



Preparation of this data base was made possible in part by the financial support of the
National Institute of Chiropractic Research
 2950 North Seventh Street, Suite 200, Phoenix AZ 85014 USA
 (602) 224-0296; www.nicr.org

Chronology of *Claude O. Watkins, D.C.*

filename: Watkins Chrono 03/06/26

word count: 19,969

Joseph C. Keating, Jr., Ph.D.
 6135 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix AZ 85012 USA
 (602) 264-3182; JCKeating@aol.com

Color Code:

Red & Magenta: questionable or uncertain information

Green: for emphasis

Year/Volume Index to the *Journal of the National Chiropractic Association* (1949-1963), formerly *National Chiropractic Journal* (1939-1948), formerly *The Chiropractic Journal* (1933-1938), formerly *Journal of the International Chiropractic Congress* (1931-1932) and *Journal of the National Chiropractic Association* (1930-1932):

Year	Vol.	Year	Vol.	Year	Vol.	Year	Vol.
		1941	10	1951	21	1961	31
		1942	11	1952	22	1962	32
1933	1	1943	12	1953	23	1963	33
1934	3	1944	14	1954	24		
1935	4	1945	15	1955	25		
1936	5	1946	16	1956	26		
1937	6	1947	17	1957	27		
1938	7	1948	18	1958	28		
1939	8	1949	19	1959	29		
1940	9	1950	20	1960	30		

CHRONOLOGY

1931 (Mar 20): CO Watkins' *Montana Chiroliite* publishes his article, "Organization" (pp. 4-5), which suggests

The **National Chiropractic Association** has organized our profession along lines similar to those of the AMA, but only for defense purposes. Much progress has been made in its work, especially during the year which has just passed. A new directory has been published. It is encouraging to note that it is just about double the size of its predecessor, and the number of states affiliated with this national organization has increased from eleven to eighteen....In the widely circulated dictionary of the *Literary Digest* the editors had published a very poor description of Chiropractic. The **NCA** immediately demanded a correction of this definition, and was successful in securing permission to write the description of Chiropractic in all future issues. Also, we find the weekly, "Time", publishing favorable comment upon Chiropractic. Evidently they decided that our profession, though not to be feared, deserves respect. We also note that **the International Congress of Chiropractic has affiliated with the NCA**, thus giving it additional strength. We hope that other state associations will affiliate with the **NCA**, thus strengthening themselves as well as our national organization...

The editor realizes the financial conditions throughout the state, and would hesitate to ask anyone to spend money unless it were a good investment. However, I am convinced that though you may feel you cannot afford the cost of joining the state and National Associations, you cannot afford to be without their help and protection. You can be a member of the National and State Associations for \$10.00 quarterly, and will thereby enjoy the privileges of **NCA protection in malpractice suits**, the details of which most of you know. It would be a pleasure for me to send your membership application to **NCA** headquarters. Let's let the **NCA** know that its Montana affiliate is a strong one. Join the Chiropractic Army now!

-**Watkins** also notes that the straight chiropractic community is allied with medical organizations in blocking broad-scope legislation for chiropractic.

1931 (June 20): CO Watkins' *Montana Chiroliite* reports that federal government, by action of Attorney General Mitchell and Secretary of the Treasury Mellon, have extended "medicinal liquor privileges" to chiropractors and osteopaths; Watkins' notes that these were not sought by chiropractors (p. 3)

1931 (Aug 26): **CO Watkins' Montana Chiroliite** (pp. 8-9, 12) notes conviction in Queens NY of **William H. Warner** DC of the **American Bureau of Chiropractic**, as reported in the July 25, 1931 issue of **JAMA**; Werner is sentenced to 6 months in jail

1931 (Oct 20): **CO Watkins' Montana Chiroliite** (p. 1) reports:

It was also decided to lower the dues of the Montan Chiropractic Ass'n from the present \$14.00 to \$12.00. This sum is due either in one annual payment of \$12.00 or by monthly payments of \$1.00 each. However, if you are a member of the **National Chiropractic Ass'n (class B or C)** \$12.00 of your membership dues will be refunded to our State Ass'n, there by taking care of you MCA membership.

1931 (Oct): **CCA Bulletin** (1[1]) includes:

-editorial indicates that the California **BCE** (pp. 5, 15):

...composed of Fish, Fishback, **Howell** and Redmond in 1928 with **Humason** as its investigator, and working understrions by the Board and in conjunction with **CH Wood**, sought to prevent the merging of the **CSCA**, the **FC of C**, the **CCDA**, all of which were State Associations. Failing in this and with the rank and file of their own little group of followers demanding the entrance of the **Progressive Association** into the one state organization the **Board** and **CH Wood** became very desperate in devising ways of accomplishing the defeat of Chiropractic organizations in California, and were the objects of severe but honest criticism which was printed and circulated to the field by the **CCA**.

Any criticism of **Humason** was not in any way personal but a denunciation of his acts which were believed to be under direction of the **Board** and **CH Wood**. The criticism of the **Board** and **CH Wood** was based on the contents of certain letters, statements, and acts of various individuals which, all together, made it appear that a conspiracy existed to do great harm to former Board Members, to certain highly respected and educated individuals (Chiropractors), to certain really Chiropractic Associations and certain of the better Chiropractic Schools.

1931 (Nov 20): **CO Watkins' Montana Chiroliite** reports that "The Iowa State Ass'n is now a part of our **National** organization at their last convention" (p. 1)

1932 (Jan 20): CO Watkins' *Montana Chiroliite* writes (p. 4):

Month after month the **FHN** goes on slinging mud. IT brings nothing else to the Chiropractors. It to is an insult to the Chiropractor

who is interested in advancing Chiropractic and not in argumentation. The Chiropractors of the United States would be better off if they would refuse such papers and let Uncle Sam carry them back to the publishers who seem to enjoy such trash.

The *FHN* reminds us of a very large whistle on an extremely small engine. From all indications the sponsors of the *FHN* have been dwarfed. Their following is limited to the few that enjoy mud-slinging. While the other colleges have been winning their way to the respect of the profession. While I do not claim to be an analyst, I believe that the "Wolf! Wolf!" cry is no longer feared nor the mud-slinging cared for by the Chiropractic profession (Watkins, 1932a, p. 4)

-article entitled "Some More Growing Pains (p. 7):

There seems to be some trouble in the **California State Board of Chiropractic Examiners**. It seems that two members of the Board are members of one State Ass'n and three belong to the other state organization. It is very obvious that this is the wrong proportion; each Ass'n should be entitled to 2.5 members. As it now exists it is said that when the board was recently canvassed as to the relative uniformity of the climates of California and Florida three members voted for Florida (which, of course, is unusual for a Californian).

