

THE CONSULTATION MYTH
'This claptrap about 'public consultation' is no more than Big Brother offering you a 'choice' over an absolute right that you already enjoy'

WATERSHED

National Pure Water Association

Croft End, Lowick Bridge, Cumbria, LA12 8EE UK
TEL: +44 (0)1229 885420. FAX: +44 (0)1229 885420

Email: liz@vaughan200.fsnet.co.uk
<http://www.npwa.freeserve.co.uk>

BRIGHTON SAYS NO - AGAIN!

Two very different meetings took place in Brighton in April. A good crowd of Brightonians gathered at the Hanover Centre on 18th to hear guest speakers thyroid specialist Dr Barry Durrant-Peatfield and West Yorkshire's Peter Crampton.

Meanwhile, preparations were underway at the Brighton Centre for the 4-day 12th Annual Public Health Forum/World Congress. Among those attending were public health minister Melanie Johnson, Sir Liam Donaldson, Chief Medical Officer and Irish Health Minister Michael Martin, who set up the much-castigated Irish Fluoridation Forum. Members of the British Fluoridation Society were also in attendance.

Volunteers from the Hanover meeting distributed thousands of 'SAY NO' leaflets outside the Brighton Centre during every day of the Congress.



Helen Dear with her baby and some of the band of enthusiastic volunteers who manned the banners and distributed thousands of leaflets at the Brighton Centre. Well done to them! Picture courtesy of *The Argus*.

YELLOW CARD CAMPAIGN A SUCCESS

As a result of generous help from *What Doctors Don't Tell You*, *Truth Magazine*, *The Green Party*, *Mother Magazine*, *Environment and Health Journal* and several other publications who circulated our postcards as inserts, tens of thousands of Yellow Cards have already landed on the desks of water company chairmen.

The water companies simply threaten to take court action to recover any monies withheld from bills, but as far as we can tell they are reluctant to take action for fear of establishing a legal precedent.

In the fluoridated North East, Newcastle osteopath Robin Watkins deducted the cost

of buying bottled water, and was threatened with court action by Northumbrian Water. But then their Customer Services Director, informed him that the Company would not be taking him to court to recover the money, implying that the case could be used as a 'national ruling'.

In the North West, a group of four hundred anti-GM campaigners wrote to United Utilities chairman, Sir Richard Evans, saying that they had received a quote for reverse osmosis equipment and had negotiated a favourable discount of £50 per unit for a group purchase. This would represent a saving of £20,000 for UU!

WATER WORKS PROFESSIONALS AT RISK OVER UNETHICAL CONDUCT

Workers at Britain's water treatment works face a serious ethical dilemma over fluoridation. Many are members of professional institutions that require them to observe strict codes of ethical conduct covering their work.

Peter Treadgold, President of the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management, urged Members to consider whether any fluoridation action that they take at a water treatment works is consistent with the CIEWM's code of ethics. Maybe some of the medical institutes and universities harbouring pro-fluoride activists should review the application of their own ethical policies?

ANGER AT UNACCEPTABLE SCIENTIFIC PRACTICE

Newcastle study tainted by 'evidence of poor design and manipulation of data'

The inconvenient findings of the York Review of Fluoridation forced the MRC to attempt to get the 'right' results in a new study

comparing the uptake of natural and artificial fluoride. Now anger at the 'misrepresentation of the research' has critics up in arms – [see page 2](#).

Jane Jones

It is with great sadness that we have to announce that Jane died on 3rd September. She bravely fought cancer for two years. We are devastated at NPWA, and our greatest sympathy and prayers go out to George, Ruth, Rachael and John

NEWCASTLE STUDY INTO BIOAVAILABILITY OF FLUORIDES PROVOKES ANGER AND RIDICULE IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

When the York Review of Fluoridation was published in 2000 it caused consternation in pro-fluoridation circles. The experts reported that not a single historical study of the effects of adding fluoride to drinking water was of adequate scientific standard to establish that it was either safe or effective.

Predictably, proponents of this public medication attempted to neutralise the Review by quoting very small extracts out of context, to the understandable anger of the York experts, who on several occasions have been forced to issue public statements refuting such distortions.

