Fluoridation promoters always prefer merely to ASSERT that it is safe. As you will see, when they attempt to prove it is safe, in the Bartlett Cameron Study, they run into an impossible situation.

While they brand as crackpots all who oppose them, they do not dare to specifically challenge the studies of an Alfred C. Taylor, of a Ramseyer et al, of a Dr. Ionel Rapaport, of a Berry and Trillwood.

Top fluoridators know that the results would be the same if the studies were done by a thousand scientists, a thousand times, that fluorine brings missing teeth, sickness and death, to both mice and men.

FLUORIDATION

NO TEST EVER PROVED IT SAFE

Oxford Warns Against Fluoridation 1/10 "Safe Dose" Not Safe

"SAFE DOSE" NOT SAFE

The October 26, 1963 issue of the British Medical Journal reported a study by Oxford University scientists, Berry and Trillwood, that one-tenth of the so-called "safe dose" of sodium fluoride inhibits human cell life. The report specifically warned against fluoridation.

HUMAN CELLS DAMAGED

Among other things, the study showed "In every experiment in which sodium fluoride in concentration of 1/10 PPM or more was added to the medium, the growth of both of these cell lines was appreciably depressed."

Similar tests with chlorine of like concentration did not cause damage.

LET US DECIDE

If Oxford University scientists have determined that one-tenth of the so-called safe dose of fluorine damages human cells, human being should have the right to determine whether they take an even more potent dose into their innerds.

The Bartlett - Cameron Story: Cataracts and 3½ Times the Deaths

Fluoridators do not like it when they are asked to prove that fluoridation is safe. They prefer just to SAY that it is safe.

DEATHS DON'T COUNT

When required to prove that it is safe, ninety-five percent of the time they will cite the Bartlett-Cameron Study. They say that the only damage resulting from fluorine in Bartlett was dental fluorosis. Such a small consideration as THREE AND A HALF TIMES THE DEATHS PER CAPITA IN BARTLETT, as in Cameron, is cunningly passed over. (Among younger people the figures were almost six to one.)

THE HISTORY BEGINS

The Bartlett Cameron story begins in 1943. In that year, 116 residents of Bartlett, Texas with 8 PPM of fluorine in their drinking water were compared with 121 residents of Cameron, Texas with .4 PPM. At that time, the researchers remarked about an excessive number of people with cataracts and brittle nails in the high fluorine localities.

10 YEARS LATER

In accord with the plan, ten years later, in 1953, a comparative study was made of the general health of the residents of both cities.

Fluoridators are now proclaiming to the world that no significant difference revealed itself in the study except for dental fluorosis. THEY IGNORE THE FACT THAT 14 OUT OF 116 DIED IN HIGHLY FLUORINATED BARTLETT, AND ONLY 4 OUT OF 121 DIED IN CONTROL CITY, CAMERON.

NOT ONE CHANCE IN 21

That was too much even for the A.M.A. to accept. The official pronouncement of the A.M.A. was that there was NOT ONE CHANCE IN 21 THAT FLUORINE DID NOT CAUSE SOME DEATHS IN BARTLETT, TEXAS. Only pronouncements of the House of Delegates represent official A.M.A. decision. We refer you to the statement on Public Water Supplies, by the House of Delegates, Philadelphia, Dec. 3-6, 1957.

STATISTICAL FORMULA

On page 13 of that report, and referring to Bartlett, Texas, the A.M.A. statisticians have calculated the possibility that the excess deaths occurred in Bartlett by chance, as follows: "These odds are approximately one in 21 that mere chance determined the difference (P-O.048)."

It is difficult for one who thinks that death is even worse than dental caries to conceive; that statistics as to deaths should be disregarded. Let us make our position clear. We do not attribute the entire difference in death rates to fluorine. Some we do.

If we were to ignore the deaths, as the fluoridators did, we would still feel that the illnesses that preceded the deaths should have been tabulated in the study. We suspect that these residents did not enjoy the most robust health preceding their demise. There was probably heart disease, cancer, diabetes, anemia, and cataracts interred with their bones.

OTHER DISEASES

The studies also showed that 40% of the Bartlett residents and 20% of the Cameron residents had no teeth. There were 759 missing teeth in Cameron and 1009 in Bartlett, which the Bartlett residents attributed to gum disorders.

IT'S A JOKE

To us it seemed funny to hear that if it were not for the missing teeth in Bartlett, there would have been 30% less dental caries in Bartlett than in Cameron. They infer that the missing teeth did not have cavities.

CAMERON ALSO FLUORINATED

Even Cameron was a fluoridated city with two-thirds of the amount that is recommended for southern cities. We find that both cities have an unbelievable amount of cataracts with 10-1/2% of the Bartlett residents affected and 12% of Cameron. 45% of the residents of both cities had white cell abnormalities.

GREAT BRITAIN ASSURED

Now you have heard the supreme proof that fluoridation is safe. Accordingly, Abstract 85 on the Role of Fluoride in Public Health, 1963 release from the Kettering Laboratory, states that the people of Great Britain need not fear to fluoridate their water even though they consume a like amount of fluorine in tea. . . . "When water containing 1 PPM is used, it is considered well within the safe limit, in view of the reports on the health of Bartlett residents who used water with a fluoride content of 8 PPM."

PEOPLE NOT TOLD

The people of Great Britain and the people of the United States have not been told that the A.M.A. believes fluorine caused some deaths in Bartlett, Texas. There is no chance whatsoever that it did not cause missing teeth in Bartlett, and a ghastly amount of cateracts, cell abnormalities and other ailments in both fluorinated cities.

NO PROOF OF SAFETY

It will come as a shock to decent, intelligent people to realize that fluoridators can offer no better proof of safety than the Bartlett-Cameron study.

The people of Great Britain and the people of the United States have reason to resent the fact that United States tax dollars are being used to promote fluoridation in other countries.

University of Texas Makes 12 Studies "Safe Dose" Kills Mice

University of Texas Studies Prove That Mice Live Nine-Tenths As Long on the So-Called "Safe Dose" of Fluoridated Water, As Reported in Dental Digest, April 1954

Dr. Alfred Taylor of the University of Texas is universally acknowledged as a cancer research scientist without peer.

In seeking drugs which might inhibit the growth of cancer cells, Dr. Taylor became interested in the possibilities of fluorine. To his consternation, the mice that he used in his experiments that got fluoridated water, did not live as long as those given plain distilled water.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE REBUFF

When he hastily relayed this information to the Public Health Service, their only interest was to attack his findings. When it was shown that there was fluorine in the food the mice consumed, it was a legitimate observation, but it still did not explain away the excess deaths that occurred only because of fluoridated water.

FIVE MORE STUDIES

To Answer Their Objections

Dr. Taylor embarked on a series of five more studies this time with as little fluorine in the food as is possible to obtain. The results were just the same: the mice given fluoridated water lived about nine-tenths as long (and we presume did not feel nearly as good) as the mice given plain water.

THE TEST WAS A MAMMOTH ONE

645 mice were used in the tests; there were 28 groups with an average

WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN. Ask him to support Congressman Baring's Bill to prevent the Public Health Service from promoting Fluoridation. It is Bill H. Res. 193. Also Bills H. Res. 191 and H. Res. 192 Baring's bills to objectively study Fluoridation.

1½ ¢