

BUITENLAND

BRIEVEN UIT AMERIKA

De boekbespreking op blz. 634 van het Aug.-Sept. nummer over het boek van Dr. George M. Anderson: „Practical Orthodontics” van de hand van collega Nord, heeft mijn aandacht getrokken. Niet zo zeer om het feit, dat orthodontie zich in mijn speciale belangstelling mag verheugen, daarvoor, placht onze onvergetelijke leermeester Dr. J. A. W. van Loon te zeggen, moet men in de wieg gelegd zijn! Echter — het dualisme dat zich in mij openbaart als genaturaliseerd Amerikaan met een goede dosis Europese en Nederlandse opvoeding, wil zo gaarne de zaak van twee kanten bezien en horen.

Het is daarom, dat ik de vrijheid genomen heb, een vertaling van Dr. Nord's critiek te maken en die heb voorgelegd aan de auteur van het boek, Dr. George M. Anderson.

Ik geloof, dat een antwoord, zoals Dr. Anderson mij zond, verhelderend werkt en waar hij mij de vrijheid heeft gegeven zijn brief aan de redactie van het Tijdschrift voor publicatie toe te zenden, zou ik verder Dr. Anderson aan het woord willen laten. Althans wanneer de redactie wat het nut van deze Amerikaans-Nederlandse uitwisseling van gedachten betreft, er dezelfde opinie op na houdt als Uw correspondent.

Boston, November 1955.

L. Herbert Loeb

* * *

My dear Dr. Loeb:

Your letter and translation of Dr. Nord's review of the 8th Ed., „Practical Orthodontics” are appreciated. His comments will be helpful in plans for future editions.

The American orthodontist has a vague idea of European orthodontics but that applies not alone to our speciality but is equally true in many other fields of activity and knowledge. The same thing, too, might be said of European comprehension of American activity and knowledge. Just a few days ago I read a comment by an American who had been in Europe studying book publication, distribution and reading and he mentioned the almost complete lack of reading in Europe of present day American literature. There are American orthodontists who attend European meetings, who subscribe to European dental publications, who purchase European orthodontic texts and who are members of European dental and orthodontic societies. I know certain American orthodontists who have participated in and contributed to European orthodontic meetings helping to provide, thereby, a closer understanding by each group as to what will help us most help our patients. I attended the 1952 meeting in Holland where I presented a clinic and then went to London to attend the dental meeting. On my desk is a copy of the transactions of the European Orthodontic Society (1954 Ed.), an English dental journal, Grossman's orthodontic text, Duyzings „Orthodontische Apparatuur”. Then, too, this month I received from C. F. Ballard of London a paper on mandibular movements (which I requested) and, which, on reading I

recommended to H. C. Pollock (Editor, American Journal of Orthodontics) for publication and have received word that it will be published*). On the coming (1956) program of the American Society of Orthodontists meeting the names of Tully of England and Harvold of Norway appear as speakers**). We are I believe, therefore, in a position to state that orthodontic progress is being made in a very substantial way in European-American cooperative effort.

My statement on Andresen's activator is true, it has received but little acceptance over here, but that doesn't mean it hasn't real merit as has been proven in European usage. However, I couldn't fill the pages of „Practical Orthodontics” (it is long enough as it is) with technics which have not evoked a substantial interest in this country. If we find that more interest develops as a result of the brief mention now included I shall enlarge on the subject as I expect to do with other subjects throughout the text, which, of necessity, could not receive too extensive elaboration until the need for it is indicated.

I do believe (I have just counted to be sure) that the author's index contains a considerable percentage of foreign (other than American) references and the exclusion of any name should not be thought of as implying a lack of appreciation for anyone but rather that when I found two or three authors covering the same subject satisfactorily I accepted the responsibility of choosing between them in accord with what I thought were the needs of my text. The names Dr. Nord mentions as not being included are too well known for their contributions to our field to cause anyone to think that what they have done is unknown or unappreciated. Not including them takes nothing from their standing, they have a lustre all their own.

Dr. Nord's last comment fascinates me. I think he paid the book a real compliment, he said it is good but should have a new title. The title he chose I consider excellent. The book is primarily intended to be „Orthodontics as practised in the U.S.A.”

If you think after reading this lengthy letter that it might serve a good purpose in being submitted to the Dutch Journal I will be agreeable to you doing so.

Assuring you of my appreciation for your interest in this matter, I am

Sincerely,

George M. Anderson

To the Editor of „Tijdschrift voor Tandheelkunde”.

Sir,

Many thanks for sending me Dr. Anderson's letter.

From the moment that Dr. Anderson states that he agrees with me that the title of his book should be „Orthodontics as practised in the U.S.A.”, most of my remarks are beside the point.

*) The Nov., 1955 issue, American Journal of Orthodontics has *two* articles by Anders Lundstrom of Sweden.

***) I have just been informed that in late summer, early fall, 1956 Korkhaus will be in this country, by invitation.

However, I would like to state emphatically, that so far as Dentistry is concerned, the European Dentists are very well aware of what is published in the U.S.A. and the European Orthodontist has not „a vague idea” of american orthodontics but knows it very well indeed.

And, I am further still afraid that Dr. A n d e r s o n does not realise, that even if the title of his book is right, the way Orthodontics is looked upon in the U.S.A. is quite different from the views in Europe and perhaps the strongest way to make this clear, is that in U.S.A. one still talks of „Orthodontics” when we speak of „Dento-facial Orthopaedia”, which means that we are of opinion that we are handling a biological and not a technical problem that can be solved with all kinds of complicated, ingenious appliances!

Therefore I would not have mentioned the fact, that I did not find any European names in Dr. A n d e r s o n's book, if that did not imply *that the principles they stand for* and which are very controversial to those of most of the prominent American Orthodontists, are utterly neglected.

To prove my case I would like to quote from a publication in the American Journal of Orthodontics, January 1953, where G. V. F i s k, M. R. C u l b e r t, R. M. G r a i n g e r, B. H e m r e n d and R. M o y e r s are discussing „The Morphology and Physiology of Distocclusion”. They call it: „A Summary of our Present Knowledge”. On page 24 one reads: „Our staff has about every shade and variety of orthodontic opinion in it and because of the heat that is engendered on this subject care was taken to place on the team a man who largely limits himself to the use of the twin wire mechanism, a man who limits himself to labiolingual appliance and one who tends to favor the edgewise mechanism”.

That there are quite a number of men who do not believe in either of these appliances, philosophies or whatever they want to call them, obviously never entered their heads.

Ch. F. L. N o r d

Prof. Dr. W. H e s s e Zürich, ere-lid van de Vereeniging van Nederlandsche Tandartsen vierde onlangs zijn zeventigste verjaardag.