Fluoride damages teeth Dated 2000

Much research from many parts of the world has suggested that, far from protecting teeth, fluoride actually damages them. One of the largest studies into fluoride levels and dental caries ever carried out comes from Japan. In this study, researchers at Tokyo Medical and Dental University examined the teeth of 20,000 students and showed clearly that they had been harmed by fluoride. The researchers compared students who came from areas with more than 0.4 parts per million fluoride in the drinking water with those whose water contained less than 0.4 ppm. Their results showed clearly that there was significantly more decay in the areas that had the higher levels of fluoride. Note that the 0.4 ppm that was harming teeth is less than half the "optimal" level. Similarly another study, conducted in Ottawa, Kansas, to assess the effects of adding fluoride to the town's water found that fluoridation was a disaster: in the first three years of drinking fluoridated water, the numbers of DMFT in 5- to 6-year-old children more than doubled, while the numbers free from decay nearly halved.

That fluorides have not been shown to benefit teeth should not come as a surprise to the dental profession. As long ago as 1940, it was suggested that seventy percent of the caries in children was in the form of pits and fissures. Recent reports indicate that today, eighty-three per cent of all caries in North American children is of this type. And there is no reason to suppose that children in other Western countries are any different. Pit and fissure cavities are prevented with sealants, they aren't preventable with fluoride........

............. Northern region is home to two flagships of fluoridation: Newcastle and Gateshead. Both fluoridated since 1968, this allows us to compare adult expenditure. Both have the most dentists and the highest expenditure per head of population anywhere in the region. The only other major industrial town is Sunderland, which is also the only genuine non-fluoridated part of the region. Sunderland wins on all counts: dentistry is less expensive and there are fewer dentists per head. Why is it that Newcastle and Gateshead have so many extra dentists if, as they claim, fluoridation reduces the need for them?

Conclusion

Given the strength of the evidence presented, the case for the fluoridation of tap water to prevent dental decay fails miserably. Nevertheless on both sides of the Atlantic, proponents, seemingly oblivious to the evidence that fluoride does more harm than good, are currently trying to get still more areas fluoridated. In 1992, when sixty percent of the US population was fluoridated, and based on what they say is "past progress and continuing evidence of effectiveness and safety of this public health measure" the American Public Health Service set a goal of having seventy-five percent of the population drinking fluoridated water by the year 2000.

And now, as I write this in 2000, the government-funded British Fluoridation Society is actively lobbying for a change in the law here to compel water companies to fluoridate tap water when Health Authorities demand it.
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