

## We Get Letters & E-Mail

"We cannot be a participant in directing the educational programs of the colleges."

Dear Editor:

I have just read your article from Dynamic Chiropractic On Line on the California Board of Chiropractic Examiners' 60-day notice to Life, Palmer and Sherman chiropractic colleges regarding the teaching of physical therapy (see the December 14 issue of DC). The report of this action by the California Board is important information for the profession, as it is an official act by a state board that affects a major sector of the profession's educational program.

While the National Board of Chiropractic Examiners is hopeful that an appropriate resolution may be worked out between the parties, we must comment on the inclusion of the National Board in your statement regarding elimination of hurdles to advances in chiropractic education.

The National Board of Chiropractic Examiners' examination process is a mirror of the chiropractic profession, both of the educational programs via delphi studies and the practice of the profession via the job analysis as they relate to requirements for standardized testing. We cannot be a participant in directing the educational programs of the colleges as your article suggests.

*Horace C. Elliott,  
Executive Director,  
National Board of Chiropractic Examiners  
Greeley, Colorado*

*Editor's note:* See "California Board, Life, Palmer and Sherman Colleges Step Back from the Brink" on page 10 of this issue.

---

VA Payed for His Chiropractic Education - Why Not Hire Him?

Dear Editor:

I would like to thank you for printing the article in the November 30, 2000 issue about the Veterans Administration. I am a service-connected disabled veteran whose chiropractic education was paid for by the V.A. (not the G.I. Bill). The Veterans Administration approved and paid to send me to Palmer College of Chiropractic in Davenport, Iowa in 1975.

*John W. Kimbell,DC  
Springdale, Arkansas*

(P.S.: The local V.A. is near here in Fayetteville, Arkansas. I have been trying to get hired there as a chiropractic physician and feel I should be, because they paid for it.)

---

## Taking ASHP to Court

Dear Editor:

Over the past two years, I've read with interest the letters to the editor from various doctors expressing their frustration; disenchantment; confusion; anger; and sometimes a sense of hopelessness regarding the changes the chiropractic profession is undergoing as a result of managed care, or better yet, "mangled care." There seems to be a pervasive anger and frustration toward one common entity in this "mangled-care" game - namely the group known as ASHP. It seems that DCs are waiting for the state associations (i.e., the CCA) or for some magic legislation to provide a solution to this erosion of our profession, not to mention the erosion of private practices that ASHP is causing. Companies like ASHP are changing DCs from providers into allopathic technicians. CCA has not provided any answers, only more rhetorical B.S. about what they can't do. Some think that a class action, anti-trust lawsuit will solve the problem. In reality, such action will take too long and be too costly. You might think of this as all-out global warfare against ASHP.

For the past two years, I've consulted with three large and prestigious antitrust law firms in California about a potential antitrust action against ASHP. The bottom line: There may be a case, but it would be an enormous undertaking in time and money, as well as the emotional turmoil it would cause.

However, there may be a weak link in the corporate defenses of ASHP. Rather than a class action case, it may be more feasible to fight them not on a global scale, but on an action similar to guerilla warfare, with individual doctors or small groups of doctors filing separate suits against ASHP. The weak link may be in filing a complaint for breach of the California Business and Professions Code. I've retained an attorney, and on November 16, we filed a complaint against ASHP in the San Diego Superior Court, with Judge S. Charles Wilkershen (in Dept. 73) presiding. We are awaiting the 30-day appeal process to see if the court will accept our complaint.

*Gerry Shigekawa, DC*  
*Orange, California*  
[docshig@aol.com](mailto:docshig@aol.com)

---

"Dr. Rondberg is too caustic for the profession's good."

Dear Editor:

"Caustic" is a good description of Dr. Rondberg's diatribe, and his idiotic political and quasi-religious goal to "bring B.J.'s vision of chiropractic to the world." Dr. R. is, in my opinion, the most dangerous person alive for this profession. He claims to love a profession that he keeps personally "shooting in the foot."

Although I do not desire to be a primary care provider, and see myself more as a back and neck specialist, I am offended at his attack on Dr. Hanbrough, that he would "not know the difference between mitral regurgitation and aortic stenosis." So what? I know many MDs that wouldn't know the difference either! In fact, as a PCP, your job is to identify the presence of pathology/abnormality and refer it to the appropriate specialist - in this case, a cardiologist.

I, for one, have identified numerous pathologies over the years and have made appropriate referrals.

No big deal! Dr. R. cannot get it through his philosophy-coated, B.J.-possessed mind that some of us can and do know more than he.

Sorry to be the one to inform Dr. R., but B.J. is dead! I wish Dr. R. would blow away with the dust, for the good of the profession!

*Michael Lynn, DC*  
*Exeter, California*

---

Thanks for Keeping Us Informed

Dear Editor:

Kudos to y'all for putting the e-commerce article in the November 15 issue of DC. I look to you for the important and timely issues in chiropractic, and you sure came through!

*Bryan Born, DC*  
*Southfield, Michigan*

JANUARY 2001