

We Get Letters & E-Mail

Time to End the False Division

Editor's note: The following letter to the editor is addressed to Dr. Meridel Gatterman in response to [her May 20 article](#), "Health Promotion, Wellness and Primary Care."

Dear Dr. Gatterman:

You are very correct about the divisions in this profession. A question we should be asking ourselves is why, as intelligent as chiropractors are supposed to be, can't we get past these divisions? Why do we constantly get in our own way? Then again, are chiropractors genuinely at the heart of this division?

A long-forgotten tidbit from the *Wilk v AMA* lawsuit comes to mind; a principle that the AMA devised and wrote down in its plans to "contain and eliminate" chiropractic. That principle was to "promote disunity from within chiropractic." I want every "true" chiropractor to meditate on this. It was a goal of the AMA to divide chiropractic. As far as I'm aware, most true chiropractors understand the need for unity and have thus pushed for unity.

Why did the AMA find it necessary to write such a principle down if it wasn't going to implement it? The AMA certainly didn't hold back on any of its other efforts, did it? And who is to say we haven't been dealing with the insidious onset of a deliberate, internalized shake-up? [Why did the CCE go after Life University](#), the largest principled chiropractic college in the world? How did [the NBCE](#) ever get so pro-medicine?

Those who respond to this letter in dissent will do so with strong language, as if to admonish such thoughts as paranoid and delusional, and point out the fact the B.J. and D.D. were also divided. But neither ever reduced the profession into a modality of therapeutic pain management. They each valued this profession as "the answer" to the insanity that was then and is today the medical profession - the pharmaceutical distribution system. (This statement will set off the dissenters big-time.)

Chiropractic has maintained its existence in spite of the overwhelming efforts by the AMA and its pharmaceutical backers because of a strong fundamental principle: the subluxation. Ironically, it is this very same fundamental principle that is at the heart of the divisions of which you, Dr. Gatterman, speak. Again I ask: Are "true" chiropractors at the heart of the division? It is my considered opinion that real chiropractors are not creating the divisions that have harmed chiropractic.

Chiropractic unity is the key to ending the false division within this profession.

Richard Bend, DC
Monterey, Calif.

Dear Editor:

Providing health care to all children (and adults, for that matter) is a noble, wonderful idea, but health insurance and health care are not synonymous. Debate on how to fund health insurance takes the focus off of the real problem. The real problem is not lack of health insurance; the real problem is health insurance.

Insurance companies take 25-30% of our health care dollar and provide no health care. Sending more of our tax dollars to insurance companies only perpetuates the problem. It is country club welfare for the insurance industry. As it stands now, employers have the power of life and death over employees and their loved ones.

A better way might be for employers to give the money spent on insurance premiums to their employees and let them purchase their own policy. For instance, an employee might purchase a policy with a high deductible and save the remaining funds for their retirement. That patient becomes a better, smarter, more informed consumer now that the money is coming out of their own pocket. They might get a second opinion before going through an expensive procedure.

They might insist on a generic version of their prescription. They might question the need for that new expensive, heavily marketed drug. They might not sign a contract for many, many chiropractic treatments they don't need. They might not go to the doctor or take their children to the doctor for every little cold and case of the flu, both of which are viral and don't respond to antibiotics anyway.

They might start living a healthier lifestyle. They might quit smoking. They might eat less junk food. They might negotiate a better price from their physician or hospital. They might insist on a policy that covers alternative medicine if that is what they think best for them and their family. Health care consumers would be empowered and bring real competition to health care.

For people without employer-based insurance, we should allow those over age 55 to buy into Medicare. For those who can't afford insurance, we should provide funds for them to purchase their own health care and put what they don't spend in an account for their retirement, motivating them to become wiser consumers. We are already paying for health care for the poor through Medicaid and increased emergency room visits. As long as we are already paying for it, let's do it efficiently.

Daniel Hough, DC
Bozeman, Mont.

"There Has to Be a Better Way"

Dear Editor:

In my more than 40 years as a practicing chiropractor, I've watched as patients, friends and relatives died of cancer in spite of the billions of dollars being spent on cancer "research," which somehow hasn't changed the treatment in the past 50 years. We look on helplessly as their quality of life decreases and they slide to a merciful death after the surgery, chemo and radiation have all taken their toll.

The horror of the prospect of modern medical treatment of cancer became very personal when my wife, Anneliese, discovered a lump over her breast. Two medical doctors confirmed the diagnosis and both recommended immediate surgery and removal of the lymph nodes, although the tumor was encapsulated. Why? Because "that's what we do."

There has to be a better way, a more natural way of encouraging the body's own natural defenses to combat this invader. I had heard of nontraditional cancer treatment clinics in Mexico and Europe, and started a correspondence with [one such clinic/spa](#) in Tijuana. I learned that they treat cancer at the cellular level [using nutraceutical therapy, oxygen therapy and various other natural protocols], and that cancer cells are nondifferentiated cells - they belong to no part of the body and only function to grow and multiply. They differ from normal cells in that they thrive in a nonoxygenated environment, crave glucose and are susceptible to heat. The treatment protocols at this clinic/spa focuses directly on the cancer cells and does not adversely affect normal cells.

When my wife visited there for the first time a year ago, the "cancer markers" in her blood test were 88 (39 is a high normal) and the tumor was a palpable mass. After three weeks of treatment, the cancer markers dropped to 77.

At home, following the dietary guidelines provided to her and taking the recommended nutritional supplements, blood tests every six weeks showed a gradual decline in cancer markers into the mid-40s; the tumor has now shrunk to the point that it is barely palpable. She has experienced good health since beginning treatment. Of course, it goes without saying that she has been receiving regular chiropractic care all along.

We recently returned to the spa for another three weeks of care. We know we have made the right decision in our choice of treatment.

Arthur Krieger, DC
Clearwater, Fla.

Dynamic Chiropractic encourages letters to the editor to discuss any issue relevant to the profession, including response to articles that appeared in a previous issue of the publication. All letters should be e-mailed to editorial@mpamedia.com with "Letter to the Editor" in the subject field. Submission represents acknowledgement that your letter may appear in a future issue of *DC*, but does not guarantee publication. We receive considerable correspondence and endeavor to publish as many perspectives as possible.

JULY 2009