More Facts About Fluoride—*Why Ithaca, New York Does Not Fluoridate*

continued from page 1

sion and you will get the message. The last paragraph of the summary states "Fluoride has only negative effects on bone cell metabolism. Fluoride should be avoided, especially in osteoporosis." If you are interested in a copy of the article from *Fluoride*, contact my office.

Fluoridation Useless and harmful

By Lennart Krook, Guest Columnist

Reprinted from The Ithaca Journal, March 4, 11, 1998

Late last year, *The Ithaca Journal* wrote about artificial water fluoridation in two articles and a pro-fluoridation editorial. Since in my opinion *The Journal* conveyed a lot of misinformation and unsubstantiated opinions, I feel compelled to write.

The editorial stated: "The burden of proof has to fall on that small band of residents who think fluoridation is a bad idea. They are part of an informal nationwide coalition whose opinions are found on the Web by calling up 'Fluoride.'"

I want to make it clear that I am not a member of "small band" and that I do not get my facts from the Web. As a professor of pathology at Cornell University's College of Veterinary Medicine from 1959-1995, I have published 12 scientific articles, including one monograph, on fluoride and fluoride-induced diseases, in peer reviewed journals. I am an appointed member of the editorial board of *Fluoride*, a peer-reviewed scientific journal of the International Society for Fluoride Research. I am conversant with the relevant literature on artificial water fluoridation.

Now to the burden of proof:

• Artificial water fluoridation does not reduce tooth decay.

Reference is made to a peer-reviewed article in a scientific journal: "Water Fluoridation and Tooth Decay: Results from the 1986-1987 National Survey of U.S. Schoolchildren."

The Introduction reads, "It has become widely accepted among dental and health professionals that fluoridation reduced tooth decay by one-half to two-thirds." However, recent studies by health dentists in New Zealand, Canada and the United States have reported similar or lower tooth decay rates in non-fluoridated areas as compared to fluoridated areas. Moreover, findings in the United States and worldwide show that, over the last 25 years, reduction in tooth decay rates in nonfluoridated areas are comparable to those in fluoridated areas.

"From 1986 to 1987, dentists trained by the U.S. National Institute of Dental Research (NIDR) performed dental examinations on 39,027 schoolchildren, ages 5-17, in 84 areas throughout the United States."

In 27 fluoridated areas, 12,747 students were examined, in 27 partially fluoridated areas 2,578 students were examined and in 30 non-fluoridated areas 13,882 students were examined. In the respective groups, 49, 45, and 39 percent of the students were life-long residents.

Ratios comparing decayed, missing and filled teeth numbers to permanent teeth were exactly the same in students of all three areas. The rates went from 0 at age 5 to just below 6 at age 17 in all groups. The percentage of decay-free children were identical in all groups, decreasing from about 60 percent in 5-year-olds to about 15 percent in 17-year-olds. In 5-year-olds, the decayed-missing-filled numbers of temporary teeth (baby teeth) were lower in fluoridated areas, but the difference disappeared in 6-year-olds, never to reappear.

In an article, "The Mystery of Declining Tooth Decay," published in the prestigious journal of *Nature* is an analysis of studies in eight countries, including the United States, on reduction in tooth cavities in nonfluoridated areas. The summary: "Large temporal reductions in tooth decay, which cannot be attributed to fluoridation, have been observed in both unfluoridated and fluoridated areas of at least eight developed countries over the past 30 years. It is now time for a scientific re-examination of the alleged enormous benefits of fluoridation."

The two articles just quoted should convince every objective person that fluoridation in no way reduces tooth decay. Refusal to accept facts can be explained only by bias, prejudice and ignorance. One reads, without surprise, in a letter to *The Journal* that "fluoride is effective." The editorial: "It is documented through several reputable sources that there are millions of children who have benefited from fluoride in their public water supply." There are no reference to support "several reputable sources" for the simple reason that there are none.

• Artificial water fluoridation is not safe.

Ithaca Journal editorial: "People who don't want fluoride should produce one person who barring some abnormally high long-

continued on page 55