In an attempt to salvage their shaky position, the MRC then commissioned yet another study, this time apparently aimed at proving their long-held view that there is no difference between human absorption of natural and artificial fluorides.

This new study was even less adequate than those that the York experts had already dismissed as lacking scientific credibility by experts in clinical pharmacology, epidemiology, statistics and trial methodology at the Universities of York and Southampton

It is a crucial claim of the fluoride lobby that natural fluoride is good for people, and so artificial fluoride, being allegedly exactly the same stuff, must also be harmless.

Unfortunately for the fluoride lobby, the study actually found that artificial fluoride IS more quickly absorbed. But according to expert critics the claim that there was no difference was made after one of the very small number of subjects was excluded because their response was so different to that of the others that it distorted the analysis!

Now expert independent scientists have condemned the MRC study as worthless, saying that it examined too few individuals (a mere 20), used poor study design, and then adjusted the results by 'manipulation of data'

This is serious criticism indeed for

a study commissioned with the obvious objective of salvaging some credibility for fluoridation after the York Review's crippling criticism of the dental lobby's claims for its efficacy and safety. Yet how else can such a scientific *faux pas* be described? For example, the primary target of fluoridation is young children, yet this study gave fluoride only to healthy adults between the ages of 20 and 35 years – no children were involved. The same dose was given to each subject, yet they varied in body mass between 48 and 86 kg.

And when one subject showed abnormal response to the 'reference solution', the results of their tests were discarded as an 'outlier'.

Compare this with what happened over thalidomide. Failure to test it on a small but critical section of the population – pregnant women – led to catastrophic effects within a minority group. These also would have been exceptions – 'outliers' even – but certainly not ignored.

The entire study is riddled with defects. Many 'confounding factors' – differences in both the biological and social factors affecting each subject – were not allowed for, and the reference sources used are highly selective. The one finding that no one will dismiss is that rather a lot more research is needed before anyone can say with any authority whether or not silicofluorides do have a similar degree of bioavailability as natural fluoride.

The evidence from this study, whilst severely compromised, does suggest that fluoride from fluoridated water may be more rapidly absorbed than that from so-called 'naturally fluoridated' sources. But until much better research is done we shall not know. Meanwhile, it is significant that the researchers for this so far (unpublished) paper were subjected to strict ethical control before even a few tumblers of fluoridated water were given to consenting adults. **So why is it that when the experiment is repeated on the general public – no such ethical safeguards seem to be thought either necessary or appropriate?**

BRITISH FLUORIDATION SOCIETY MOVES OFFICE – TO A CHILDREN'S WARD!

The BFS has moved from Liverpool University (where its chairman, Professor Michael Lennon, once worked) to an office in Manchester – Ward 4, Booth Hall Children's Hospital. A personal enquiry at the hospital about the BFS drew blank looks from receptionists, until they heard the name 'Sheila Jones'!

ANOTHER NEW MUST READ BOOK

"The Fluoride Deception" by Christopher Bryson has been published by Seven Stories Press in New York. Members may recall the article, "Fluoride, Teeth and the Atomic Bomb" which Bryson co-wrote to Joel Griffiths in 1997.

"The Fluoride Deception" reveals the dark history of water fluoridation, with much of the information gleaned from declassified US documents. **An extremely well-sourced, must read account.**

BOOK OFFERS

NAMASTE PUBLISHING has offered to supply the following books to our members:

The Fluoride Deception, £13.99 + £3 p&p. RRP £17.99.

Tears Behind Closed Doors by Diana Holmes (noting the fluoride connection with hypothyroidism.). £6.70 + £1.50 p&p. RRP £9.95.

The Great Thyroid Scandal and How to Survive It, by Dr Barry Durrant-Peatfield. (More fluoride connections – brilliant). £11.50 + £3 p&p. RRP 12.99.

Fluoride – Drinking Ourselves to Death? By Barry Groves. This is a brilliant critique of the BFS. *Know the enemy!* £11.50 + £3 p&p. RRP £12.99.

Orders to Namaste Publishing, PO Box 127, Shrewsbury, SY3 7WS

Can you help?

