

Re: Fluoride treatments

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.dentistry/2005-04/msg01456.html>

- *From:* "NOYB" <noyb@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 21 Apr 2005 20:09:57 GMT
-

"Peter Meiers" <Tren_Dean@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:4268011D.4D69@xxxxxxxxxxxx

> NOYB wrote:

>

>> "Peter Meiers" <Tren_Dean@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

>> news:4267E726.61B@xxxxxxxxxxxx

>>> NOYB wrote:

>>>>

>>>> "Peter Meiers" <Tren_Dean@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

>>>> news:4267DE73.69FD@xxxxxxxxxxxx

>>>>> The Real Paul wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Fluoride given to children while their teeth are developing is

>>>>>> incorporated

>>>>>> into the tooth structure and creates a more decay resistant enamel

>>>>>> structure.

>>>>>

>>>>> Nonsense.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> --

>>>>> -History of fluorine, fluoride and fluoridation-:

>>>>> --- <http://www.fluoride-history.de/index.htm> ---

>>>>> -----

>>>>

>>>> I followed your link and could not find one peer-reviewed study that

>>>> said

>>>> that fluoride does not make enamel more resistant to decay.

>>>

>>> Perhaps you could cite one that does?

>>>

>>>

>>> There were 10-year studies in the 40's and 50's that showed caries

>>> reduction

>>> resulting from fluoridated water.

>>>

>>> Did you ever see/read the original series of papers on these trials?

>>> Additional material on these early experiments is contained in the

Re: Fluoride treatments

- > papers of Henry Trendley Dean and Ruth Roy Harris, at the National
- > Library of Medicine. Guess what they reveal? Anything but proof of a
- > fluoride effect!
- >
- >> I'm wondering if you're challenging the statement that "fluoride in
- >> developing teeth make them more resistant to decay", or if you're
- >> challenging the idea that fluoride makes already-erupted teeth more
- >> resistant to decay.
- >
- > It does neither.

Sure it does...and the evidence is overwhelming that it helps already-erupted teeth.

- >
- >> The pre-eruptive benefits are there, but not significant. The
- >> post-eruptive
- >> benefits of water fluoridation and topical application of fluoride are
- >> very
- >> significant and indisputable.
- >
- > This is your view. What is indeed "significant" is the influence of the
- > so-called "confounding variables"! Nothing else. And "indisputable"
- > means that you are not interested in any discussion. So why should I
- > elaborate? Just to be ignored for saying what nobody here wants to
- > hear/read? I'm not interested in wasting time. I'll elaborate on that
- > elsewhere.

Elsewhere? Elsewhere you have no hope in influencing a single person who matters. At least on sci.med.dentistry, you could conceivably convince a handful of dentists here, who could then pass your message along to several thousand patients each year. If you're afraid to try to make your case among educated professionals, I can certainly understand. It's much easier to herd the uniformed masses via a website.

- ***Follow-Ups:***

- ◆ ***Re: Fluoride treatments***

- ◇ *From:* Peter Meiers

- ***References:***

- ◆ ***Fluoride treatments***

- ◇ *From:* elbyc

- ◆ ***Re: Fluoride treatments***

- ◇ *From:* nyscof

- ◆ ***Re: Fluoride treatments***

- ◇ *From:* The Real Paul

Re: Fluoride treatments

- ◆ **Re: Fluoride treatments**
 - ◇ *From: Peter Meiers*
- ◆ **Re: Fluoride treatments**
 - ◇ *From: NOYB*
- ◆ **Re: Fluoride treatments**
 - ◇ *From: Peter Meiers*
- ◆ **Re: Fluoride treatments**
 - ◇ *From: NOYB*
- ◆ **Re: Fluoride treatments**
 - ◇ *From: Peter Meiers*

- Prev by Date: **Re: Fluoride treatments**
- Next by Date: **Re: Fluoride treatments**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Fluoride treatments**
- Next by thread: **Re: Fluoride treatments**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**