

General Dental Council



27th October 2009

Dear 

Thank you very much for your last mail and its promptness, it is unfortunate that it was not delivered until the end of last week.

I have to take issue with your comments and conclusion.

Firstly I feel that two unrelated issues are being confused here, in your initial letter you stated "it would not be at all appropriate for the Council to open a debate or to discuss orthotropics with you" and your second letter you state that "The Council's position has not changed; you are currently in fitness to practice procedures due to allegations made against where your treatment of a patient's malocclusion is being called into question and it would therefore be wholly inappropriate for the Council to open a debate into this topic with you". These both refer to the philosophy of Orthotropics and an allegation by a patient's mother (now retracted) with regards to her daughter's treatment. The word "this" before "topic" in the second letter **is** a little ambiguous but should grammatically refer to Orthotropics as well. However, I **was** to bring to the attention of the council, via yourself, the fact that current orthodontic treatment in the UK **was** possibly not evidence based and that its causes **was** certainly unknown, and suggested that the council re-held a debate into the cause (or aetiology) of malocclusion, neither of these two issues relate to Orthotropics.

Also an individual cannot be held accountable for the full text content of an article that he quotes, regardless of whether he wrote it or not. The fact that I mentioned "Orthotropics" in the article "A Black Swan" does not preclude me from bringing to your attention a potentially serious issue, whether related or not. Would this not be a breach of my freedom of speech and your role in protecting patients? A murderer can still call and rely on the police.

My concern is that you are using the issue of an investigation into Orthotropics as an excuse not to enter into a debate on the aetiology of

malocclusion. These are unrelated issues and it would seem very strange to me and anyone else, especially the public that the GDC are supposed to protect, that you are not keen to hear my concerns in more detail and from that decide whether any further action is needed. I do not expect you to believe **a word that I say** but I do expect you to listen to my concerns.

The case must now rest with you, but I will take a third refusal to enter into a conversation, as a confirmation that the Council does not consider it in the interests of the public or it's self to pursue **this matter** further.

Best wishes

Mike Mew