Sometime ago the **International Chiropractic Congress** saved Chiropractic in California, and, of course, now it is saved. Even that did not answer their present problem. It seems to us that if they had seven members on the Board, having four from one Ass'n and...No, that wouldn't work either. Suppose they had six members on the Board, three from each Ass'n. -then ask them problems and broadcast the arguments. Never-the-less, Chiropractic is not standing still in California; it is advancing inspite of these differences.

1932 (Feb 20): CO Watkins' *Montana Chirolite* reports:

- "This month chiropractors received the first issue of the *Indicator*, a publication of The Indicator Publishing Company, Syracuse, New York, and sponsored by the **National Chiropractic Ass'n**. It is very interesting to the layman and therefore should have a wide spread circulation" (p. 1); presumably the *Indicator* was arranged by **BA Sauer DC**

1932 (Apr 20): CO Watkins' *Montana Chirolite* reports that NCA has distributed a questionnaire to the field" (p. 4):

...1. Do you approve the action of **BJ Palmer** in dividing the Chiropractic profession? 2. Do you approve the action of anyone working with the Medical Boards against the Chiropractors? 3. Do you approve the action of anyone declaring to the public to the effect that Chiropractors who do not practice as he dictates are incompetent, insincere, and dishonest? 4. Do you approve of a Chiropractic Radio station advertising patent medicines? 5. Do you approve of letting the field decide these questions in hope that such controversies can be ended and their repetition prevented? You are to answer these questions 'yes' or 'no' and sign your name with date.

If anyone fails to receive his questionnaire, he should write the **National Chiropractic Association**, 528 Butternut St., Syracuse, NY for a copy as it is desired that all should vote. We can see no objection to your making duplicate questionnaire and sending it in to headquarters.

-Watkins also notes passage of **basic science laws** in WI (1925), CT (1925), MN (1927), NE (1927), WA (1927), Arkansas (1929), Washington DC (1929) (p. 6)

1932 (June): *Journal of the International Chiropractic Congress* [1(7)] includes:

-reprint of editorial by C.O. Watkins, D.C. in the April 1932 issue of *Montana Chirolite*, entitled "Are we fair to chiropractic?" (p. 21)

1932 (June 10): CO Watkins' *Montana Chirolite* reports that **NCA** has approved a "North Central Circuit of Conventions"

whereby state conventions will be scheduled to permit national speakers to attend in sequence (p. 2); also reports that **Lillard T. Marshall**, president of **NCA**, and **JE Slocum**, president of **ICC**, will attend **Lincoln College** Reunion at Antlers Hotel, July 25-29, 1932; other speakers will include Leo J **Steinbach**, president of the **Universal Chiropractic College** in Pittsburgh (p. 6)

1932 (July 10): CO Watkins' *Montana Chirolite* reports that **NCA** will hold its annual convention in Detroit in August, 1932 (p. 1); also notes that (p. 8):

A **National Board of Chiropractic Examiners** has been established. The first examination is to be held during the Convention at Detroit, Mich., the 5th and 6th of August, 1932. The members of the **National Board** are Dr **JE Slocum**, Webster City, Iowa; Dr **JH Durham** of Louisville Ky., Dr **AH O'Connell**, Barre, Vt.

A certificate from the **National Board** will be accepted in place of an examination for license in many states, even by the **Basic Science Board**.

For further information and application write to Dr **BA Sauer**, Secretary of the **NCA**, 528 Butternut Street, Syracuse, New York. We urge everyone possible to take this examination, especially graduates not yet licensed.

1932 (Nov 5): **Cleveland Chiropractic College** now located at 3724 Troost Ave, KC; **CS Cleveland** is Chairman of the Program Committee for the **ICC** conference; he notes that speakers will include: Lt. Gov. "Happy" Chandler of KY, **James R. Drain DC** and **HE Weiser DC** of **TCC**, **HC Harring DC** of **Missouri CC**, "**Dr Watkins** of the Educational Clinics", Dr Hawkins of the Psychopathic Sanitarium, Dr Carver, **HE Vedder** of **Lincoln CC**, **WC Schulze** of **National**, **Steinbach** of **Universal CC**, [**A.B.?**] **Hender** of **PSC**, **Trubenbach** of NY, "Beatty and Russell of the Colorado", also "**Drs Slocum, Rogers, Ohlson, Gallaher, Marshall**, **Schwiertert**, **Ingram**, **Blanchat**, **Greene**, **Hanson**, **Kolar**, **Adelman**, **Gatten**, **McNichols**"; registrants may arrange for "dissection work" through **CCC/KC** (Cleveland papers, CCC/KC)

1933 (May 10): CO Watkins' *Montana Chirolite* notes upcoming **NCA** convention in Denver on August 13-20, 1933 (p. 1); **LF Downs DC**, chairman of the **Montana Chiropractic Association's** Legislative Committee notes that Oregon recently passed **basic science law** (p. 2); Watkins also reports (p. 3):

Arizona and Oregon passed **Basic Science** laws.

North Dakota passed a law calling for two years of college work before taking the professional course. By passing such a law they were able to defeat the **Basic Science law** and retain control of Chiropractic in the state.

Most of the states have passed laws raising requirements in general.

A number of states passed laws making membership in the state Ass'n a requirement to obtain a renewal of license. It can be said to be the outstanding legislation of the year and I believe we will see much good effects from these strong State Ass'n's.

