

## All Chiropractors Are Created Equal, But Some Are More Chiropractic Than Others

Roland Toth, DC

It has come time for Straight Chiropractic Academic Standards Association (SCASA) to pay their dues and be certified in the same way that all others are certified under the United States Office of Education (USOE); but the SCASA supporters still want it their way. From what I see printed in Dynamic Chiropractic, it appears to me that the Vertebral Subluxation Research Institute (VSRI) protocol is a proven sham! Why else would a satisfied "researcher" state that the program paid for itself within a certain period of time? I've never heard of purchasing a "research program." And listen to them all scream! To "ice the cake," SCASA pretends it is a different animal, with all the rights attached to being "more equal" (with apologies to George Orwell).

I should like to add an argument to the learned pronouncements of many research authorities such as Dr. Reed Phillips and Dr. John Triano. I feel humble to do so.

I have had personal experience as a research subject in the past. In those instances, I was paid for my participation; I did not pay, nor did my insurance company. Further, I solicited to participate; I was not solicited. Excerpts from the VSRI tapes which you printed in your paper certainly suggested to me that the VSRI tapes were a means of coercing chiropractic participation. In short, it was a means of acquiring patients. It seems to me that what is present is no more than bare-faced, possibly fraudulent, recruitment.

Additionally, it would appear that a SCASA student can be licensed to practice in very few states. There is a disparity between the number of states which SCASA says will accept them and the states which say they license SCASA students -- just another inconsistency. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how SCASA can deny "diagnosis" in the light of D.D. Palmer's statements, before he died, that "analysis" was a new term to use until our place was legally secure. It still isn't secure and the espionage of the "straight" is why. With their stubborn stance against diagnosis and mainstream chiropractic, it probably never will be secure.

As I read both The Chiropractic Journal and Dynamic Chiropractic, (presuming the evidence is reliably reported by both papers), I am reminded of a traffic court verdict delivered against me: "Guilty by virtue of your own testimony," and I so state to SCASA. To Rondberg and his fellow travelers: You are making it easy for our enemies to defeat us. You are entitled to your opinions but not to destroy our profession. You appear to be throwing out the baby with the bathwater and trying to catch the baby in mid-air to "prove" your good will. It won't succeed and will hurt all of us. But then, I don't think you care since you aren't in charge of chiropractic.

All in all, when one examines the published data and information, one is struck by the fact that the defense of the SCASA crew and Rondberg et al. is the pure emotional content devoid of any factual documentation. There are many things that need to be accomplished by SCASA, which have not occurred. These are requirements which the Chiropractic Council on Education (CCE), Council on Post-secondary Accreditation (COPA) and others have laid down for all entities seeking a particular level of post-secondary accreditation, to assure minimum levels of proficiency and instructional

competence. The testimony of CCE and others demonstrates that SCASA cannot or will not meet these same standards as the rest of the profession. Why should the reputation of the entire profession suffer because of the insufferable ego of a few.

With all the problems of our profession, I do not understand why the energy of these self-proclaimed prophets of the "one true faith of straight chiropractic" will not be used to overcome the tremendous problems which the whole profession faces. A few of these problems are:

Item: We have had two nice efforts by Reader's Digest to promote chiropractic. This should have been promoted widely in the media but that didn't happen. Rondberg, why didn't you promote it more strongly?

Item: The British Medical Journal performed a long and excellent study which was published in early June, but wasn't given much attention anywhere. Had this been a study by the American Medical Association (AMA) disproving chiropractic, we all know what the strength of the campaign would have been. When the AMA learns a new technique, i.e., for splinter removal from the skin, it's on every news show. We chiropractors get a favorable report from the British Medical Journal and no one knows it. Why? This would be a "natural" for Rondberg et al., but what are they doing? Their misplaced action speaks loudly. You can bet that the AMA wouldn't tell the world of a report favorable to chiropractic.

Item: The Wilk vs. AMA et al. case has been refused to be heard by the United States Supreme Court. Why hasn't this been vigorously pressed through the media by Rondberg et al? See the above item. We spend too much time preaching to the choir or battling each other over imaginary wrongs.

Item: Our profession is being written out of almost every insurance plan in existence and being denied entry into Health Medical Organizations (HMOs) and PPOs, and almost every other version of health insurance that you can imagine. Our participation in Medicare is a national joke, bordering on disgrace. The courts have decided that the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) is a valid plan and pre-empts all state self-insured funds. And every fund qualifies, with some clever "weasel wording." We loose again. What are the self-appointed leaders doing? Rondberg and SCASA: Wake up and smell the coffee! Help us! Show us how! Show us the "way!"

During the early days of World War II, there was a debate in the British Parliament as to whether they would honor their treaty commitments to Poland and enter the war. A well-known member of the "loyal opposition" rose to address the House of Commons. Everyone had great fear that he would deliver an impassioned political speech in favor of his party's position, which was other than the national need. As he rose to speak, a voice shouted out, "Speak for England." He paused and abandoned his prepared test and, indeed, spoke for England -- very passionately. He spoke for England and England entered the war for freedom. It cost dearly -- but then freedom always does. Who speaks for chiropractic? Certainly not SCASA or Rondberg. Rondberg does not unify; he divides with the hope of rising like a magnificent Phoenix. But he can't -- nor will he ever. He and SCASA speaks for a fraction of an otherwise good profession. But that fraction(al) part of our profession is too self-centered to speak for the good of any whole.

*Roland Toth, D.C.*  
*Dayton, Ohio*

MARCH 1991