

Nov. 2015 In Gloucester, Massachusetts, voters voted to continue fluoridation in spite of all the smart reasons to stop.

Gloucester Times Gloucester, MA October 8, 2015

## Letter: Ingesting fluoride should be a personal choice

Posted: Thursday, **October 8, 2015**

To the Editor:

Given that a substantial number of townsfolk oppose continued fluoridation, while at the same time a substantial number of others promote continued fluoridation, the question arises as to how the community can amicably and fairly resolve the issue?

Each side believes that “its science” is the one, true science; that the opposition’s science is faulty.

Fortunately, with respect to the fluoridation dispute, it doesn’t really matter whether or not the claims for or against fluoridation are true or false.

When the dispute is analyzed, it immediately becomes clear that **there is no basis in logic or fair play for the pro-fluoridation side to be allowed to impose its will on the anti-fluoridation group.** The group that favors fluoridation can simply use fluoridated toothpaste to obtain the benefit they see in fluoridation, while leaving the community water source free of the additive for those who object to it. **The community water supply should be made available to the general public in its most pristine possible form;** those who wish to treat their water with fluoride, Kool-Aid, tea leaves, coffee beans or any other additive of their choice are free to do so, without imposing their personal preferences on the general public (even if they perceive themselves to be much smarter than everyone else, and to know what’s best for all).

When fluoridation was initiated in the 1940s, dentists believed the benefit was a systemic one to the non-erupted teeth of children, derived by ingesting fluoride (rather than by direct topical application to the teeth, i.e., by brushing with fluoridated toothpaste.) That original theory of systemic benefit has since been discarded, however, in favor of the current understanding that fluoride benefit is derived from topical use.

When I drink from a glass of water, even assuming that it is fluoridated tap water and not designer water, not much water comes in contact with my teeth. Nonetheless, I am obliged to ingest the fluoride, which is of no benefit, and may be of some harm.

Topical application of fluoride to the teeth is best accomplished by brushing with fluoridated toothpaste, not by insinuating one’s personal preference for fluoridation into the drinking water of every person in the community.

Saying “no” to the continued fluoridation of Gloucester’s water supply is the logical and fair choice

Doug Hill  
Gloucester, MA

[http://www.gloucestertimes.com/opinion/letter-ingesting-fluoride-is-a-personal-choice/article\\_9711aefe-8ff2-519d-82d3-443bc9e02dfc.html](http://www.gloucestertimes.com/opinion/letter-ingesting-fluoride-is-a-personal-choice/article_9711aefe-8ff2-519d-82d3-443bc9e02dfc.html)