

Cassidy Quits Orthopractic CONSIDERS ORGANIZATION "TOO POLITICAL"

Editorial Staff

A person with a true research mentality is a bit different than most of us. Where we might pass something off as "ridiculous," a person with a research bent might feel the need to investigate.

Such has been the case with the orthopractic movement. With all of its claims about being a "scientific" organization, it is not unthinkable for those of a scientific bent within the chiropractic profession to investigate such claims. The important question then becomes: What did the investigator(s) find?

Many in the chiropractic profession were stunned when noted chiropractic researcher Dr. David Cassidy revealed that he had joined Orthopractic Manipulation International; some felt betrayed.

But after being a member for a little over a month, Dr. Cassidy changed his mind. In a letter to Murray Katz, MD, dated September 22, 1994, he stated:

"It is with regret that I must resign from the Orthopractic Manipulation Society (OMSI), effective immediately. As I stated in my initial letter to you, I am interested in the scientific advancement of manipulative clinical practice. However, it is becoming more obvious to me that OMSI is a political rather than academic society. At present, OMSI is too political for me as an academic to make any meaningful contribution."

Dr. Cassidy's comments about the Orthopractic corporation being "too political" were echoed by Dr. Katz in his presentation on orthopractic before the Ontario Medical Association:

"It (Orthopractic Manipulation International, Inc.) does not assess competence. We don't care who joins. It is not a medical issue, it is a political perception, public issue. So one of the weaknesses of the Orthopractic Society is that it does not assess competence. We have no idea whether the people joining are good or bad manipulators, and quite frankly we don't care."

Political manipulation is the real issue. As the chiropractic profession continues to examine Dr. Katz's orthopractic organization, the question becomes: What is the quality of the organization's scientific claim? Is this claim accurate, or just a buzz word?

OCTOBER 1994