-Montana was apparently one such state

PHOTOGRAPH



William A. Budden, D.C., N.D.

circa 1934-36: **Budden** (1951) recalls that:

That the private ownership of the institutions in a measure militated against a generous and wholesale upsurge to finance this idea is true and must be taken into account in appraising the situation prevailing at that time. Only an optimist, however, and one quite unfamiliar with the economics of chiropractic schools and colleges would suggest that, by advancing scholastic requirements, more money could be made. The facts being quite the contrary, as we have intimated, the "school men" as a group hesitated. Some suggested that while the idea was a good one, the time was not yet. Nevertheless, Dr. **E.J. Smith**, young graduate of the **National College** and of Western Reserve University in 1921, gave the first real impetus toward what is now so far developed by establishing a four-year school in Cleveland, Ohio. The **Metropolitan College of Chiropractic** opened its doors to the **first four-year** students and the new era had begun. Shortly after this pioneer effort, the **National College** proclaimed that it would issue certificates of graduation "cum laude" to those who successfully negotiated its thirty-two months course. The writer of this article initiated this action and signed as "Dean" the first diplomas. It should be stated here, and with no sense of derogation of those who took a leading part in this advance, in the case of the N.C.C. certainly, the fact that a medical board of examiners held sway over chiropractic activities in Illinois, and to some extent in Ohio, tended powerfully to fertilize the soil in which the actual four-year course took root.

Almost simultaneously with these events, the new idea appeared in Colorado. The late **Homer Beatty**, head of the college in Denver and author of the well-known text, "Anatomical Adjustive Technique," now began to raise his voice calling for thirty-six months training. A vigorous advocate of any cause he espoused, the impact of his personality and propaganda soon began to make itself felt. Dr. **Beatty**, however, was not alone. Associated with him in this crusade were several of the teachers of the school, notably Dr. Niel Bishop, as well as a number of men "in the field." Behind them all, however, and adding powerfully to the growth of the movement, loomed the figure of **Professor Jones**, dean emeritus of **Northwestern University, School of Psychology**, and doctor of chiropractic of **National College**.

Now another voice from the far west was added to the growing debate. The pages of the **National Journal** began to reflect the views of **C.O. Watkins** of Montana. Logical, incisive persistent "**C.O.**" hammered away at the bulwarks of the short-course school of thought. There can be no doubt that his rapid rise to a leading place in the councils of the NCA brought powerful aid and comfort to the four-year idea.

It was, however, to Dr. R.D. **Ketchum**, of Bend, Oregon, that credit must go for giving final impulse toward definite action by the NCA. The doctor was at that time state delegate for Oregon, and was generally admitted to be one of the most influential and respected members of the then **House of Counselors**. It was as such that he issued his call to arms. Said he at the close of a short but powerful

exhortation, "We have talked a lot about the four-year course, let us get busy and do something about it.

Some time previous to this event, however, a committee appointed by the NCA had been at work attempting to evaluate the status of the schools. The outline of an accreditation system already had emerged. The groundwork was being laid for what was to come. The challenge from the West then was caught up and echoed by this committee and the wheels began to turn. At this point there strode into the forefront of the picture a stalwart figure. Already a leading member of the committee, he now took a commanding position. From that moment on, the incisive logic, the mordant sarcasm, the merciless dialectic, coupled with a calm, rock-like resistance to criticism and opposition that is **J.J. Nugent**, served as a rallying point in the conflict which suged and eddied around the four-year idea.

Powerful aid now also came from members of the Executive Committee. The secretary, Dr. **L.M. Rogers**, as an executive, long a silent symphizer, became effectively articulate on The affirmative side. Drs. Gordon M. **Goodfellow**, of California, Downs, of Montana, Harriman, of North Dakota; men from Iowa, from Illinois, from Minnesota, from Wisconsin, stood up to be counted for the new day in education. Thus ended phase one. (Budden, 1951).

1934 (Mar): **The Chiropractic Journal** (NCA) [3(3)] notes:

-**?LM Rogers?** writes (pp. 32, 40):

The **Montana Chirolite** published monthly at Sidney, Montana, by Editor Dr. **C.O. Watkins** is only a eight or ten page mimeographed news letter, but the editor has the knack of boiling everything down and giving his readers the meat of the most interesting news in the air. Let us hope that eventually every state will have its own little news bulletin keeping its members informed of local news, and that every practitioner will eventually become a subscriber to the Chiropractic Journal, so as to keep abreast of progress and national news of interest to the profession.

1934 (May): **CO Watkins' Montana Chirolite** publishes his article

"The new offensive" [republished in Keating, 1988] in which **Watkins** proposes a standard curriculum of 4 years of 9 months each to be implemented by the NCA, to be implemented in states without **Basic Science** laws (pp. 3-7) and as an alternative to **Basic Science** laws in those states which have them; this plan will be the basis for **Watkins'** proposal at the 1935 NCA convention in Hollywood, and will be re-published in slightly modified form in the NCA's **Chiropractic Journal** in June, 1934 (Watkins, 1934)

1934 (June): **The Chiropractic Journal** (NCA) [3(6)] includes:

-C.O. Watkins, D.C., secretary of the Montana Chiropractic Association, authors "The new offensive will bring sound professional advancement" (pp. 5-6, 33):

Editor's Foreword: The National Chiropractic Association does not necessarily agree with the statements made and conclusions reached in the following article, but it is timely and pertinent and is presented in the interests of sound professional advancement.

The United States Government has offered most every industry a new deal. This privilege was not extended to the professions; which may or may not be fore the best. All of the professions should be able to give themselves a new deal. This would be superior in every respect to any government-controlled plan that could be presented.

Today, Chiropractic is confronted with opportunities of which it is failing to take advantage, rather than by an advancement it is making. It is moving from side to side with no very definite progress. Although this is equally true of the other healing professions, we cannot be content to console ourselves with such facts. We must make a campaign forward, a march that will startle our quiescent competitors. We must begin an offensive which will profit not only

the future of Chiropractic generations, but which will bear fruit within a decade, and a complete victory in a score of years.

In presenting such a project, we realize that it will be accorded light consideration by many members of our profession. Others will deem it impractical. Nevertheless, we shall proffer this plan. After it has received due consideration we feel that it will be accepted by the majority of the profession. We do not contend that our plan is technically the best, but rather that the principle involved will place Chiropractic in a position superior to any of which most of us have dared to dream.

We present this plan first for the consideration of the field at large, because like Roosevelt's New Deal, this new deal depends upon the support it will obtain from the profession as a whole. It will require work, co-operation, and understanding. Its reward will be the elevation of Chiropractic above that of any healing profession in the United States yesterday, today, or tomorrow.

In undertaking it, we must free ourselves from the bondage of the past and work for but one object, namely, a superb public service. The public shall determine our reward. If the profession finds this plan acceptable, it will be presented to the N.C.A. for consideration at the Pittsburgh Convention, July 31 to August 4. This plan is here described just as it will be presented to the N.C.A. with such revisions as constructive criticism will warrant.

