, which is answered adequately by the people who've been interviewed but what would you say to the sufferers and the people that are having this [inaudible].

[00:58:39]

**Malcolm:** To the sufferers.

**Jaya:** What can they do, according to the Constitution?

[00:58:47]

**Malcolm:** The damage that's being done is difficult to undo. You know. The teeth that have been destroyed because of fluoride. The tissues that have been destroyed. The rashes and things. Some of these things can be undone a little bit, you know. But there's a lot of damage that's happening. And they are damages for which payment for damages is not sufficient. That's a legal speak that says you've got a right to claim a financial a compensation for the damage that you've experienced. That's a fundamental right, and we have an action for you to join so that you can at least get your paper work together in readiness to lodge and file your claim against the government.

[00:59:42]

**Jaya:** But the government have put that legislation in place that they cannot be held to account.

[00:59:50]

**Malcolm:** That legislation is ultra vires. I have no qualms about challenging that legislation.

[00:59:57]

**Jaya:** So what can people do; what physically, you talk about paperwork. Is there a website or something that people can go to?

**Malcolm:** [axefluoride.com](http://axefluoride.com)

**Jaya:** How do we spell that?

**Malcolm:** [Axefluoride.com](http://Axefluoride.com)

**Jaya:** Wonderful and we'll put that up on the site for you. And that, it gives instructions on what to do?

[01:00:20]

**Malcolm:** Yes. It's a very simple site. We don't go into the health issues and all the other infractions pursuant to fluoride. It's just simply a site for people to find out where to go to um... and of course we'll have links to FluorideAlert

and some of the other ones that are already up there, and we'll work together as a community so that we can allow for people that have got damages to find their way through to us such that they can do their claim, do their affidavit and we can get ready to file their claim in the court and handle this ridiculous law that says um that the government can't be held accountable. That's crazy.

[01:01:05]

**Jaya:** Is it wise for people to ask for a moratorium? Perhaps you could explain moratorium.

[01:01:13]

**Malcolm:** A moratorium is basically a boycott, and the boycott can take various forms. We are up in Mildura at the moment, we're going to boycott, rates. There's over two hundred individuals now that are not paying their rates.

[01:01:29]

**Jaya:** And that's within peoples' jurisdiction, they're able to do that?

[01:01:35]

**Malcolm:** They're able to do that. They're entitled legally to a... have a moratorium and when they resume payment, if they do, it'll only be from the point of time... not going to back pay, no, no, no, they're just going to continue on paying if that's part of the damage that government's gotta wear. And the key questions again come to mind, does the Federal and State Parliaments have jurisdiction to medicate us against our informed consent? [01:02:14] And the Constitution speaks to this, and the answer is no. So there is a violation of human right and that's the thing we need to get out there. The violation is at the individual level and at the collective level. Then the actions we've taken to nullify those infractions against our rights are really not enough. There are people having been, as it were violated ought to even have a greater response than what they've had. I think the response has been very, very tame. Any person who medicates us against our informed consent ought to be treated harshly as we would be treated harshly. It's a it's a chemical rape, nothing short of that.

[01:03:14]

**Jaya:** Ok.

**Anna Michalik (O/C):** Do you think the reason why there isn't such a huge swell of opposition to this is because of fear?

[01:03:24]

**Malcolm:** Yeah; also people are complacent. I've found in my many years of human rights that they're comfortable, until something *really* hits them hard. They'll say I don't need to do anything yet, you know everything's still ok. I'll just let somebody else do it. Oh gee Anna's out there doing a great job. I don't have to do anything, you know, and they don't understand that our rights are with us like our Constitutional rights, because of our forefathers, and the diligence that they did to ensure that our Constitution at least gives us some basic rights and we have inherited within our law, basic rights and... but the law like this entire constitution (holding up the book) that we have here, our Australian Constitution. It's an amazing authority. [01:04:31] But it's only a book. And the words of power that are in it are *huge*. I mean, like you go into it

and you realise well these forefathers, they really had it down pat, but we're not living the rights. So this Constitution's only paper. We're the ones that give it life. So it's up to the people to take affirmative action to stand and do something. [01:05:09] We have a duty of care, all of us, in this day and age, and that duty of care is to the generations to follow and those generations that follow they need this generation, the people here and now, alive here and now, to stand, cause if we who are here and now don't stand, then we are going to once again shift the buck to the next generation; and the smallest violation of an individual's right, one individual's right by a government is the violation of everybody's right.

[01:05:47]

**Jaya:** As simple as that.

[01:05:51]