

Dear Politicians

Can you imagine sitting at a table with the highest, most evolved thinkers, where ego, jealousy, competition, personal desire and agendas have no seat and where no minority group is ignored?

Instead in this most sacrosanct place (regarded as too valuable to be interfered with), the heart is open and welcomed by intuition, grace, respect, integrity and humbleness, and the common goal of obtaining the highest thought on any issue to reign supreme.

The highest thought as the solution, can only be accessed after all members of the community are given due and equal diligence; their evidence neither repressed nor adulterated. When solutions are the norm and no one is pushed away or considered insignificant – for to do that would be a slight on the soul – an act of failure in the natural process.

I have been fortunate to sit at such a table of wisdom and elders. Their stature would seemingly overwhelm a younger person, but their strength of resolve to remain as servants of the public, ensured the encounter was reminiscent of an open and familiar embrace.

Sadly, I have never witnessed this when watching politicians' at work and wonder how they let their embrace falter. What knife in the guise of party agenda, lobbyist or untested logic did they succumb to? How did they not hear the hollowness and lack of promise for a healthy planetary future in their sarcastic and well-rehearsed party slogans?

Evolution means that every thought and decision comes from this higher mode of existence. When practised regularly it becomes the automatic mode of operation.

I am old enough to have seen many government representatives make very bad decisions for the public, after giving in to lobbyists and corporate agendas. Many held shares in these corporations or took gratuitous payments for their votes. None of these decisions led to the betterment of humanity, individuals or the planet. The long list of mistakes includes DDT, agent orange, formaldehyde, tobacco, lead petrol, asbestos, DES, thalidomide, BPA, mercury fillings and fluoride, to name a few.

Each and every time doctors, medical associations and pharmaceutical corporations deemed them safe for use. Time has proven each wrong and much harm done.

If we are to be truthful and in touch with the highest values, we need to accept many mistakes have been made in the race to global corporization and retrospectively we are 100% certain, they should never have been permitted but for the frailty of the human ego.

We also have to question the processes that allowed them to come into existence and harm those who trusted the 'wisdom of their leaders'.

Let's look at one i.e. fluoride. Fluoridation was introduced experimentally in Germany in 1952, but was discontinued after two years. This was because the recommended dosage of 1ppm was too close to the dose at which long-term damage to the human body is to be expected. Today more than seventy percent of Europe does not use fluoride, so we need to question why it is still present in Australian water supplies, given it is a recognized neural toxin, an industrial waste by-product and no studies have proven it is either safe or that it prevents cavities.

It was pointed out by Chris Wark in his article "Fluoride: How A Toxic Poison Ended Up In Our Water Supply" that it was Sigmund Freud's nephew, Edward Bernays, also known as 'The Father of Spin' who crafted the campaign to sell fluoride to nations on the 'recommendation of your doctor and dentist for healthy teeth'. He pioneered modern marketing propaganda using the theories of mass psychology and persuasion, to suit the needs of unethical corporate and political organizations. Bernays even created similar marketing campaigns for tobacco companies using the doctor and dentist endorsements. Convincing the general public we needed to add fluoride to our water supply was one of the most sophisticated cons of all time. It created a multi-billion dollar industry and enabled manufacturers to sell this worthless toxic by-product of aluminium to local municipalities for massive profits. The main fluoride chemical added to water today is hydrofluorosilicic acid, an industrial by-product from the phosphate fertilizer industry.

Bernays knew that he could easily manipulate doctors, dentists and others to promote his corporate clients' campaigns and recorded in detail how he achieved this in his 1928 book Propaganda,

"If you can influence the leaders, either with or without their conscious cooperation, you automatically influence the group which they sway" and "If we understand the mechanism and motives of the group mind, it is now possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without them knowing it."

It is lazy government to apply slogans such as 'The Science is in' when science is organic in nature and forever changing the facts on any issue. This is a continuation of the propaganda machine started by Edward Bernays. This slogan is designed to manipulate rather than educate. It is well known two experts on a subject will rarely agree.

Sound leadership unites and motivates. Unsound seeks to create division and knock an opponent onto the sideline as a sacrifice in the name of the misused term 'greater good'. In actuality this behaviour signifies a failure of integrity and sound research.

If we view the history of scientific research we find one such authority is Dr Richard Horton, the current editor-in-chief of the Lancet – considered to be one of the most

well respected peer-reviewed medical journals in the world. Dr Horton recently published a statement declaring that a lot of published research is in fact unreliable at best, if not completely false.

“The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness.”

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2964337/>

This sentiment is echoed by Ben Goldacre “industry-funded trials are more likely to produce a positive, flattering result than independently funded trials”, meaning professional bias exists. “In 2010, three researchers from Harvard and Toronto found all the trials looking at five major classes of drug—antidepressants, ulcer drugs and so on—then measured two key features: were they positive, and were they funded by industry? They found over five hundred trials in total: 85 per cent of the industry-funded studies were positive, but only 50 per cent of the government funded trials were. That’s a very significant difference.”

“In 2006, researchers looked into every trial of psychiatric drugs in four academic journals over a ten-year period, finding 542 trial outcomes in total. Industry sponsors got favourable outcomes for their own drug 78 per cent of the time, while independently funded trials only gave a positive result in 48 per cent of cases.”

“In Fries and Krishnan [2004] the results from every RCT (45 out of 45) favoured the drug of the sponsor.”

Goldacre goes on to prove “the process whereby negative results go unpublished—is endemic throughout the whole of medicine and academia; and that regulators have failed to do anything about it, despite decades of data showing the size of the problem.”

“Those with favourable outcomes were a full four times more likely to be published in academic papers than those with negative outcomes. On top of that, four of the trials with negative outcomes changed, once they appeared in the academic literature, to favor the drug.” <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/trial-sans-error-how-pharma-funded-research-cherry-picks-positive-results/>

So it has been proven scientific trials are tainted by industry bias and indeed outcomes will be changed to suit the industry. Edward Bernays was very proud of his marketing ability to influence doctors, dentists, medical associations and universities, with the grants his industry clients financed. This devious means of obtaining results has only increased over time since 1928.

Now what are our politicians going to do with the truth given their track record in making poor health decisions previously? When there is doubt, they must err in favour of caution or we will have far greater tragedies.

I would suggest they adhere to our Constitution and the Nuremberg Code which protect citizens from coerced or forced medical interventions. They must deny the introduction of the No Job No Pay legislation before senate and never remove Conscientious Objection as a right from the public.

Copyright Giselle Tonee www.giselletonee.com I give permission for this article to be used in its entirety in the public domain and sent to all politicians.