

Subject: FW: Next step?

Date: Tuesday, 2 March 2010 at 10:32:36 Greenwich Mean Time

From: Mike Mew

To: Nigel.Harradine@bristol.ac.uk

CC: Ljoffeorth@aol.com, Alison.Murray@sdah-tr.trent.nhs.uk, sadafkhan86@hotmail.com, AliMurray@aol.com, ann.wright@bos.org.uk, d.e.j.b@btinternet.com, helen@bools.plus.com, helennewbrook@btinternet.com, pearsonkj@aol.com, pjmc@talktalk.net, S.Cunningham@eastman.ucl.ac.uk, sadafkhan86@hotmail.co.uk, tracyposner@positivecomm.com, 'Tidy David'

Dear BOS

I think you are aware of our concerns on the following issues

- 1) We need a full, fair and free debate on the aetiology of malocclusion, starting with a debate (by free we mean open).
- 2) The public should receive fully informed consent, being told about any alternatives that they might want to know, especially prior to surgical procedures.

We have raised both these before and in view of your lack of response feel we must take further action. Both you and the GDC have declined repeated invitations to organise a debate on the former subject. In response to my question of what had orthodontics to lose from a debate, Nigel has argued that "It is not so much a question of what orthodontics has to lose but rather of what would be gained" .

If you feel that you have no need to understand the cause of malocclusion then I feel that I am acting in the public interest to push you into a debate. It seems that there is collective hand washing by both your selves and the GDC, both of you feeling justified in claiming that this is not your problem. I am aware that my behaviour in this has been pushy almost to the point of rudeness for which I can only hope you can forgive me in the name of science.

Both my Father and I were a little dismayed by the response by David Tidy at the end of last year to my email. I do not think that he intended to send this response, however it is quite informative.

In this David mentioned that "We'll take more notice when he [John Mew] spends time doing some decent research instead of arguing". You must know how difficult it is to perform "decent" research in general practice, especially for a system that relies of the cooperation of 8 year olds. Surely it should only be for him to prove a likely probability after which "it should be for universities funded by the public to investigate for the public good, if only to prove Orthodontics wrong" (Black swan BDJ 2009). Your accusation is more galling after the BOS have declined my Fathers request to either have a full debate with him (despite repeated attempts- and please don't bring up the public hanging in Manchester- which was a farce) or to enter a project of comparing excellent results. It is very unlikely, either statistically or with common sense, that one small practice with less than 30 referrals per year can consistently produce the very best facial changes in the country where nearly a million people are treated a year, that is of scientific merit and if proven would deserve further

investigation. But if you refuse to participate then you can hardly criticise his level of research. And furthermore, in the words of Tom Lessl “*Science, in other words, is argument and debate*” 2005. Thus to avoid argument is to avoid science, and “studied silence” can never be a scientific response. It is the response of a bankrupt philosophy.

It is interesting that you bring the subject of my Father being expelled from the BOS. You mention that this is for misconduct. The matter was in regard to the advert with which he had placed in the *Parents News*. This was clearly an attempt to blow the whistle and it called for an independent enquiry, as all other avenues, including through your selves, had been exhausted.

I know of nothing in this advertisement that is factually incorrect. In any independent organisation my father would have been asked to explain himself, and any errors in the advertisement would have been identified, but unfortunately his guilt was assumed and an apology was demanded on threat of expulsion. When acting as investigator, prosecutor, jury and sentencing judge, a level of accountability and even-handedness is required, all of which was sorely lacking. Furthermore we saw the demand for an apology (and indeed your hearing) as somewhat premature as the case will not reach the GDC until 16th and 17th of March this year in a hearing that if independent and fair should find that we have no case to answer. I would like this opportunity to invite you to send a representative to the hearing and possibly be prepared to reinstate my Father with an obvious apology should he indeed be cleared of the charges.

David also mentions that “He has "close relationships with many leading figures across the profession" so he doesn't need our help”, interestingly he has always considered yourself to be one of those *close relationships*. It would appear that this is not reciprocated which has been a great shame, for he speaks highly of you. If someone who would let me die without consenting to hear my life’s work out in full, I would question the relationship. It is interesting and unfortunate that such issues of scientific debate unleash such polarisation in some people.

Against the need to hear my Fathers ideas you quote that the aims of the BOS which is to;

- promote the study and practice of orthodontics
- maintain and improve professional standards in orthodontics
- encourage research and education in orthodontics

And then continue to say “Nowhere does this say we have a responsibility to facilitate a platform for anyone's ideas”. I guess that it was a little naive of me to think that you would want to listen to someone else’s ideas for the sake of scientific interest. As I mentioned in the previous letter I very much doubt that any of you understand the Orthotropic concept to the point where you could give constructive criticism, and thus you don’t really understand it. In a rather flat earth perspective you simply dismiss it as it does not fit with your concept and it challenges your core principles. And it does not align the teeth very well, but then this is the whole point that we have been trying to get across, straight teeth are not its primary aim and you need to see why not to understand the concept.

