

## We Get Letters

Disgusted with Florida Peer Review

Dear Editor:

In response to your article on Florida Peer Review and the DRS utilization review company, as well as the Florida Chiropractic Association president's message, I am truly disgusted.

The FCA response of no laws broken is clearly an admission of co-conspiracy. The FCA found no wrong doing yet the Florida state Agency for Health Care Administration has found enough unethical behavior to call for the following law changes, much to the chagrin of DRS, FCA, state peer review, and the chiropractic board:

1. reduced terms for peer review members;
2. no employment by DRS or other such companies of board members, peer review members, or probable cause members;
3. possible elimination of peer review entirely.

The FCA, peer review, and board of chiropractic should be ashamed if not censured for the despicable behavior with DRS at the expense of their own members.

*Henry Rubinstein, DC  
Miami, Florida*

---

Ready, Aim, Fire!

Dear Editor:

I thought it was interesting that you had the MCO article by Dr. Cooperstein on page 20 (volume 13, #5), and on the opposing page you had the full-page ad for the Military Combat Training Camp.

What a combination!

It gave your readers who became so peeving mad from the MCO garbage an opportunity to call the 800 number so they can prepare to readily kill someone.

What has our profession and society come to?

*Scott Shephard, DC  
Portland, Oregon*

---

## Wonderful Correction from Consumer Reports

Dear Editor:

I've just read the February 27, 1995 issue of "DC," and at the same time the March 1995 issue of Consumer Reports magazine.

Your article on page 38 about Consumer Reports printing a correction to its incorrect figures on the incidence of chiropractic-induced stroke was WONDERFUL!

Dr. William J. Laretti of Bethesda, Maryland should be considered a chiropractic hero for his hard work in getting "CR" to admit its error.

I think every chiropractor in the country should send a letter of thanks and congratulations to Dr. Laretti for his accomplishments.

Dynamic Chiropractic should also be recognized for its high quality of content as well as its timeliness.

*Eugene Hirsh, DC  
Mount Kisco, New York*

---

## The Problem with NSAIDS

Dear Editor:

I read with interest the risks named in your article "AHCPR Guidelines Recommend NSAIDS over Acetaminophen." But I was surprised that the biggest problem of all was not even mentioned. NSAIDS slow the body's ability to heal the joints that are in pain! NSAIDS are metabolized out of the body using the sulfation pathway in the liver. The sulfation process involves attaching a sulfate group to the substance you're getting rid of; so you use up sulfates. But you need sulfates to make chondroitin sulfates, which the body uses to repair joints.

By consuming NSAIDS, you deplete the pool of sulfates that the body draws from to repair the joints. The joints don't heal as quickly, so you take more NSAIDS, so the joints don't heal as quickly, around and around ...

Let's not forget that NSAIDS reduce pain by blocking the synthesis of PG2. You can take sources of PG1 and PG3, which oppose the action of PG2, and get the same effect without the side effects. PG1 precursors include black current oil and other vegetable oils. PG3 precursors include fish oils and flax oil.

*Sam Yanuck, DC  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina*

---

## Taking the Offensive

Dear Editor:

I must applaud the letter you published in the January 16, 1995 issue by Dr. Allen Roberds, "A Chiropractic Response to the Chiefs of the Pediatrics of Pediatric Hospitals in Canada and Elsewhere." It is about time someone in the profession took an offensive position regarding the bad "science" that is carried out every day in medical offices throughout the world. We cannot let the medical profession continue to condemn the chiropractic profession without the appropriate evidence to support their claims. They say we are not scientific. Is science not a subjective belief (hypothesis) that is confirmed through objective means and then repeated over again producing the same results? Does chiropractic not fit that model? I see no "scientific evidence" in the medical profession's attack on chiropractic, but no one seems to be concerned about that. The approach of defending chiropractic has gained us little ground in the health care system. The truth of the benefits of chiropractic and the harmful outcome of many medical procedures must be relayed to the general public and let them tell the politicians of the world what sort of "health care" they want.

We must not sell our philosophical background for any amount of money: that and that alone has maintained the autonomy of chiropractic. The fact that chiropractic is the best approach for spinal pain is an asset to our patients, but I would hope not the only reason they continue with chiropractic care. If the profession would like to continue practicing chiropractic, as opposed to medicine, orthopractic, or physiotherapy, we must not forget how we began. I hope the chiropractic profession is strong enough to join together to let the public know what we know about health care. I thank you Dr. Roberds for your inspiring article.

*Craig Bottrell, DC*  
*Adelaide, Australia*

APRIL 1995