

Merilyn Haines B App Sc Med Lab Tech
58 Vied Rd Pallara
Queensland Australia 4110

OPEN LETTER

September 13th, 2017

RE: Flawed Review of Water Fluoridation from the 2017 National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC)

Dear Mayors, Regional Councillors, City Solicitors and City Staff:

My name is Merilyn Haines and I live in Brisbane, Australia. I have worked as a medical laboratory scientist for over 30 years (now retired) and I first started researching fluoridation over 20 years ago when a close family member developed severe dermatitis from fluoridated water. I have been actively working to educate members of the public and our government leaders on the many health harms associated with ingested fluoride.

I am writing you today to inform you that **as leaders, you have a judiciary duty of care to protect the health and well-being** of the 1,400,000 residents in which you serve.

On July 6th, 2017 your staff was asked to look into the latest Australian government's review from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and report back to Council.

I have prepared an extensive critique and analysis of the said NHMRC review.

Upon learning this, Liesa Cianchino, Chair of the Concerned Residents of Peel to End Fluoridation reached out to me and requested that I personally send you this important information for your review.

Please find attached my press release of August 3 and a report highlighting my 23-point critique of the NHMRC's defence of this discredited policy.

Fluoride Action Network have kindly uploaded these documents to their website and they can be viewed at the following links -

▪ **Press Release from Fluoride Action Network Australia**

http://fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/fan-australia.nhmrc_fluoridation-critique.exec_summary.8-3-17.pdf

▪ **Full Report on NHMRC review**

<http://fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/fan-australia.nhmrc-fluoridation-critique-8-3-17-1.pdf>

In this analysis, 23 specific examples of NHMRC manipulations have been documented. Many of these by themselves should disqualify the NHMRC 2017 review from serious consideration, but in combination should question the very existence of the NHMRC as a body that can be relied upon by the public and decision-makers to provide objective analysis of government policy.

A brief summary of these 23 examples are listed below.

Make no mistake, this latest attempt by the NHMRC to mislead the Australian public and decision makers that water fluoridation is safe, effective and ethical will, in no uncertain terms, be challenged by many professionals and well-informed citizens from around the world demanding a **Royal Commission investigation** of both the review itself and the need for establishing a non-governmental agency to objectively review the science underpinning controversial government public health and environmental policies.

Red flags are waving across the miles to alert you to these important facts as presented in my critique and analysis of the NHMRC review.

Today, citizens from around the globe are becoming much better informed and **demanding greater scrutiny and accountability** from all levels of government on **issues affecting human health** and the **environment** and **will hold to account all proponents who continue to deceive the public at large on the safety and efficacy of fluoridation.**

I trust this information will serve you well in your deliberations as the Region of Peel is being challenged on the **safety, efficacy and legality** of artificial water fluoridation.

Respectively Submitted,

Marilyn Haines
Chair Fluoride Action Network Australia Inc
Founding Member Worldwide Alliance to End Fluoridation

A brief summary of the 23 examples of what the NHMRC has done -

- 1.** Stacked the fluoride review committee with fluoridation lobbyists and advocates.
- 2.** Broke a promise that it would include experts opposed to fluoridation.
- 3.** Secretly commissioned a new study on dental effects (previously listed as “out of scope”), when the 2015 Cochrane Collaboration review didn’t deliver a convincing pro-fluoridation position.
- 4.** First misled about its knowledge of a new thyroid study (Peckham et al., 2015) and then dismissed its findings, reaching a biased and false position that there is no evidence that fluoride interferes with thyroid function.
- 5.** Falsely claimed a low-quality IQ study (Broadbent et al, 2014) was a high-quality study.

6. Downplayed, dismissed or excluded most other IQ studies and evidence of fluoride's neurotoxicity.
7. On flimsy grounds excluded a significant study linking fluoridation to ADHD – then failed to even acknowledge its existence.
8. In 2007, the NHMRC used a *promised* study in a Letter-to-the-Editor to negate an unrefuted Osteosarcoma study (Bassin, 2006) to claim there was no link to cancer. Then in its 2017 review the NHMRC failed to acknowledge that the promised study failed to refute the Bassin study but still continued to maintain no evidence of a link between fluoridation and cancer.
9. Selected a publication cut – off date for studies (that would be considered) that would exclude a very significant review by the US NRC (2006) and the Bassin (2006) study that were not given due consideration in its 2007 review.
10. The NHMRC 2017 review based its claims of safety largely on its 2007 review, however, its 2007 review was largely a copy of the 2000 York University review, which according to the York Review's Professor Sheldon did NOT show fluoridation to be safe!
11. Obfuscated on chronic kidney disease even though it is aware that poor kidney function increases uptake of fluoride into the bones poses risks over a lifetime. Such cumulative risks – and the special plight of those with poor kidney function – have never been investigated by NHMRC.
12. On another but related matter, the NHMRC endorsed doubling children's upper safety limits for fluoride ingestion (using data from the 1930s) almost certainly anticipating that the pre-existing limits would be exceeded by bottle-fed infants in which formula is made up with fluoridated tap-water.
13. Used an evidence evaluation system (GRADE) on studies of fluoride's effectiveness almost certainly in an effort to disguise the fact that most of the studies reviewed were of low, or very low quality.
14. NHMRC 2017 rates tooth decay and dental fluorosis as more important end point than other health incomes, including cancer and IQ.
15. Commenced review with strict restrictions for acceptable evidence, then included a) unpublished work; b) a favourable narrative and c) an abstract.
16. Attempted to diminish known dental fluorosis harm by manipulating fluorosis ratings and raising threshold of concern.
17. Misleads the public and decision-makers by claiming fluoridation reduces tooth decay by 26- 44 % - but without indicating just how small such reductions are in absolute terms – often less than one tooth surface out of over 100 tooth surfaces in a child's mouth!
18. Dishonestly claims fluoridation is safe by excluding important studies on spurious grounds, ignoring many others, and even cherry-picking weak studies that serve their purpose (e.g. Broadbent on IQ).
19. Doesn't understand principles of toxicology – concentration is not the same as dose!
20. Perverted the principles of medical ethics by presenting a bogus ethical claim constructed by lobbyists rather than ethicists.
21. Gave an incomplete project of dubious quality a prestigious NHMRC award
22. NHMRC fluoridation public consultations have been shams.

23. The NHMRC's extraordinary effort to maintain the dubious claims that fluoridation is safe, effective and ethical, are becoming more and more desperate by the year. NHMRC 2007 was very bad, NHMRC 2017 verges on fraud.