

Chiropractic Is Opposed by Medical Incompetents

HERE IS THE LOGIC FOR THAT CONCLUSION.

Walter R. Rhodes, DC, FCCC

There has not, in recent memory, been a chiropractic advance in the legislature, in the insurance industry, in hospitals or most of the major publishers which was not bitterly opposed.

In years just past, even a favorable newspaper article was regarded as a "big victory" and cause for celebration. In the Ft. Worth Star-Telegram, for example, even a lowly letter to the editor signed by a DC (regardless of the topic of the letter) was cause for champagne and steaks for many years. Fortunately for chiropractors, especially in the legislatures, the opposition was so extreme it was unreasonable and was ultimately so viewed by the legislators.

Denial of Truths -- Eventually Gains Disgust

It became a case of our opposition declaring the world to be flat when all evidence pointed to a round world. The legislators finally heard testimony about the world being flat until they were disgusted with it, and at that point passed legislation favorable to chiropractors.

Look At What's Happening Now -- Where Is Our Opposition

Because of the intense bitterness of the New Zealand medical organizations, that nation convened an official governmental inquiry in 1979 to objectively study the worth, training, and role of chiropractic in that nation. Originally designed for a six-month life, the inquiry continued over 18 months and witnesses were heard from Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States.

When it was over, the commission wrote the most favorable report concerning chiropractic that had ever been written -- including those by chiropractors -- because the DCs had never covered as much territory, sifted through as much evidence, and studied as much chiropractic training as done all over the world, as did the Commission of New Zealand, nor were the DCs purely objective.

Made Short Work of Craftiness

It is more than amusing to know that the New Zealand Commission considered the infamous U.S. Report on Chiropractors done by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and rejected it as biased and unfair. Since the "results" of the study were published before the members of the investigating committee were even appointed, they had ample grounds for suspecting its origins.

No Room for Bias

It's important to know that there were no chiropractors on the New Zealand Commission. The Hon. Brian D. Inglis, Q.C., B.A., J.D., LL.D., a professor of law; Betty Frasher, M.B.E., M.A., an educator; and Bruce R. Penfold, M.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.N.Z., a chemistry professor, were given the responsibilities.

Then Australia did much the same in 1986; shortly followed by Norway and then Sweden in 1987.¹ In all, the result was: including the insertion of the study of chiropractic into the university system, favorable chiropractic regulatory laws passed, and inclusion in the health systems of each country.

All modern inquiries into chiropractic have resulted in favorable reports, including those in Canada, Switzerland, and Denmark.

Pragmatic Evidence

These could all be referred to as pragmatic conclusions based on clinical evidence. Thus, the door was left open through which could be heard, "'scientific evidence' is missing." It came through as a shout as puffy egos had what will soon be known as their last hurrah.

Britian Had a Study Brewing for Ten Years

Few people knew that the British Medical Research Council was studying the chiropractors as an opportunity instead of as a problem and had been since 1979. They compared chiropractic treatment of back pain patients with hospital out-patient management chiefly involving medications and physiotherapy in a multicenter study. The multicenters allowed the varying techniques of both professions to be enmeshed within the whole so that the study truly involved multiple doctors and multiple techniques of both groups.

Thus Sayeth the British

The Research Team, which did not have a chiropractor as a member, reported back to its parent and the report was made public in the most respected medical journal in the entire world: the British Medical Journal. (June 2, 1990)

- It said chiropractic was more effective, especially with chronic and severe pain patients.
- It said that chiropractic patients lost less time from work; 21 percent of chiropractic patients vs. 35 percent of hospital managed patients.
- It recommended inclusion of chiropractic into the National Health System because it would save an estimated L 10,000,000 per year, which converts to \$19,000,000.

As an aside: there are in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland a combined total of 360 chiropractors, which would result in their saving \$52,776 each annually for Britian.

Economic Impact in America -- Would Be Earthshaking

In America, where there are 46,606² chiropractors, the economic impact would be far greater. When the opposition to chiropractic says something about the "public's interests" this is to be translated as "personal, private, and pocketbook interests" of the complaining party. With that done, the correct perspective is normally visible.

In the final analysis, it's going to boil down to one question: Does the government want to continue enriching the medical monopoly, or does it want to save millions of dollars by letting competitors compete?

The Scientific World -- Married to These Conclusions for at Least Ten Years

The British study of chiropractic effectiveness is of the highest quality and standard, and will have to be lived with for at least ten years because that was the length of time the study embraced.

Regarding Permanency of Results -- DCs on Top

Other conclusions involved the permanency of chiropractic care. For those who enjoy telling how temporary chiropractic results are, the British study contradicts it. Chiropractic is the more effective and more permanent.

