

Dr. Paul Connett Interview on Shocking New Flouride Study

Source: [No More Fake News](#)

Exclusive: Dr. Paul Connett interview on shocking new fluoride study

by Jon Rappoport

November 19, 2017

Explosive: new mainstream study concludes fluorides are lowering children's IQ.

The study referred to in this interview was published in Environmental Health Perspectives, in September 2017. It is titled: [“Prenatal Fluoride Exposure and Cognitive Outcomes in Children at 4 and 6-12 Years of Age.”](#) It is often referred to as the Bashash study, after its first listed author.

The study concluded: “...higher prenatal fluoride exposure, in the general range of exposures reported for other general population samples of pregnant women and nonpregnant adults, was associated with lower scores on tests of cognitive function in the offspring at age 4 and 6–12 y.”

In short, pregnant women exposed to fluorides give birth to children who later show up with lower IQ.

I interviewed Paul Connett, PhD.

[From his CV](#): “Paul Connett is Professor Emeritus in Environmental Chemistry at St. Lawrence University in Canton, NY. For the past 30 years, Paul has put his scientific knowledge to work by helping (without fee) communities around the world understand the science of controversial issues like...fluoridation. In addition to explaining the dangers of these practices he offers details of the alternatives...[Dr. Connett is the author of] [The Case Against Fluoride](#) (Chelsea Green, 2011, co-authored with James Beck & H. Spedding

Micklem).”

“Paul has researched the literature on fluoride’s toxicity and the fluoridation debate for 17 years. He helped to found the [Fluoride Action Network \(FAN\)](#).”

I found the following items from Dr. Connett’s bio fascinating:

“In June 2001, Paul (together with Dr. William Hirzy) was invited to debate proponents of fluoridation at the annual conference of the Association for Science in the Public Interest (ASIP) in Richmond, Virginia. The proponents refused to participate in this debate.”

“In November 2001, Paul (together with Dr. Phyllis Mullenix) were invited by the American College of Toxicology to debate proponents, but they [the proponents of fluoridation] again refused. On both the above occasions Dr. Connett gave a presentation of the arguments against fluoridation in lieu of the debate.”

“In March 2003, Paul was invited by the US EPA to present the opponent’s position in a one-on-one debate on fluoridation to be held at their annual Science Forum in Washington, DC, on May 6, 2003. Despite a six week effort by the organizers of this event, no scientist or official holding a pro-fluoridation position was willing to participate in this debate. In lieu of this debate, Paul provided a power-point presentation to a packed audience, which included 8 congressional aides, representatives from major environmental organizations, EPA officials and the media. The title of Paul’s talk—‘Fluoridation: The Undefendable Practice.’”

Here is my interview with Dr. Connett:

Q: There is a new study on the effect of fluorides on IQ.

Several questions: Do you believe the study is well done? Does it deserve our attention? What conclusions does it draw?

A: This is a very important study. You can see my reaction to it [in the videotaped interview](#) at this link on the day it was published: Fluoride Exposure in Utero Linked to Lower IQ in Kids, New Study Says.

Taken at face value it should have been a good study. It was financed largely by the NIEHS [National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences] (part of NIH [US National Institutes of Health], which of course is pro-fluoridation). It was conducted largely by specialists in the field who have done similar studies on other neurotoxicants. None of them to my knowledge had taken a public position against water fluoridation (indeed one was known to be pro-fluoridation) so the notion of bias here was small...

Q: What is the reaction of public health agencies to the new study?

A: Pro-fluoridation agencies have done what they always do – attack any study that finds harm. They are all more interested in protecting the archaic practice of water fluoridation than to protect the health of our children. Extraordinary that any civil servant should think that children's teeth are more important than their brains! The people at the top are desperately trying to protect a policy they have waxed lyrical about for 70 years. The people in the middle are taught to promote "policy" not question it and the people at the bottom simply believe what they were taught at dental or medical school and reinforced by their professional bodies. Others I think are very concerned that if they lose fluoridation it will affect the public's trust in other public health practices – a clear example would be vaccination, a multi-billion dollar interest supported by the CDC (a big champion of fluoridation).

Q: How have major media reacted to the new study?

A: Apart from CNN and CTV in Canada and Newsweek there has been little coverage by the mainstream media. It was not covered by the NY Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal or any other major newspaper. That again is extraordinary for a study of this significance. Sadly, this is also typical of these outlets when it comes to the detailed science on this issue. They simply don't want to know.

Q: I've been covering the fluoride situation [fluoridating water supplies] in New Zealand (note to reader: article archive [here](#)). Last I heard, there was a move to take decision-making away from local governments and put it in the hands of federal health councils, who would determine whether to fluoridate water supplies. Can you give me an update?

A: Yes this is a dreadful development. Thus, in addition to the health issues we now have democracy threatened in NZ. Yesterday [11/16/17], the new government re-introduced the bill [handing over fluoridating decisions to federal authorities] for a second reading. One can only hope that the coalition partners will not be bullied into going along with this. A NZ first member is strongly against this bill. I would hope that the Green Party will not be railroaded on this either. But they have been very weak so far.

Q: I've been told that many years ago, you were in favor of water fluoridation. What was the turning point? What made you change your mind?

A: To be more accurate I didn't want to get involved. I was so busy teaching chemistry and working on waste [disposal issues] (which has taken me to 49 states and 65 other countries) that I didn't have time for a third issue. And I certainly didn't want a third issue in which if I got involved would get me labelled as "loony tunes." Over the years I was approached by three different people to get involved (once in Spokane, WA;

another from Ohio and a third from Ontario). I resisted them all. Then someone I couldn't resist twisted my arm...— my wife — in 1996. When I read the literature she had amassed I was both shocked with what I learned and embarrassed that I had not got involved before. I have spent the last 21 years trying to make amends.

—end of interview—

Here are [further comments](#) on the new Bashash fluoride study, from the group Dr. Connett helped start, the Fluoride Action Network:

“The loss of IQ [reported in the Bashash study] is very large. The child of a mother who was drinking 1 ppm F [fluoride] water would be predicted to have 5 to 6 IQ points lower than if the mother had drunk water with close to zero F in it.”

“The range of F exposures in this study is likely to be very close to the range in a fluoridated area of the United States. The doses in this study are directly applicable to areas with artificial fluoridation.”

“This study was very carefully done, by a group of researchers who have produced over 50 papers on the cognitive health of children in relationship to environmental exposures. This was funded by the NIH and was a multi-million dollar study. This was the group's first study of fluoride, their other studies mostly dealing with lead, mercury, and other environmental neurotoxicants.”

“The study authors are cautious in their conclusions, as is common for scientists. But the implications of this study are enormous. A single study will never prove that F lowers IQ at doses found in fluoridated areas, but this is more than a red flag. It is a cannon shot across the bow of the 80 year old practice of artificial fluoridation.”

As I've been writing and saying for many years, one of the

major forms of fake news is not mentioning the real news at all. Omitting it. Or downplaying it. This is the case here, with the new fluoride study.

Mothers giving birth to children with lower IQs? Not a concern. Not a problem. This is the stance of major media, who shout about "other people's fake news."