

Letters from Readers

The views expressed in the letters printed below do not necessarily reflect our own. However we are glad to present their opinions and invite others to write to this column.

More About Chiropractic

CHICAGO.

Dear Editor:

This is in reply to the Case Against Chiropractic by W. R. of Chicago which appeared in the Sunday Worker, Oct. 14, in reply to Charles Strong. Why Chiropractic in the Sept. 30 issue of the Worker. Strong explained the growing demand for this service and the recognition of the Chiropractors by the various Government departments including insurance companies and major corporations who have them in their factory medical departments. This information he states came from a pamphlet published recently by the Public Affairs Institute in Washington.

W. R. gives us his own experience visiting a Chiropractor whose diagnosis seemed phony to him. If this incident happened several decades ago, or was recently performed by one who attended an unrecognized school I have no doubts about it. To judge this against the whole profession is absurd. Facts are, that a few generations ago, all medical doctors had only six months of training. Do we slur them!

As Charles Strong points out, in the states where chiropractors are licensed, the training includes the same basic course as for a medical doctor and the number of hours is about 4,000. Today this practice is considered scientific. Over 33 million patients in the past year have enjoyed the comfort of this science.

I had medical attention from time to time until my middle forties. I was getting very discouraged with my condition I turned to a chiropractor. He gave me a physical and spine examination. He suggested going to the clinic for X-ray and other tests, which I did. He prescribed a diet and a supplement to my food. In the interim of his treatments I had pleurisy and stomach catarrh. I took no medicine while under his care. Today I am enjoying good health, thanks to the chiropractic profession and a good doctor. . . I have the X-rays to prove the arthritis is

cleared up and the spine back to normal.

I would like to refer any one interested to a book by James Mennell, M.A., M.D., B.C. (Contab), etc. Vol II 1952. THE SCIENCE AND ART OF JOINT MANIPULATION, McGraw-Hill Book Co., who says,

"Few people would claim to be infallible in diagnosis, and if errors in medical diagnosis are to be reduced, the technique of joint examination should form part of medical training. In the past there was valid reason for ignoring its possibilities for good, merely because of the shroud of mystery in which joint manipulation was draped."

Though the medical top bodies have recognized their failure of curing many ills of mankind, they would like to take over the whole healing art. In the words of Charles Strong "The die-hard hostility of the American Medical Association's top bodies have resisted the licensing of chiropractors."

More and more medical and chiropractic doctors see the great need for cooperation in their field in the interest of their patients. This is as it should be. The day is not far off when chiropractors will be part of hospital and clinic staff as well as in industry. This will be part of progress.

—Alice S. Belester.

Nothing New In Resolution

Dear Editor:

After reading the draft resolution I'm at a loss to discover anything as a basis for discussion at a district or national level. There is nothing in it to begin with, or so far as I can see, anything new but a rehash of propaganda that will build nothing.

It is becoming apparent to me that we definitely have two factions within the N.C. One side, the people, who wrote the "draft resolution," sees the party's failures within the area of "mistakes." The other side, consisting of Foster and Davis sees the past period in terms of reality, thereby, projecting the



objective conditions as the real road-block.

Here, it seems to me is the starting point for the draft resolution. Who is "right" and who is wrong and begin from there; for Dennis and the Gates faction to state their position and for Foster and Davis to state theirs.

After following the paper for some time, devotedly reading the "Speak Your Piece" column, reading the draft resolution and a small article by Foster on his position relative to the draft resolution, and, following Davis in his reply to this "Chick Mason," I can only conclude that there are two factions.

It also appears to me that the paper is taking sides with that of the Dennis and Gates position. Correct me if I'm wrong—but with proof. (Davis charged, for instance, that the paper withheld his reply to "Chick" for a month) Is this true?

As for me, unless I can be proven wrong, I am solid in the corner of Foster and Davis.

I will agree that the policy of the CP over the past ten years made some mistakes but nothing of such a serious nature to isolate, and weaken us numerically to the point we now find ourselves. This was done by ruthless reactionary forces which embodied McCarthyism as its way of life. It is to our credit that we have come out of this period intact.

I am not one who believes that the Progressive Party was a mistake or that the fight against fascism was a mistake either. Is it a mistake simply because we lost? Was it a mistake to fight for the Rosenbergs' lives because we lost the fight and they died? Can we not see our role and our achievements under almost impossible circumstances within the past ten years?

I lived those ten years a worker and I've felt those "objective conditions." No one can minimize their effect on me.

As for the draft resolution,

I am anxiously awaiting an alternative resolution by Foster and Davis so that by the time of the district and national conventions, we'll have something to begin with.

In conclusion, I, like Foster, believe, with confidence, that the national convention will produce, on the basis of Foster's position, not only clarity on the period past but a realistic program for the future where we will find ourselves, once again, moving with the people and the labor movement. A WORKER

Readers' Loyalty Our Capital

Dear Editor:

Again this year your paper is making a second appeal for funds in order to continue publishing—a most worthy of support endeavor this. What follows might prove helpful to arrive at an understanding of why it is so essential extending generous financial aid to a newspaper free from the influences corporate wealth unfortunately exercises over most of the nation's newspapers and magazines.

Upton Sinclair in 1920 published his book, *The Brass Check* and the public found in its pages shocking revelations concerning the plutocratic orientation of almost the entire press. And long before him Henry Adams had stated that "the press is the hired agent of a monied system. . . ." (Vol II of his collected epistles.)

The great commercialized press of the USA remains the agent guardian and voice of Big Business interests. It cannot, therefore, be both a purely business enterprise and the devoted public servant it was originally intended it to be.

Time was when publishers were editors who endeavored to mould the opinion of their readers. But nowadays the real publishers are the wealthy advertisers. Without their lavish financial support most newspapers and magazines are doomed to expire.

The Daily Worker manages to survive only because of the unflagging loyalty of its politically alert readers. May they save it again and again from undeserved disappearance from the market place of ideas.

JEFFERSONIAN

Dear Editor:

In answer to the front page appeal, in the Daily Worker of Oct. 2, we, a group of Bronx women collectively contribute \$18. Check for same is enclosed. We all unanimously feel that the Daily Worker must continue as a Daily.

FIVE BRONX WOMEN