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My PhD thesis is a cross-disciplinary and qualitative analysis involving the social and dental sciences.

The problem statement is obvious, Queensland’s low fluoridation status.

The reasons why municipalities ignore, defer, reject or implement water fluoridation have long fascinated political and behavioural scientists.
My literature review follows the traditional model of international, Australian and Queensland perspectives.

A hypothesis emerges: “with respect to water fluoridation, the more people involved, the less the chance of adoption.”

Adjusted fluoridation has a genesis anchored in the duality of nature: fluoride has a potential for therapy and toxicity.

To this bipolarity, add community acceptance of the caries epidemic and the political sensitivities of water.

This background explains why adjusted fluoridation is amenable to challenge.

Dental statistics and field studies are the powerhouse of fluoride advocacy.

Herein lay enormous problems for Australian inquiry.

The constitution fragments responsibility for health, research and water treatment.

However, by the 1970s, other states had widely implemented fluoridation.

At this time, political scientists increasingly posed their cultural hypothesis: “Queensland is different”.

Queensland’s topography and demography influenced early fluoride politics.

Distance and decentralisation hindered prospects for epidemiological investigations.

Climate and geology were also relevant.

Queensland’s artesian fluoride experience threatened the pastoral industry.
Twelve deaths following a 1928 vaccination programme in Bundaberg carried a sociological legacy for fluoridation.

Patterns of fluid consumption in cane cutters did not conform to scientific models.

A strong opponent to fluoridation, the Social Credit movement, using the clarion call, “fluoride is a poison”, emerged as another distinctively Queensland factor in Australia’s fluoride politics.

Queensland’s constitutional and sociopolitical backgrounds are also relevant.

The unicameral and cabinet-dominated parliament epitomises centralised authority, which can either implement or hinder public policy.

The 1957 ALP split, electoral redistribution, the “politics of development” and decades of coalition government influenced Queensland’s fluoride politics.

Queensland’s Fluoridation Act institutionalised referendum into decisions and devolved power without resource to local government, which was unprepared for and disinterested in matters relating to oral health.

This background paralysed prospects for adjusted fluoridation in Queensland.

Anna Bligh’s historic announcement in 2007 demonstrates the role of one enduring tenet: centralised authority.

Thank you.