

From: Marco Conti [<mailto:marco.conti@westnet.com.au>]
Sent: Thursday, 13 January 2011 1:06 PM
To: 'news@sunraysiadaily.com.au'
Subject: Make the right decision about fluoride

<http://www.sunraysiadaily.com.au/news/opinion/letters/general/make-the-right-decision-about-fluoride/2044515.aspx>

Dear Editor,

Mr. Fraser Mitcham's statements are based on misleading observations that fall at the first non superficial cross verification.

The NHMRC study he mentioned, reported a very small note saying that they **would** not consider any research **that is** not written in English language. **In fact**, there are about 17,000 research **artifacts** not written in **the** English language **that** oppose fluoride, while there is only one "pseudo-research" pro fluoride **article**, written by a credible university, the York university.

However, Prof. Sheldon, the Chairman of the department who produced the research at York, wrote a letter to denounce that dental and medical association **misunderstanding** of the findings. He stated that that the research was too rigid to be credible about fluoride's safety and the researchers found a great number of children with fluorosis (41% **to** the best of my knowledge). He also wrote that fluoride did not reduce any social gap between and poor (**having studied university** Statistics **and having** read the York Review, I agree with him on this point). Prof. Sheldon did not step back from saying that fluoridation was beneficial concerning cavity prevention; however, I can say that the research did not consider any realistic variable affecting oral health such the **accurate** drinking water content and other environmental variables, therefore all results **have** little **credibility** at a scientific level. Finally, the alleged results in absolute numbers were very modest and they were lost with aging above 15.

In Queensland, raw statistical data such the Child Dental Survey, Queensland 2002 prove that 40 years of fluoridation in Townsville did not **provide** any realistic advantage. We also have the yellow pages that lead to suppose that in Townsville there are more dentists than in other places without fluoride in the water but better teeth than in Townsville.

Other Australian studies prove that in areas where children have plenty of cavities, only 33% brushed their teeth at least once per day and other studies shows that in indigenous areas, 33% did not even own a toothbrush.

So, what do we have in Australia to prove that fluoridation is beneficial?

We have the Department of Dentistry of the Adelaide University – true paladins of water fluoridation. At the best of my knowledge, when the Department is asked –eventually under FOI - to release the public data on which they base their miraculous results related to water fluoridation, the directors eventually resist the FOI request by saying that "the research is incomplete..." and "the premature disclosure of data could financially damage their stream revenues". Notwithstanding, the University continues to promote fluoridation behind closed doors and those who have any contrary opinion have no chance to engage in debate. This is how the fluoridation lobby has been prevalently working until now.

Further, an example of information that is known but not communicated with people such as Mr. Fraser:

"South Australian children 10- to 17-years-old were able to recognize very mild and mild fluorosis and register changes in satisfaction with the color and appearance of teeth. Even mild changes were associated with psychological-behavioural impacts. Hoskin and Spencer asked eight questions on psycho-behavioral impact, such as embarrassment or self consciousness because of the appearance of the teeth... The most dramatic finding was the strength of the association of **TISF score** with psychological-behavioural impact was similar to that of crowding and overbite, both considered key occlusal traits driving the demand for orthodontic care.
" SOURCE: Spencer AJ, et al. (1996). Water fluoridation in Australia. *Community Dental Health* 13(Suppl 2): 27-37. Well, in Australia –officially – fluorosis almost do not exist.

Fluoridation has no rational or sane basis. A group of people, mostly with no qualification in toxicology or with an enormous rigidity and knowledge of a very restricted base of data, has decided without any democratic debate that we had be given for all our life a Schedule 5 poison, second only to Arsenic according to all the toxicologists

of the world, because – their mysterious studies say that maybe a fraction of the surface between two molars would be preserved in children for a couple of years? Please....

In fact, SCHER

(http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/consultations/public_consultations/scher_cons_05_en.htm), the top Scientific Committee for Health Hazards of the EU, slammed fluoridation in a temporary opinion published in 2010 by saying three important things:

1. Fluoridation is an ineffective means to prevent oral cavities;
2. Children's health under 12yo is eventually damaged in fluoridated areas because the maximum safe concentration of fluoride may be exceeded;
3. Fluoride does not hamper intelligence and health 'AT EUROPEAN' level. This DOES NOT MEAN THAT IN A COUNTRY TOTALLY FLUORIDATED AS AUSTRALIA, CHARACTERISED BY VERY MUCH DIFFERENT FOOD CHAIN AND WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IT IS HARMLESS.

My advice is to be less superficial and after having got independent information, think with your head because the Australian health is still under attack by an army of fragile politicians seeking the votes of the disinformed voters by pursuing the shortest way, that is creating illusions when they speak of health prevention.

Those who sell fluoride are also industries that have a track record of environmental disasters and have a financial conflict of interest because the safe disposal of fluoride would be costly to them.

Other searches showed politicians who had direct or indirect financial interests in such industries financial success and grants –that no small private industry with a genuine reason could achieve - to dental associations (e.g. ADAQ, 2006) to persuade the population that fluoride is only beneficial.

Search ADHD in children worldwide: 3.8% in Australia, 7% of the total population affected. 1.5% in every country without fluorides in the nutritional chain. Search depression and schizophrenia: none of the other countries has our rates and we find consistent data only if we look at other fluoridated societies.

A few epidemiological notes: read WHO on cancer if you understand statistics, you have travelled the world like me over 22 countries and you know the dietary customs and TRUE environmental data of some places with cancer peaks: you will see that after having done a differential analysis to exclude other possible root causes, the fluoridated countries have the cancer record in terms of age (cancer may hit 15 years earlier) and magnitude of the incidence (even 5 times more). Only the most industrialized cities of the world have similar cancer rates of low density population and still relatively green Australian cities.

Are you concerned about melanoma? Well ask yourself why -if we read the UV density in different countries and localities and we eliminate UVs'impact after making the proper statistical calculations- the higher incidence of melanoma cancer is always in water fluoridated countries and cities without fluorides but very elevated levels of atmospheric ozone, which is substantially as electro aggressive as much as fluoride? Well, read some scientific research on nouvelle semi-conductors about the melanin electro-positivity and its extraordinary capacity to be oxidized by electro-negative ions. I do not think it is a case if the highest melanoma rate in Europe, in Switzerland, that has been water fluoridated until recently when they stopped because they acknowledged the health damage and not because they swapped fluoridation with "beneficial fluoridated salt" as some health minister I heard said.

I conclude with a note on my son: 13yo, no one cavity in his mouth, zero fluoride in water, food and toothpaste. How is it possible whilst the most of his school have bad teeth? The story is simple: when he was 4yo I gave him a few Colgate tablets, he swallowed toothpaste and his first tooth showed fluorosis. I immediately suspended fluoride and he lived rigorously fluoride free during the last 9 years. The rules were: drink extremely pure water (I found that at tap point many water are affected by heavy metal contamination and lead makes tooth enamel less resistant to acidic saliva) , brush your teeth with a fluoride-free toothpaste within 20 minutes from meals (bacteria work in that timeframe) and acidic soft drinks are totally banned (orthophosphoric acid dissolves the tooth enamel) . Follow these rules and your children will never develop just one cavity.