

We Get Letters

"Labor Union Mentality"

Dear Editor:

Dynamic Chiropractic has always been and continues to be one of the most valuable publications that comes through the mail slot on a regular basis. It is, in fact, dynamic because it deals with many of the most important issues facing the profession in a timely manner (whereas, some other popular publications are full of stale "news" and filler culled from non-chiropractic sources).

Your column is always one of the first things I read, knowing that your position keeps you abreast of the most important themes with regard to the profession at any given moment. I find them always well-written and for the most part journalistically sound.

Today, however, I ran across a phrase which was unfamiliar to me in your discussion of corporate medicine's sought-after monopoly: "labor union mentality."

Could you tell me, just exactly what that means?

Thanking you for your clarification, I remain.

*Thomas Volenik, D.C.,
San Francisco, California*

Editor's Note: The remark was made to highlight the apparent attempt by the AMA to keep us "non-MDs" out of the health care arena. No reflection on labor unions was intended.

Editor's Note: Regarding RHT's departure from the editorial page of "DC": The letters we receive about RHT's column tend to fall into two clear categories: those that love him and those that feel his editorials have no place in our pages. The letters below are representative of this dichotomy of sentiments.

"We Needed Him"

Dear Editor:

What a marvelous tribute to RHT.

We needed him. It will be such a loss, but probably someone will come along to fill his shoes and, of course, we can't deny his wish to go on to other things.

Mary Ann Orr, D.C.

Warsaw, Indiana

"Intolerant, Sarcastic, and Openly Hostile"

Dear Editor:

MPI's mission statement says, "MPI is committed to bringing unity without uniformity to the chiropractic profession through increased knowledge and tolerance -- will you help?"

I believe everyone is entitled to an opinion. My opinion is that your publication would be better off without the intolerant, sarcastic, and openly hostile Richard H. Tyler, D.C. At a time when unity is so very important, it seems to me to be inappropriate to have a consulting editor that is angry and intolerant, and so vocal.

*Joe J. Ashton, D.C.
Canon City, Colorado*

RHT -- Our Chiropractic Nemesis

Dear Editor:

I read with great lament the recent editorial obituary of RHT. It came as a great surprise as well as with great sadness because I felt RHT was one of a few columnists that wrote about the most important issues facing our profession. His voice was one that chiropractic needed because he had the courage to confront those foes within and outside our field.

While most writers were afraid to address the major players within chiropractic, RHT attacked them with humor and style. Indeed, the loss of RHT as a critic of chiropractic's numerous problems will be felt not only by Dynamic Chiropractic, but it will be felt by our entire profession as his columns became the beacon of reform within chiropractic.

*J.C. Smith, D.C.
Warner Robins, Georgia*

Clarification: New ICD Codes

Dear Editor:

As the editor of PMIC's best selling ICD-9-CM book, I would like to respond to Stephen Kelly's article "New ICD Codes Incorporate Chiropractic Terminology" featured in the July 31, 1992 issue.

The World Health Organization's ICD-10 book has been published and includes the new M codes that pertain to chiropractors, but it is important for your readers to understand that the most recent statement from the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) is that ICD-10 will not be

implemented in the United States until "at least 2000." This means that U.S. insurance carriers will not accept these codes until ICD-10 is adopted by HCFA. Therefore, chiropractors must continue to use updated ICD-9-CM codes for at least the next eight years.

I hope this clarifies the current status of ICD-10.

Melanie C. Karaffa
Los Angeles, California

Reflections on Research

Dear Editor:

I want to comment on your recent "Report of My Findings" article. I can understand and appreciate our need for research and what it can mean for our profession. Research essentially proves what many already believe because they have been living it. However, there is another side to the research question which virtually everyone overlooks.

From ancient times to the present, man has consistently avoided, fought against, restricted and even killed over what eventually was proven to be absolutely true. The medical profession has consistently resisted virtually every non-medical form of health care for a hundred years. Today, however, all of these forms are proving to be true and valid.

My point is this: All the millions of people who have been indoctrinated into the "scientific method" and require proof of something before accepting or believing or investigating for themselves are the losers. Incalculable loss can be directly attributed to waiting for "research" to prove something or another. If health care were treated as a natural part of the system which exists in nature, then there wouldn't have to be this intellectual barrier called research to prevent people from seeking to understand the simplicity with which nature and the natural system work. From nutrition and herbs to exercise and chiropractic, when people understand how "the system" works, there isn't a lot of confusion, hesitation, and doubt. For the most part, it is readily apparent what the right course or an acceptable course of action may be. It requires natural common sense. Something, unfortunately, sorely lacking in many health professions, including our own.

Questions about whether food additives are safe, which type of vitamin to take -- natural or synthetic, a health care system dependent on drug use, etc., don't require a Ph.D. in chemistry or a medical degree to figure out. Research is great to grow in understanding and ability to help humankind. But to limit our vision and ability to serve to simply what we can "prove" would relegate us back to simply being what recent research is "permitting" people to believe -- that we are good for some cases of back pain.

The truth is far beyond what many even in our own profession believe or practice. I honestly don't know what it is going to take for people to "get the big idea" and begin to live and teach this big idea. For the natural system to function at its optimum level, it absolutely must have consistent and proper maintenance. Whether growing crops or preventing and maintaining good health, nature needs to be wisely governed and utilized, but according to nature's rules, nature's system.

Perhaps our environmental conscience awakening will help us to realize we all belong to the same

system. Waiting around for research to prove that polluting the atmosphere, the land, the water, and our food is in fact dangerous has cost trillions of dollars and millions of lives. It could even cost us our planet. How long will we continue to play the same losing game?

Jeffrey T. Maehr, D.C.
Pasadena, California

SEPTEMBER 1992