DCs Treat Longer -- Time Credited with Aiding Results

Other conclusions involved the time under care. The chiropractor kept his patients under treatment longer and this was found to be directly related to effectiveness.

DCs Vs Physiotherapists

Chiropractic treatment was found also to be distinctly different from physiotherapy; the chiropractor's training more thorough; his understanding of anatomy, physiology, and biological pathology higher, which contributed to his higher skill levels.

No Shock to American Doctors -- Who Knew Already

Is this news to American doctors? No, not if they read with their eyes open. Then, of course, the workers' compensation figures from the computers of insurance carriers all across America say the same thing. Begin with the California Report back in 1972 where Dr. Richard Wolf, M.D., found that chiropractors, when compared with their medical counterparts on similar cases, got their patients back to work in half the time, at half the cost, with half the residual injuries.

There were studies in Utah, Texas, and many other states which bore the figures out, but in 1988 a Florida study of several thousand closed workers' compensation cases was done and reported to the Foundation for Chiropractic Education and Research. The same message was in the conclusion: Chiropractors beat their competition badly. The carriers' talk of cost-containment is an obscenity until they take advantage of the chiropractic profession's cost reductions.

Opposition Now Cruelty -- Or Incompetence

It has finally and happily reached that point where opposition to chiropractic can be justifiably accused of a failure to keep up with the medical advances around the world: They are medical doctors in Germany who are the leaders in physical medicine; they are medical doctors in New Zealand who have accepted chiropractors; they are medical doctors in Sweden, Norway, and Australia who have put chiropractic in the university systems; and finally they are medical doctors in Britain who are asking that chiropractors be added to the public health system.

Is There a Motive at Work?

Those who consistently and bitterly oppose chiropractic in the United States are also medical doctors. From the halls of the sections of government which they unhappily influence, to the boards of directors of insurance carriers where they dominate medical policies, the opposition remains and festers.

Opportunity Rejected

They could have fairly investigated in the public interest, but did not. They are still following the September 1963 decision by the American Medical Association to set an objective of "the complete elimination of the chiropractic profession" as they appointed Mr. H. Doyl Taylor to head up the effort. This goal was pursued for ten years because "DCs were a health hazard," an assertion the

trial judge felt was "incredible and unworthy of belief" based on the evidence presented.

Organized, Financed Lying

A disinformation campaign, better known as deliberately purchased and distributed lies and half-truths, was only one of the tools the inventive Mr. Taylor developed. As a matter of cold, hard facts, they impeded progress at every possible turn, were caught at it, and convicted. One result of Mr. Taylor's legal advice to the AMA came to fruition when the American Medical Association was found guilty of violating the anti-trust laws of the United States in September 1987, by Judge Susan Getzendanner.

Access to Valid Information

But there are areas in this world where they have no influence; and good, logical, rational, and scientific studies can be made. Such studies have been made; they have been reported in scientific journals of the finest caliber. We know Mr. Taylor had access to these, plus Mr. John Jens, an Australian, came down to investigate chiropractors and found them productive and useful, but that information didn't suit Mr. Taylor's game plan, even after he met with Mr. Jens and compared notes in 1975 or shortly earlier. (The Chiropractic Report, November 1987, Vol. 2, No. 1)

Ignorance Is No Excuse

That there is no excuse for continued ignorance or drawn out opposition is a conclusion solidly based on the foundation studies mentioned above. For a doctor "not to know" of the benefits of chiropractic and other forms of physical medicine is virtually impossible in this enlightened world. It would be much like finding a doctor who didn't "know where babies came from" and trying to respect his medical knowledge in spite of his oversight.

For him to know and remain oppositional does a disservice to him; it can only erode his credibility. But to the multitude who still "believe their doctors' every word" he causes the avoidance of treatment which could reduce pain and raise the quality of life to new heights for literally thousands of people. That's much more than a mere disservice.

To Deny Incompetence -- Proves Our Point

To avoid referring to oppositional doctors as greedy, grasping, and conniving, which are abstracts difficult to prove, let them be known as incompetent. They will be incensed and provoked into defending their knowledge and abilities, and in their own defense will make our case, or break theirs. Either way is satisfactory.

Limited Choices

Except for apologizing to the whole world for being stubborn and blind, they have no position to take other than that the world is flat and all persons going east will eventually fall off. True?

References

1. Source of identities of the New Zealand appointees and dates and countries where governmental inquiries have been made: The Chiropractic Report. David Chapman Smith, March 1988, 2(3).
2. Figure from MPI's Dynamic Chiropractic. July 18, 1990, 8(15).