Read this outline carefully together with our discussion of its purposes. After giving it careful consideration, write your criticisms, your suggestions for its improvement, or your unqualified support of its proposals to the Montana Chiropractic Association in care of Dr. C.O. Watkins. This plan should interest all College heads, State Boards, State Association officers and practitioners. Their opinions will be appreciated.

I BELIEVE THAT THE CHIROPRACTORS SHOULD PRESENT THE FOLLOWING PLAN AND RECOMMEND THAT IT BE ADOPTED AS THE EDUCATIONAL PLAN OF THE NATIONAL CHIROPRACTIC ASSOCIATION:

I. That the National Chiropractic Association shall adopt as its educational plan the indorsement of the following educational requirements: Each state shall pass a law by January 1, 1938, which shall require a minimum of at least FOUR YEARS OF NINE MONTHS training in a recognized college of chiropractic. It shall also contain a **delinquency clause** requiring annually at least three days' post graduate work provided by the State Association, or some recognized college of Chiropractic, and payment proportionate to the same with the following exemptions: This clause shall not apply to any chiropractor who has graduated from a recognized college within the immediately preceding three-year period, or to any chiropractor holding a certificate of at least three months' post graduate work at a recognized College of Chiropractic within the past three years. The State Board of Chiropractic Examiners is authorized to grant further exemptions upon proper evidence of sickness, etc., but shall be consistent concerning the purpose of the Act.

II. That the National Chiropractic Association shall indorse a plan requiring that the following minimum essentials be attained by January 1, 1944. Each state shall pass a law requiring a minimum of education of at least five of nine months each at a recognized College of Chiropractic together with a two weeks' post graduate course annually subject to exemption as provided in part one.

III. That no State Association shall adopt the Educational Plan of the National Chiropractic Association without first pledging, with reasonable assurance that such a pledge can be fulfilled, to furnish the Chiropractic Colleges of the United States with high school graduates financially equipped to complete the required training, and in numbers equal to five per cent of its licensed membership in the state.

IV. That this plan shall not be used in states now subject to **Basic Science** legislation except when and where it can be substituted therefor.

V. That this plan shall not be considered an indorsement of the present or future curriculum of any Chiropractic College over that of

another, nor that all the required education time shall be obtained at any one college, nor to cause any chiropractor to support any one particular college with students other than they are now supporting.

Part I applies to a law to be passed in each state before January 1, 1938. This law will require four years of professional training. In mentioning this requirement to a chiropractor recently he commented that it called for qualifications superior to many of those of the medical profession. We admit that it does. We want to be better qualified than any of our competitors. We want to give service that is unquestionably superior. We want to place Chiropractic in front, and to keep so far in advance that we cannot be approached. Out in front the traveling is not so rough. (Our public prestige will be enhanced so that taxpayers will gladly lend state support to our educational institutions.)

Naturally, if our graduates are so well-trained, they will prove to be rather stiff competition for many of us. Some might not consider this to be a desirable situation for those who have spent their lives fighting for Chiropractic. On the other hand, these new practitioners do not want to be retarded by our short-comings. So, it is only logical that the law should contain an amendment requiring a one week post graduate course annually. This plan does not aim to compel anyone to join any State or National Association, nor does it seek to eliminate any chiropractor, regardless of his delinquency, providing that he does not insist upon remaining delinquent. Any alert professional man realizes the value of annual post graduate work. He recognizes that its financial reward is great, as well as the fact that annual post graduate work enables him to become more outstanding in his profession. Why not make this universal in our profession? These post graduate courses can be provided by the State Association at small cost per capita. Necessarily, the Chiropractic conventions should present a more educational program than do those of the average type, but a few years' experience will develop meritorious programs.

Montana has the **delinquency amendment** at present. By means of this delinquency clause we hope to make every chiropractor a professional asset. Professional animosity between the delinquent and the graduate will be eliminated. Chiropractic practice will keep more nearly apace of Chiropractic progress, and every chiropractor will be better equipped to become a leader among the members of the healing professions. This delinquency clause will raise professional standards without cost to the schools, and the practitioners will receive large dividends upon their investment. Do not let anyone tell you that the people of a state cannot fix minimum professional educational requirements or that a delinquency clause is unconstitutional.

Excellent educational programs are now being developed. At present we cannot boast of anything like perfection. After five years more experience and organization of the Convention Circuit Plan, our practitioners will be enabled to derive great benefit from attendance at our educational post graduate courses.

Part II of this plan fixes minimum requirements of the profession ten years hence. It is but a second step in our advancement, and would logically follow the benefits of the first. Arguments presented for Part I are equally true of Part II. These will be the best qualifications ever attained by any profession other than on paper.

Part III is very important. In fact, it is upon this clause that the whole plan depends. Our schools are very important. No informed chiropractor would do anything to injure them. Understanding of the Chiropractic situation forces the realization that something must be done about our schools. They need support today – tomorrow may be too late! Recently, I read an announcement from a school which offered to pay a good commission for students; another offered prizes to those who sent students. This is no reflection upon the school; it is a serious reflection upon you and me.

Recent figures show that in 1932, 16,000 students applied for admission to medical schools. Of these, only 6,200 were accepted. What became of the other 9,800 students who were able and willing

to spend a small fortune and to devote seven years to study a professional course that at the most can be considered only fifty per cent practical? Did they enter Chiropractic colleges? Did our colleges need these students who were financially able and qualified to enter medical colleges? Would you like to have them working on your side? Also, there are other thousands of students with sufficient desire and funds to enter a good profession. Are we attracting them? No! The colleges are obliged to offer rewards for any students they receive. In order to survive they must be very lenient in their selections, all because of practitioners, such as you and I.

If fifty percent of the practitioners would evidence the least bit of interest in this plan they could supply students equal to five per cent of our membership annually. This percentage may not be correct to maintain our ranks and allow for the increased membership which our additional recognition under such a plan would require, but the correct percentage can be determined.

Obviously, this phase of the plan is dependent upon an active cooperation of the profession, cooperation which has been lacking hitherto due to the lack of a definite plan. The problem of our colleges teaching a course such as prescribed in this plan need not be considered. If students with ample funds are provided, the schools can be depended upon to furnish the work.

