More Facts About Fluoride

continued from page 53

Fluoridation is claimed to reduce tooth decay by 50 percent, let us say from four to two cavities per child. Two cavities multiplied by the cost of restoration per cavity multiplied by huge numbers of children results in huge amounts of money.

Because the reduction in cavities by fluoride has been proven to be zero, there is a zero in this equation. Zero multiplied by whatever is still zero. In spite of these facts, a fluoridationist writes in his letter to *The Journal* that "fluoride is safe, effective and economical." I challenge him and all other fluoridationists to reveal their sources.

Dr. Samson, of the Department of Politics at the University of Bristol, put "the case against fluoridation precisely and irrevocably." But however irritating to them, the fact may be, try as they will, the fluoridators cannot answer the objection that the measure is incompatible with human freedom.

"No amount of ransacking constitutional law books, invocation of legal authorities, appeals to the principal of parliamentary sovereignty, touches the principle, immediately evident to all unprejudiced men, that the forcing of any ingredient into the body of another is a most fundamental violation of his choice to personal liberty. This cannot be denied."

In a letter to *The Journal* (July 18, 1997) I wrote: "Artificial water fluoridation violates one sacred principle: freedom of choice — no one escapes. Let those who are ignorant of the failure of fluoride to reduce cavities and of the proven health hazards, take the poison by tablets or drops." The subtitle of the Dec. 26, 1997, editorial reads: "Ithaca made a mistake in 1965; it's time those in charge finally correct it." The voters are in charge, not county officials as the editorial implies. The voters rejected water fluoridation convincingly in 1965 and in the 1970s by a margin of 2-to-1. Voters in a landslide majority cannot be considered "a small band of residents who think fluoridation is a bad idea."

Does the editorial suggest that 2 out of 3 voters made a mistake? Is it a mistake to have an opinion other that that of the editor? Informed voters made, will make, no mistake. ▼