In order to raise funds for the NPWA we have obtained collection tins. If you can display a tin in your local health food shop or any other place, please contact Peter Crampton on Tel 01422 884451, or email him at judithcrampton@onetel.com

THE WATER ACT CONSULTATION MYTH

In its attempt to persuade us that we will be permitted (permitted!) to voice an opinion on whether or not our water should be contaminated with fluoride, the Dept of Health has put up a smokescreen of deliberate confusion and deception concerning its willingness to listen to the concerns of the ordinary people.

Its claim that there will be full consultation, and that those wishes will be observed, has been couched in almost impenetrable and convoluted language. As always, the more devious the policy, the more complex the accompanying decoy documentation and the infamous Government's 'Guidance' notes.

In this case we have to rely on some truly amazing 'Explanatory Notes' issued by those nice people at the Department of Health so that we can understand the new **Water Fluoridation (Consultation) Regulations 2004**. They would have us believe that they are inviting our comments on the Regulations, but the text simply does not mention true public consultation, at least not as we would recognise it.

In fact, the Regulations simply says that the Strategic Health Authority is required to publish information on **what it plans to impose in the way of water fluoridation, where, when and why** - nothing there about actually asking the public for an opinion.

And even this 'consultation' will only be required when the plan is either to change the boundary of an existing scheme, or else to maintain or upgrade an existing scheme – there is no mention about consulting us, or even anyone at all when putting in any entirely new schemes.

In fact this is, they say, all about **"balancing the public interest with the need to give SHAs sufficient flexibility to manage and operate fluoridation schemes efficiently."**

The 'public interest' is of course public sector interest, and not the interest of us, the general public. It's all about cost-efficiency, and as the entire cost of the process is to be paid by the Health Authority, ultimately we subsidise the entire process – yes, that's right, we pay them to poison us!

And what happens when industry starts to cut costs? Costs and cost-cutting are going to be at the forefront of any of these new fluoridation schemes. Do you really feel confident that there will not be yet another accident, like the 1988 Camelford poisoning, or the recent incident in Pleasanton (USA) where half a tonne of silicofluoride was suddenly spilled into the water at the town's water treatment works?

In fact, no part of the Regulations actually specifies true public consultation - at least, not as we recognise that idea. Regulation 5 merely requires the Health Authority to comply with the balance of opinion expressed by those strategically (or

perhaps politically) selected to be eligible to provide an opinion.

And who are these selected few? Certainly not your local MP, Local Council or other elected representatives. Consultees will mainly be DoH-appointed members of Strategic Health Authorities and Primary Health Care Trusts. And guess what they have been persuaded to think about fluoridation!

NO ONE CAN DEPRIVE YOU OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHT TO REFUSE FLUORIDE

This claptrap about 'public consultation' is no more than Big Brother offering you and your neighbours an illusory 'democratic choice' over a right that you already enjoy, and one that the State has absolutely no power to overturn.

Article 3 of the Human Rights Act (and much other Human Rights legislation) ensures that **every person has the absolute right to refuse medication**. Why do you think that that nice Mr Blair has never made MMR vaccination compulsory?

And when you do consent to be medicated by a qualified doctor or dentist (not a water company!), at least you can expect to be treated with chemicals that have, at the very least, an appropriate medical Product Licence and have been clinically tested for safety.

Can't you?

IT COULDN'T HAPPEN HERE – COULD IT?

For a little light bedside reading try this website – it has a list of fluoridation chemical spills in the USA. If you have never thought about the risks of moving this highly toxic material around the country, discover just how often spillages have occurred elsewhere.

<http://www.penweb.org//fluoride/chemicals/accidents-us.html>

REMEMBER – THERE IS A DEADLINE FOR YOUR COMMENTS ON THE WATER ACT!

Almost two million people have already registered as objectors with the NPWA. Now it's time to tell the DoH what you think about the new power of Strategic Health Authorities to order water companies to add **unlicensed medicinal products** to your drinking water supply without your personal consent,

and do it before 29 October 2004

Contact Sarah Lowney, Office of the Chief Dental Officer,
Department Of Health, Room 330A, Wellington House,
133 - 55 Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG

Fax no 020 7972 3999 or E mail Sarah.Lowney@doh.qsi.gov.uk

CLASH OF THE TITANS!