Part IV relates to the introduction of the law. If every state having a **Basic Science** law as it applies to our profession, Chiropractic would be again under the guidance of the Chiropractic profession in that state. I believe that this could be done if the legislators could be made to realize that we have a definite educational plan. If necessary, the second plan would be used and yet be very much superior to the Basic Science plan. In this way we would place Chiropractic in a position superior to any of the other healing professions and **abolish the damnatory Basic Science law**. The first law should always be used by a state wherein it is necessary to defeat the passage of the Basic Science law. It should also be offered in every state which has no Chiropractic law at this time. All other states should introduce it by January 1, 1938; not until the State Chiropractic Association of that state has adopted the plan in its entirety.

Part V applies to the colleges. Naturally, we need all of our colleges. If a college gives only a three year course at present send students to it, but have them finish elsewhere. After this plan has been in operation a year or two every school can lengthen its course. In large cities it might result in the founding of Senior Colleges operated upon a public clinic basis, which would provide the last one or two years of training. The schools will be glad to make the necessary adjustments if students are furnished. We must work WITH our schools, not against them. We do not want to lose the delinquent college or practitioner. We want to help them to help themselves. (Professionally-owned and controlled colleges are to be desired and in the ultimate are bound to obtain.)

Considering the plan as a whole it is one of action, a plan of honest service. It is not based upon strategy; it is not complicated. It is a more aggressive plan than any ever attempted by any profession, yet it is highly feasible. Why should we not adopt such a plan? Few of us have more than forty or fifty years more to remain upon this earth, yet we are content to stand still. Circumstances may move us forward at times, often backwards. We must direct circumstances that our progress may become consistent.

I often think of a retired farmer who in the summer months runs his car down town, parks at the curb, places his feet upon the wheel and watches the passers-by. It is true he is on the "wagon" but he isn't going anywhere. I also think of the car in the snow drift that goes ahead then back, burning up energy but getting nowhere. Then, it gains a solid foothold and forges ahead. The Chiropractic profession "wiggles" back and forth and sidewise. The clock ticks on. When are we going to get somewhere? Time is short for most of us. When you are obliged to pass out of the Chiropractic picture, will Chiropractic still be squirming from side to side? Will it be on its way somewhere? Or will it have arrived? It depends only upon

whether or not you and your brother are willing to do your part in the "New Offensive."

1934 (June): CO **Watkins' Montana Chiolite** reports on injunction in Iowa court against Charles J. Boston DC's use of physiotherapy, mechanical methods and dietary recommendations; **Watkins** suggests that the case was instigated "by the **PSC**, **HIO** and **AMA**" to uphold the "so-called Model Chiropractic Law which was advocated by **Palmer** a few years ago....The decision which was handed down against Dr. Boston shows the effects of the argument of the counsel for the state which represented the side of Palmer and the AMA. After such an overwhelming defeat tendered the Chiropractors of Iowa on the recent **basic science legislation**, an Iowa court could feel free to hand down a decision very favorable to the **AMA**; which it did..." (p. 4)

1934 (July): CO **Watkins' Montana Chiolite** reports that: **-James E Slocum** DC has moved from Webster City IA to Des Moines (p. 1)

-notes JAMA's (5/5/34) report that "The cults scored heavily against public health interests in 1933. **Independent Chiropractic examining and licensing boards** were created for the first time in Colorado and Michigan, and Chiropractic acts in Montana, New Mexico, N. Carolina and North Dakota were amended so as to enlarge the scope of Chiropractic practice" (p. 2)

-neither NCA nor **CHB** protested Morris Fishbein MD's (**JAMA** Editor) radio broadcast "Character of a Quack" to the Federal Radio Commission (p. 3)

-notes upcoming NCA convention at William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh during July 31-August 4, 1934; **James E. Slocum** DC is **NCA** Chairman of Public Relations; **Lillard T. Marshall** is still **NCA** president (p. 6)

1934 (Oct): **The Chiropractic Journal (NCA)** [3(10)] includes:

-photo (l to r): W.C. **Schulze**, M.D., D.C., C.O. **Watkins**, D.C., K.J. **Hawkins**, D.C. and James **Slocum**, D.C.; **Watkins** was the organizer and **Schulze**, **Hawkins** and **Slocum** the presenters for the **NCA's** Northwest Circuit of state convention speakers/educators (cover)

1934 (Nov): **The Chiropractic Journal (NCA)** [3(11)] includes:

-photograph (cover) of Montana Chiropractic Association Convention at Butte MT, September 10-12, 1934; squatting front and center is W.C. **Schulze**, M.D., D.C., on his left James **Slocum**, D.C., on his left K.J. **Hawkins**, D.C.; the trio comprises the **NCA's** Northwest Circuit of state convention speakers/educators; C.O. **Watkins**, D.C., squatting third from left in the front row, was the organizer of the Northwest Circuit (see also **The Chiropractic Journal (NCA)** 1934 (Oct); 3(11): cover)



1934 (Dec): **National College Journal of Chiropractic** (7[4]:3,4,6,8) notes Dr. **Schulze's** participation in the **Northwest Circuit** Conventon Tour, including MN, ND, MT,

WA, UT, WY, CO, NE, SD, Ontario, IN and OH; CO Watkins' role in creating the **Northwest Circuit** is acknowledge (p. 8)

PHOTOGRAPH



C.O. Watkins, D.C., c1935

1935 (July): *The Scientific Chiropractor* (Vol. 1, No. 2) published by **National-Affiliated Chiropractors of California (NACC)** at 1102 Foreman Bldg, LA-"Official Program...40th Anniversary Convention, 1895-1935" of the **National Chiropractic Association (NCA)**, July 28-Aug 4, 1935 at the Hollywood Roosevelt Hotel in Hollywood (pp. 8-12); speakers will include:

-**CO Watkins** DC, sec'y of the **Montana Chiropractic Association**, who will speak on "Social Security Program" and "A Modern Curriculum"; Watkins will introduce the resolution to create the **NCA** Committee on Education, forerunner of the Council on Chiropractic Education (**CCE**)

1935: "The Committee on Educational Standards was created by the National Chiropractic Association (now ACA) on a resolution presented by Dr. **C.O. Watkins** who served as its chairman until 1938 (Martin RJ. Federal recognition of chiropractic accreditation agency: a story of vision and supreme effort. *The Chirogram* 1974; November: 6-21)

1936 (Jan): *The Chiropractic Journal* (NCA) [5(1)] includes: -letter to the editor from G. Pothoff DC, president of the Chiropractic Sanitarium, Forest Park, Davenport IA (p. 27):

Dear Dr. Rogers: We wish to advise you that we received a letter from Dr. Watkins of Sidney, Montana, who is secretary of the Montana Chiropractic Association, and he states that they are putting on quite a unique program. They selected the names of two hundred state officers, including the county judges and the county commissioners of each county, sent the names and addresses to us, and we addressed a copy of the booklet, "Facts - What Chiropractic Can Do for Insanity" to them, stamped them and sent the whole lot by express to Judge Ponath at Wahpeton, North Dakota, and he mailed them out from there. You will appreciate this has a far better effect than if we would mail them out from here.

