

Mercury Amalgam Fillings: Lies, Damn Lies and Statistics

by Russell L. Blaylock, M.D.

Recently I reported on the methodology and machinations involved in vaccine-related injury cover-ups by the elitists in science and government at the Simpsonwood Conference on Thimerosal in vaccines. A new scandal has been recently released concerning the safety of mercury contained in dental amalgam, which is of equal magnitude and again showing the modus operandi of the government/elitist scientist's coalition. The official name of the report is: Dental Amalgam: A Scientific Review and Recommended Public Health Service Strategy for Research, Education and Regulation. This report is described as the Trans-agency Working Group on the Health Effects of Dental Amalgam, which included representatives of the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Devices and Radiological Health of the U. S. Food and Drug Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Office of the Chief Dental Officer of the Public Health Service. These organizations requested that the Life Sciences Research Office (LSRO) as a subcontractor of BETAH Associates undertake an independent third-party review of the topic. BETAH received the contract from the Department of Health and Human Services without bidding, as is proscribed by law. To carry out this mandate, they were asked to consider peer-reviewed, primary scientific and medical literature published between January 1, 1996 and December 31, 2003 addressing this specific question. This begins our lesson in how to cover-up a major health disaster using scientific "evidence-based" methods meant to impress the media and public at large. In this review, I will consider only the Executive Summary, which is written for the media and the lay public. Overwhelm them with your credentials Students of this methodology will always be impressed ..."

"WebMD should be called QuackMD"

So-called "orthodox medicine" likes to imply that traditional medical practice is based on hard scientific evidence, which they tout as "evidence-based medicine" and that everything outside their control is un-scientific. Several studies have shown that 80% or more of standard medical practice has no scientific basis whatsoever. WebMD posted on their website their take on this study, implying that it was definitive and based on hard science by the best experts in the world. Ironically, they have Cynthia Trajtenberg, a professor of restorative dentistry and dental biomaterials at the University of Texas Dental Branch at Houston, add her idiotic commentary. She resorts to the ADA's standby nonsense, which they used to brainwash their dental members over half a century ago. It goes like this: You can think of it like chlorine, which alone is a serious toxin, but when bound with sodium it becomes harmless salt.

She goes on to say, "It's the same with mercury. Mercury in dental fillings is combined with silver and copper, and is transformed into a stable metal material that is not easily released into the oral cavity. Therefore it is not harmful." This laughable nonsense is not even endorsed by the report, which clearly says that the mercury vapor easily escapes the filling and is absorbed into the blood by way of the tissues of the mouth and lungs. She obviously slept through her chemistry courses. Sodium chloride is a compound, bound by strong ionic bonds. Amalgam is a mixture of metals not in an ionic state. Metallic mercury has a very low evaporation temperature and readily turns into a vapor. This is "hard science". Why would WebMD, which professes to be "evidence-based", print such obvious idiocy easily exposed by even freshmen in high school? Could it be that they are prejudiced against the idea of amalgam toxicity? Or perhaps, could it be that the editors have friends in the dental community who asked for their help against "charlatans" in alternative medicine? It is obvious that little in the way of "hard science" is in evidence."

Conclusions:

This is just another piece of "junk science" to come out of the government/industry coalition. An avalanche of such phony studies have descended from some prestigious institutions such as the Institute of Medicine, Health and Human Services, CDC, Life Sciences Research Office, FDA, etc. By cleverly restricting the information (scientific research), excluding real experts in the area in question and by forcefully implying clear cut conclusions when none exist, they deceive the media and public. In all of these studies they provide the media with an Executive Summary, which often has conclusions that are opposite what was shown in the body of the report, knowing that the media are often too lazy or not sophisticated enough to understand the subtleties of the science being discussed. As a result, the public is assured that dental amalgam is perfectly safe and that the question has been carefully examined by some of the best scientific minds in the world in every way the issue could be examined. In essence, the issue is closed. How many times do we have to face a medical disaster resulting from this errant thinking before we learn? While I have analyzed only the Executive Summary and not the body of the report, this Executive Summary is what will reach the public. The LSRO is charging \$75 for the report itself if you include the references. This is outrageous for a study funded by taxpayer monies, printed on a computer. But then they hope none of their critics will ever read the report."