

Diane T. Yu M.D.
June 28, 2008
412 Lily Road N.E.
Lacey, WA 98506

Dear Dr. Yu:

Thank you for coming to Port Angeles on June 17th to meet with our County Board of Health.

You were candid about not thinking any information I might give you would change your opinion on the wisdom of drinking water fluoridation. On the other hand I need to tell you that my position is very much subject to change as new information is available.

My professional life has been spent half on the clinical practice of allergy and half on research. I am Board certified for Allergy/Immunology, taught medical students at Howard University for close to a quarter of a century, served as editor for Abstracts section of Journal of Allergy for about 30 years, was State's Witness for the first air pollution case brought under the Clean Air Act in Maryland and served as Chair of the Technical Committee on Air Pollution for the Metropolitan Council of Governments of Washington, D.C. for several years before moving to Washington State in 1971.

I have seen many situations where old beliefs had to be changed in the light of new knowledge and even new standards. A classic example is the radical re-evaluation of Premarin despite decades of its medical use as "safe and effective". Newspapers today are full of similar reversals based on new knowledge. As to institutional attitudes, the use of uninformed black syphilis patients for decades as controls for experiments by US Public Health Service is a practice now considered grossly unethical. So I welcome and respond to new knowledge.

With respect to drinking water fluoridation I have diligently searched for evidence of both its safety and effectiveness. My questions to USPHS elicited only responses relating to opinions or beliefs of one group or another, which cite no specific studies meeting modern standards. The USPHS admits that efficacy for tooth decay prevention by fluoridation of drinking water lacks support by "Class One" evidence due to lack of any double blind tests. On the other hand, topical applications such as use of fluoridated toothpaste were properly qualified but only at concentrations more than a thousand fold above those found in drinking water.

The position of Washington State Department of Health on fluoridation is stated as being "evidence based". Perhaps you have found something I have missed. If so, would you please provide me with any one or two studies that meet modern scientific criteria that led you to your conclusion that fluoridation is safe and effective?

Eloise Kailin, M.D.
Secretary, PPF
P. O. Box 2418, Sequim, WA 98382