It surely has been an eye-opener to Montana, as the booklets have only been out about ten days, and we have had some very fine comments from the state. We feel that other states should follow this same procedure and would be glad to have the secretaries of other state associations provide this forward-looking program in their states. It would not be much of an outlay of money for any state association, as we will gladly furnish the booklets gratis.

Thanking you in advance for any consideration given this matter and with best wishes and kind regards.

1936 (Mar): CO Watkins' *Montana Chirolyte* notes: - (p. 2):

The **Society of American Chiropractors** a few years ago publicized throughout the country what is fast becoming the

recognized **Chiropractic emblem**. The **International Chiropractic Congress** adopted it; and, at its 1934 convention it was adopted by the **NCA**...Dr. McIlroy is leading a campaign to bring the publicity value of the Chiropractic emblem to the attention of the members of our profession and we are glad to give him a hand.

-notes upcoming **NCA** convention in Indianapolis, August 9-14, 1936 (p. 3)

1938 (?**May/June?**): *Associated Chiropractic Colleges of America News* (ACCA News) [1(3)] includes (Cleveland papers, CCC/KC):

-H.E. Weiser, D.C., Ph.C., dean of the Texas Chiropractic College, authors "Something to think about" (p. 4):

Can you imagine a representative group of three men telling Chiropractic boards what to do and trying to dictate the policies for Chiropractic schools? The first is not even a member of an examining board; the second is a member of a Basic Science board; and the third is a man on a board of drugless healers. We can't feel that such leadership is Chiropractic in any way.

In the June issue of the Montana Chirolyte, Dr. C.O. Watkins, editor, speaking of our attitude toward medical control and public opinion stated: "However, we might find it wiser to **conform** than **reform**, and infinitely more practical." There is a very fine line of distinction between "**conform**," "**mimic**" and "**comply**." There are those who are fighting tooth and toenail in the profession today to have us **conform** or comply with the demands of the medical profession or of the public through the medical profession. Supposing D.D. Palmer had complied or **conformed**? Supposing every Chiropractor **conformed** with the general medical public idea of the healing art? Where would Chiropractic be today? Surely following the road of least resistance may be the easier way; it may, for the time being, be very practical, especially for personal comfort and gain. But, the road of **reform** is the road that has placed Chiropractic at the pinnacle of the healing arts. I believe it is wiser and a whole lot more honest and practical to reform others to your convictions than to conform or comply to the demands of those in power.



1938: photograph from Tom Lawrence, D.C. shows NCA group aboard tour boat during 1938 convention in Toronto; left to right are: unknown man; C.O. Watkins, D.C.; unknown man; unknown man; Mr. Cash Asher; Floyd Cregger, D.C.; Wilbern Lawrence, D.C.; Gordon M. Goodfellow, D.C., N.D.

1938: **CO Watkins** DC completes term as first chairman of the **NCA Committee on Education**, which he had initiated (reported in *Chirogram* 1974 (Nov); 41(11): 11-14); **Watkins** was elected to **NCA** Board of Directors in 1938; according to *Chirogram* 1974 (Nov); 41(11): 11-14:

The **Council of State Examining Boards** had a similar program going on at the same time - one was offsetting the other.

In 1938 Dr **KC Robinson**, president of the **NCA**, appointed Dr **Gordon Goodfellow** as chairman of the committee and allowed him

to appoint the rest of the members. He appointed Drs **Wayne Crider**, John J **Nugent**, LF Downs and FA Baker; thus combining the two groups as the **Committee on Educational Standards**. The self-evaluation request was sent to all of the then 37 chiropractic colleges in the United States, fifteen colleges responded and requested approval.

In 1939 the Committee adopted the first criteria for the approval of chiropractic colleges, which has often been modified and brought up to date.

In 1940 Dr John J. **Nugent** was hired as the Director of Education to inspect the colleges. In 1941 the first list of provisional approved colleges was issued.

1938 (Dec): **The Chiropractic Journal (NCA)** [7(12)] includes:

-“News Flashes: OKLAHOMA” (pp. 36, 38, 40) notes that Mrs. C. Sterling Cooley was Toastmaster at the state association’s convention banquet and dance; C.O. Watkins DC was a speaker:

Dr. C.O. Watkins, of Sidney Montana, member of the Executive Board of the NCA, spoke on the subject, Higher Educational Standards.” Dr. Watkins has for several years been one of the outstanding advocates of higher standards in our educational institutions, has devoted much time and study to this question, and has assembled a large volume of statistical information to support the stand he takes.

1940 (Mar): “When Chiropractic history is written it will have 30 years of which it will not be proud. Thirty years characterized by lost opportunities.” (Watkins, 1940)

1940 (Mar): **National College Journal of Chiropractic** (13[1]: 2) publishes:

Only Chiropractors Can Define Chiropractic

When chiropractic definitions were written into State laws, chiropractors themselves wrote those definitions. Chiropractors alone could say what was chiropractic.

Because most chiropractors then practiced only one drugless method, spinal adjustment, they defined chiropractic legally as adjustment of the spine.

The great majority of chiropractors now use other drugless methods in addition to spinal adjustment. **In some states chiropractors have included these other drugless methods in the legal definition of chiropractic.** They can do the same in other states. They can broaden their definition as they have broadened their practice of Chiropractic.

Neither a judge of any court, jury, legislature or layman is qualified to say what chiropractic is, except by reference to the chiropractors’ own definition. Today, as always, **only chiropractors can define chiropractic.**

“Chiropractic is what chiropractors practice’ recently wrote Dr. **CO Watkins**, Member, Executive Board, **National Chiropractic Association**. He further wrote: ‘Chiropractors practice what they have found to be scientifically correct and practical. They are the real chiropractors who are primarily interested in getting sick people well. Then it follows that chiropractic is today and will be tomorrow what scientific and practical-minded chiropractors practice.’”

