

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.



Let's Get Back to
Negro, Labor Issues

HOUSTON, Texas.

Dear Editor:

The current discussions of party policy toward national issues facing us are interesting, but do they really provide us with more insight into the problems, or are they tilting at imaginary windmills? Maybe my viewpoint is prejudiced and provincial, since I am at the center of—at least two of the most vital issues, but I cannot help feeling the Party must "get with" the Negro and the trade unionist or we have lost a large part of our purpose.

When we discuss the Negro as a nation within a nation, or merely as a man with a problem, we are putting him in a position as a member of a minority group seeking rights and privileges denied him because of this classification. . . . We increase this fallacious thinking when we continue to classify him at all turns into the special category.

I am an individual free to choose my own economic path and political views and I don't like to be rubber stamped as just

another number in a minority group, especially by my own Party.

The efforts of the Party in stamping out chauvinistic attitudes and practices have been most heartening, but are we not now raising a great chauvinistic monster by insisting on regarding the Negro as a group and not as a group of individuals? It is true that we have common problems we hope to solve them by mutual action, but we don't want every facet of our lives colored by the classification.

Even in our own Party in the South, we recognize the unhealthy social division of the past by segregating the membership right down the color line, because some of the older white members are afraid of defying local traditions too openly!

Let us individuals cease this nonsense and get on with our fight for peace and equality. Let's break down the resistance to the labor movement in the South, and we Southerners feel that a lot of the social problems will disappear at the same time.

At least, let us of the Communist Party work with some show of solidarity or we can never hope to gain anything.

SOUTHERN TRADE
UNIONIST

Why Chiropractic

Dear Editor:

Recognizing the growing interest in chiropractic, the Public Affairs Institute in Washington recently published a pamphlet entitled "The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic." The pamphlet was particularly stimulating in view of the diehard hostility of the American Medical Association's top bodies, which have resisted licensing of chiropractors in New York and elsewhere. In

this respect New York shares the unenviable distinction of being together with Mississippi, Louisiana and Massachusetts, the only states which do not license chiropractors.

The pamphlet exposes many unfounded conceptions of chiropractic, the roots of which as a method of healing go back to ancient times. The concept of chiropractic is that dislocations of vertebra of the spine cause pressure on nerves, and this in turn impairs the functioning of various organs of the body; that by straightening the spine these organs are restored to normal function. In the states where chiropractic is licensed, the training includes the same basic courses as for a doctor, and the total number of school hours is roughly the same (about 4,000 hours).

Chiropractic is a growing profession. Each year over two million new patients seek the aid of 25,000 chiropractors. Chiropractic is now recognized by the U. S. Veterans Administrators, the U. S. Armed Services, the Railroad Retirement Board, Workmen's Compensation laws in all but six states, as well as by insurance companies. Many of the major corporations use chiropractors in their factory medical departments.

A series of articles in May, 1956, in the New York Daily News called the profession "unlicensed but not unsung by its patients." Though technically subject to prosecution (because unlicensed), the article pointed out that "judges and juries automatically throw out cases against chiropractors." Attorney General Javits himself favors legal supervision of chiropractors.

It is hardly consistent for doctors to oppose licensing chiropractors in New York—since this opens the field wide for any quack to call himself a chiropractor—and then blame the profession because there are many unqualified people in practice! Many doctors, however, do favor licensing and have developed

Trachtenberg

(Continued from Page 7)

he was put in prison. He finally had to flee north himself and keep up the fight from there.

When the Civil War, the second American Revolution, as quoted by the historians, was over, the editor came back to his home town. A banquet was held in his honor in that southern city celebrating the return of the exile. To that homecoming celebration the editor made a few remarks engendered with the following meaningful peroration, and I quote:

"There was something deeper in the struggle in which I was engaged than the question of ethical law. There was something higher than the decisions of the courts. It was the old battle not yet ended between freedom and slavery, between the rights of the toiling many and the special privileges of the aristocratic few. It was human justice against arbitrary power. It was the refining spirit of humanity."

I thank you.

cooperative relations with chiropractors in the treatment of patients.

It seems to me that chiropractic is a legitimate part of the medical profession, all the more important since emphasis is placed on prevention and not only cure. Chiropractic does not supplant existing medical advances, but supplements them with a new approach and technique which in fact are finding recognition in the medical profession itself as part of physical medicine. In many European countries and elsewhere chiropractic is a recognized part of medicine.

The subject of chiropractic should not be taboo. I would hope that doctors and others in the ranks will see fit to discuss the pros and cons of chiropractic and speak up for licensing.

CHARLES STRONG.