However if you read or interpret your aims (constitution) you would have to agree that you are committed to furthering the understanding malocclusion. That you do not understand the cause,

pathology or cure of malocclusion is a great shame and must reflect the fact that Orthodontic research is of notoriously poor quality, little could be considered “decent”. Very fortunately there are adequate well researched papers published in respectable peer reviewed journals to warrant a review of the cause of malocclusion. These papers have been generally over looked. And if you know so little about malocclusion then you should start with looking at the cause, the aetiology.

I should not have to remind you that you are also a charity and to quote the Charities Commission’s general guidance on public benefit, “all charities’ aims to be, demonstrably, for the public benefit”. As such it could be assumed that it would be in the public interest to enter a debate on the cause of the problem that you are treating, especially if you don’t know.

I do not claim that Orthotropics as we practice it can provide all the answers or is an ideal solution. We feel and have always felt that it is only through constructive scientific critique that it can develop. Had Orthotropics received university focus and research this might already be the case but unfortunately it has not. Scientific interchange, be that debate or argument, is the option that you must now take. Blocking this is trying to stop science, and the more that you try to hold down the lid on this issue, the more the pressure is rising and eventually it will explode. You cannot stop the truth.

Are you going to assist us in our objectives or not? It upsets me to have to push so hard but otherwise nothing will happen.

Mike

From: john mew [mailto:john.mew@virgin.net]
Sent: 10 December 2009 20:24
To: 'Mike Mew'
Subject: FW: Next step?

[This was accidentally sent to me.](#)

From: David Tidy [mailto:dctidy@gmail.com]
Sent: 03 December 2009 16:25
To: Nigel Harradine
Cc: Joffe Les; Murray Alison; sadafkhan86@hotmail.com; AliMurray@aol.com; ann.wright@bos.org.uk; d.e.j.b@btinternet.com; helen@bools.plus.com; helennewbrook@btinternet.com; pearsonkj@aol.com; pj MCC@talktalk.net; S.Cunningham@eastman.ucl.ac.uk; sadafkhan86@hotmail.co.uk; tracyposner@positivecomm.com; john mew
Subject: Re: Next step?

Nigel

To quote: The British Orthodontic Society is a charity which aims to

- promote the study and practice of orthodontics
- maintain and improve professional standards in orthodontics
- encourage research and education in orthodontics

Nowhere does this say we have a responsibility to facilitate a platform for anyone's ideas, let alone those of a member expelled for misconduct. How we pursue our aims is entirely our decision. If he wants a debate on his ideas, it is up to him to find the participants and stage it himself. He has "close relationships with many leading figures across the profession" so he doesn't need our help.

We'll take more notice when he spends time doing some decent research instead of arguing. Meanwhile a studied silence on our part would seem the best response.

Incidentally I notice there was a nicely understated riposte to him in the latest BDJ.

David

2009/12/3 Mike Mew <mikemew@gmail.com>

Dear Executives and trustees of the BOS

Where are we with all this and how we might move forward? I am concerned that the profession will come into disrepute if it is seen to be actively avoiding or suppressing the discussion on Orthotropics or the aetiology of malocclusion

The leaders of all professions have a duty to the public to give a valid assessment of any new ideas and concepts, especially when they come from someone who is undeniably well published, has a large international following and has close relationships with many leading figures across the profession. And even some of you would consider a friend.

Many of you have had discussions with my father on a range of topics: you must therefore have an opinion on whether he gave well supported arguments or was knowledgeable. However, he has never actually been allowed to give a full account of his ideas to the orthodontic community, and at his age does not have much time left in which to do so. Therefore , unless you are convinced that you understand his ideas sufficiently in order to be able to dismiss their merit entirely and unless you are convinced that the profession has nothing whatsoever to gain from him and his ideas, you should be doing all you can to expedite and accelerate the path towards full discussion, rather than seeking to frustrate or suppress it with the risk that the opportunity to accurately review one of the profession's greatest lateral thinkers be lost entirely.

In a science that is far from exact and where there are such large gaps in the understanding of malocclusion it would take great arrogance and even greater folly to dismiss new ideas, especially when you have a duty to the public to give a valid assessment of their merit. I am concerned though that the leaders of this profession lack a sufficient level of understand of my father's ideas in order to be in a position to give constructive criticism or make a valid assessment of their merit, which makes the argument for a broader and more inclusive debate all the more compelling. Many of you

do not see the stark separation between Orthotropics and functional therapy.

Following our previous conversation (23rd June) I am waiting on a response from you with regard to sending a mass email to find an opponent for a debate on the aetiology of malocclusion. I am now appealing to you on a formal basis as leaders of the profession to find me an opponent for a debate that is long overdue. While I would welcome your participation in the debate I do understand that you do not have a responsibility to participate personally in it, but you do have a responsibility as a professional organisation to facilitate it – whatever your ideological beliefs. So could you possibly send a mass email out for me, in which I could set out the basis for the debate and seek an opponent?

My Father is 81 now, please give me some consideration in my urgency and excess my frustration with the lack of progress.

Mike

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.426 / Virus Database: 270.14.98/2552 - Release Date: 12/10/09 07:36:00