1940 (Oct): **National Chiropractic Journal** [9(10)] notes:

-C.O. Watkins, D.C., member of NCA board of directors, authors “Graduate education amendment will bring greater advancement” (pp. 9, 54):

A few years ago the Montana Chiropractic Association drew up and the Montana legislature passed an amendment to the Chiropractic practice act of Montana. Since its passage, it has been known by a number of names, but for the want of a better one, it has been called the “professional delinquency amendment.” There has been considerable objection to that name, due to the fact that it implied

professional delinquency. The writer was never quite satisfied with the title either, but since we could not find a better one it was used. Since I proposed the first designation and it has not met with either my approval or that of the majority of the profession, I have given it considerable thought, and have come to the conclusion that the title “Graduate Education Amendment” is much better than the previous one, and will possibly serve us better for sometime.

In arriving at this title, I have observed the use of the term “graduate education” throughout the educational field. It first came into general use, to my knowledge, about five years ago. I was used to replace the term, “post-graduate education” and today has practically replaced that term. When the term “post-graduate” is used today, it applies to college courses wherein an additional degree is offered. Extension [sic] and field courses are usually designated as “graduate courses,” “graduate work,” etc. Therefore, I feel that our amendment is possibly better titled the “Graduate Education Amendment.”

Since **Montana has the first law of this type ever written in any statute of the United States, involving any profession**, it naturally is not perfect. However, since it is new and a number of weaknesses may be found in it as time goes on, there need be no rush to improve upon the amendment. The idea originated from the ruling of district school boards, that require school teachers to take a stipulated amount of “graduate education” to continue to retain their position. Of course, since the members of our profession are not on hire, it had to be written in our law.

Since the Montana amendment was passed it has been passed in about eight states effecting Chiropractic acts, and I believe, one state involving the dental act, and one involving the osteopathic act. It has been attempted in a number of other states, but due to misunderstanding has failed to pass. With the experience of these states, the amendment can be improved and we suggest that the **Council of State Examining Boards** make an attempt to correlate the experiences of the boards with the amendment in these various states, and take advantage of any possibilities for improvement that may be found and make recommendations to other states that they may propose a better amendment to their legislatures.

There has been and still is considerable misunderstanding of the “Graduate Education Amendment.” Due to the fact, it has met with some opposition. It has been associated with the South Dakota Act, which I believe grants the Board of Examiners power to make certain rules for the control of the profession. There is but little similarity in the two acts.

Some still believe that it provides that a practitioner must join the state association. That is not true, nor is it the purpose of the act. All the act does is provide that every licensed practitioner must attend “graduate education work” each year and makes it possible to provide such work in a cooperative way through the state association. Of course, a certificate of attendance must be sent to the board of examiners before a license can be renewed.

By providing graduate education courses through the state association, the cost is held to a minimum. In Montana, we charge \$8.00 for the educational work. If we were obliged to attend courses at Chiropractic colleges each year the cost in tuition and transportation alone would make the cost, in many cases, prohibitive. When a practitioner has attended the “graduate course” and has paid his proportionate share of the cost he is issued his certificate of attendance. The certificate of attendance cannot be issued until the tuition has been paid. Every educational institution in the United States operates on the same basis. You do not obtain your diploma until you pay your tuition and you cannot get a license until you have a diploma.

We mention the above because some question as to the constitutionality of the amendment has been raised in certain quarters. Most of these arguments are not even worthy of consideration. The amendment is definitely constitutional and we must accept that fact in view of the great number of court decisions upon similar legislation. If the state has the power to grant you a license and set certain

requirements for that license, as it has done in all states, and all professions, we cannot attack the constitutionality of this law when passed as a part of an original act. If, however, an amendment is added to a previously passed practice act the question of revoking an inalienable right must be considered. On this point, the courts have held on numerous occasions that, the state does NOT grant the members of a profession a **right** to practice, but rather the **privilege** to practice and, as such, it is alterable or revokable. The courts have never held to the contrary so far as we know. So even if an amendment is made to the original act it is constitutional.

During these first years state boards have been operating on the cautious side. It was a new idea which created some misunderstanding and no state board wishes to invoke penalties, brought about through misunderstanding, but from all reports boards are now insisting that the law be complied with. They feel that it is a good law, passed to accomplish a specific purpose, and it is their duty to enforce it.

What we are all most interested in is the success of the law. Has it accomplished its purpose of lending an increased public protection to the people of the state? I believe it has and further that it has done much more than that. By providing for graduate education, it has kept the practitioners abreast of the scientific advancement of the profession. It gives the public the best that the science has to offer. Through their association at these courses, it unites the members of the profession in the common cause, and makes for a much stronger state association. I believe, in a few years time there will be as noticeable a difference in professional standards of a state with the "graduate education amendment" over the state that hasn't it, as there now is in states that have Chiropractic laws over those that do not. Its success is also shown in the fact that other professions are very much interested in the act and some have copied the idea and are using it.

Its full success cannot be judged, however, until we take a greater advantage of the possibilities it offers. We must improve our graduate education work. We must organize it better, especially nationally. Graduate education is a problem in all professions that is receiving considerable consideration at this time. I honestly believe that the Chiropractic profession has made the greatest contribution to the solution of that problem through the "Graduate Education Amendment." A profession is expected to contribute to its own advancement, but when a profession can contribute something **original** to the great field of education, I believe we should feel justly proud. When all professions adopt our plan, we can confidently, and proudly say, that it was one original idea!

I believe it is the hope of every chiropractor who has become acquainted with and understands the graduate education amendment, that it will sooner or later become the law in the state in which he practices.

1941 (Jan 7): BJ writes to **CS Cleveland** re: **NCA**, need for schools to work together against **NCA** programs, encloses a copy of a letter (dated 12/14/40) from **Wilma Churchill Wood** DC, sec'y and owner of the **LACC** to **Gordon M. Goodfellow** DC, chair, **NCA** Committee on Education Standards (**Goodfellow** succeeded? **Crider**, who succeeded? **Watkins**); notes Crider's premature 1939 rating of schools (Cleveland papers-CCC/KC)

1941 (Apr): **National Chiropractic Journal** [10(4)] includes: "Montana: Interesting report of activities" (pp. 38, 40):

The recent legislative session proved a very active one for the healing professions in Montana. The Montana Medical Association sold bonds and did a lot of preliminary work with the intentions of making it a big legislative year. As a result the Chiropractic profession became very active and remained so throughout the session.