The campaign to take the fight to the opposition is hotting up! Arguments over compulsory fluoridation have been hi-jacked by deliberately focussing on dental and medical issues.

Environmental strategist Doug Cross opened up the field by challenging the Dept of Health on human rights law and medical ethics grounds.

Then in July Liz Vaughan, Dr Dianne Philips and Doug met Foreign Secretary The Rt. Hon. Jack Straw at his constituency office in Burnley, and a very strange meeting that turned out to be. Admitting that we are winning the fluoridation fight – “Don’t push it too hard, Liz!” was his advice – lawyer Mr Straw was visibly alarmed when Doug started to discuss human rights and the use of silicofluorides (unlicensed medicinal substances) with intent to medicate the public.

Dianne then explained to him the dramatic link with thyroid damage. Too much! – we were hurried out of the room by a visibly disturbed Foreign Secretary.

All very interesting – now we know what the Health people are really worried about – Human Rights!

Score one for the campaign!

NORTH WEST COUNCILS GO NATIONAL Now get your local council to join in

Liz Vaughan has been linking up a growing number of Councils from outside the original NW area under the umbrella of the NWCAF. Now it’s time to recruit on a wider scale, so the North West Council has now gone nation-wide, and is now the UK Councils Against Fluoridation.

A recent meeting agreed that the organisation should make a presentation to Rt. Hon. Jack Straw, as the highest placed MP in the North West opposed to fluoridation. Mr Straw has now written to John Reid to inform him of the Councils’ objections to fluoridation.

Now we need Local and County Councils throughout the country that are opposed to water fluoridation to join the UKCAF. They are almost certainly unaware that the new Water Act does not include local Councils as statutory consultees, so their representation of their local population may count for nothing in the coming battle against human rights abuse. If you have a friendly councillor opposed to fluoridation we need to know how to contact them. Contact Cllr Liz Vaughan on 01229 885420 or email her on liz@vaughan200.fsnet.co.uk

INDEMNITY – A HOT ISSUE FOR WATER COMPANIES – AND THE INSURERS

What is the status of the offer of indemnity to water companies ordered to fluoridate public water supplies? A very good question, and one that has got the industry rather flustered. Indemnity is an offer of contract, but a lawful contract cannot be made to cover anyone committing an illegal act.

Since fluoridation contravenes numerous laws on medicines, the use of poisons, and human rights, the indemnity offer is not worth the paper it’s written on. So who’s worried? We suggest you ask the insurance sector, and the hapless shareholders who will have to pick up the potentially huge tab for future medical damages!

NEARLY THERE

**After 16 years, new evidence
on the Camelford Poisoning.**

A Draft Report on the 1988 **Camelford Poisoning** is being finalised by the DoH’s Committee on Toxicity, and will be released for public consultation – yes, really – towards the end of this year. In an encouraging new approach to public consultation before the report is finalised, the Draft will be available on the Internet, so anyone, anywhere in the world, will be able to provide comments, information and expertise that will be used to prepare the Final Report.

Doug Cross, official People’s Representative on the Committee and a veteran of the incident, is a member of the Drafting Group, and has provided important new and contemporary information on the medical and veterinary effects of the incident, and this new investigation should make riveting reading.

We’ll have a summary for you when it’s released later this year.

HERE WE GO AGAIN! MASS MEDICATION, BUT NOT AS WE KNOW IT!

As we go to press, yet another health scare has prompted calls for ‘mass medication to curb Britain’s silent killer’. This time it’s high blood pressure, which affects 14 million people in the UK, causing fatal heart attacks and strokes, and is responsible for 30% of deaths in the UK

Yet remarkably, ‘mass medication’ in this case differs profoundly from the new fluoridation powers in one vital respect – according to the Guidelines, anyone at risk will be

‘**offered advice**’, and treatment ‘should be **offered** to those with a significantly increased risk’.

Nothing there about imposing treatment on whole communities, regardless of consent, need or personal medical supervision. And you can bet that, unlike fluoridation chemicals, all of the drugs involved are registered as medicines.

When it comes to water fluoridation, medical ethics go out of the window. Yet they draw back at compulsory vaccination – at least, until fluoridation has paved the way for future ethical erosion.