Two **Basic Science** Acts were introduced and both were defeated quite decisively.

The medical profession introduced and was successful in passing what is possibly the most modern medical practice act in the United States. As it was originally introduced it would have proved bad for the Chiropractic profession and possibly would not have passed had it not been amended to exempt the Chiropractic profession. However, the medical profession agreed to the following exemptions under the Act:

"Section 7. Exceptions: This act shall not apply to dentists, pharmacists, nurses, optometrists, or chiropodists, practicing within the limits of their respective callings as defined by law, and when lawfully licensed under the law, of the state of Montana. Nothing in this Act shall apply in any manner whatsoever, nor shall it be construed to restrain or restrict any legally licensed osteopath or Chiropractic practitioner licensed under the laws of this state."

While the Chiropractic profession had an agreement on these exceptions and the bill passed both the House and Senate with unimportant amendments it was necessary for it to go to conference committee. From the conference committee it emerged to pass both houses again but despite the agreement we found it had been amended in conference committee to striking out the period after the word "State" and adding "and practicing within the limits of such licensed calling." Because of this little double-cross it was necessary to take the bill from the Governor's desk back to the legislature and have this amendment taken out which was done. As the bill finely passed it is a fine piece of legislation which completely divorces the healing profession in Montana. It will serve to keep both the medical profession and the drugless professions out of court and allow each to advance its own science unmolested by the other.

Note: Just as we go to press Dr. Watkins advises that the medical profession (not liking the amendment) requested the Governor to veto the bill, which he did, so its status quo in Montana.

A new Pure Food and Drug act was also passed under which the Chiropractic profession was exempted.

A law appropriating \$5000.00 for physical education work in the state of Montana was also passed. The administration of the work is under the Dept. of Education of the state.

The Montana Chiropractic Association owes much credit for this fine legislation session, to a very fine legislative body, the high respect with which the profession is held in the state, the cooperation of its membership and especially those who worked at the legislature. While a number took part in the work at the capital, Drs. L.F. Downs and Richard Clark spent considerable of their time in Helena while the Legislature was in session and did a fine piece of work. – Reported by Dr. C.O. Watkins, Sec'y.

1942 (July 7): letter from Wilber Lawrence, D.C. to Guy M. Cheatham of the Nashville College (CCE Archives):

Dr. Guy M. Cheatham
230 Boscobel Street
Nashville College
Nashville, Tennessee
Dear Dr. Cheatham:

I want to thank you most sincerely for the certificate which entitled me to a degree of master of Chiropractic issued by your school. I certainly appreciate it beyond words. Although I have spent many years in service which have included some tokens of appreciation, I must say that none has ever come that has been appreciated more than this.

All year I have looked for an opportunity to visit your school but it has not come my way. So now I hope to see you in Chicago at the business meeting of the House of Counselors, National Chiropractic Association.

I have had several letters from Dr. Carrick insisting that some employee of the educational standard committee inspect your school. I assure you that there is nothing on earth that will give me more pleasure than to see this school included in the group of higher educational standards. If there is anything in the world that I can do to aid you in this important job, let me know. Dr. Carrick suggested

that Dr. Nugent visit your school but as you know Dr. Nugent has been out since the last convention sick and is getting back in harness very slowly. It takes time to get up his itinerary. I am writing him today, but confidentially between us I do not see how he can do anything before the July meeting. I think a fine idea would be for you to get in touch with him through correspondence. Do not hesitate, call on me for anything I can do to help you, I am

Yours very truly,...

WL:mds

1944: CO Watkins DC, FICC authors *The Basic Principles of Chiropractic Government*:

There are several facts upon the relative importance of basic and clinical research that every leader should ponder over if he is to give chiropractic prudent leadership: (1) The advancement of the **basic sciences** is not a chiropractic responsibility. (2) Chiropractic can be established and defended as a separate science only so far as we organize our own clinical research to find our own specific facts and general laws as they apply to chiropractic methods. (3) Regardless of how well chiropractic is substantiated by good basic theory, it does not establish chiropractic as a separate science. (4) It is only through clinical research in which all methods and theories are tested for specific facts that we can ever hope to synthesize chiropractic knowledge and eliminate cultism from chiropractic. To state it another way: Until the chiropractic physician can base his chiropractic practice methods upon specific knowledge obtained through clinical research there will be numerous cults and systems such as are not found in medicine or other organized clinical sciences. If we are to eliminate the cult from chiropractic, practice methods cannot be based upon basic theory anymore than they could be based upon philosophy. (5) The average chiropractic physician is not primarily interested in basic sciences, nor is he qualified to carry on research in them even if it were his responsibility to do so, but, given proper leadership every chiropractor would be able to do clinical research within the scope of his practice. (6) We have neither the specific facts to base our practice methods upon nor the specific facts to give to the public and its agencies. We are continually expecting the public and its agencies to accept chiropractic upon a basis of chiropractic theory or philosophy.

The foregoing facts should be thoroughly considered by the leaders of chiropractic. **They are the most important consideration of chiropractic organization today.** Recently, Mr. Bernard Baruch, a layman, gave a large sum of money to the medical profession to test and find the specific facts concerning chiropractic methods. The fact that it has become necessary for a layman to ask organized medicine to do clinical research upon our methods in order to determine their scientific worth should cause every chiropractic leader who has opposed the development of a scientific organization and the organization of profession-wide clinical research to hang his head in shame. If we will not develop a scientific organization to test our own methods, organized medicine will usurp our privilege. When it discovers a method of value, medical science will adopt it and incorporate it into scientific medical practice. One would think that the mere mention of these facts to chiropractic leaders would be sufficient to persuade them to develop a scientific organization to organize our science. However, these facts have been called to their attention again and again in the past few years with meagre results. Chiropractic government of yesterday was dominated by the philosopher who believed a sound, philosophical argument was sufficient basis for chiropractic methods. Cultism developed and thrived under this leadership. Chiropractic government of today is dominated by those who feel that good, basic theory is sufficient of substantiate chiropractic methods of practice. But recognized sciences base their methods not upon philosophy or theory but upon specific facts demonstrated in practice through clinical research. By its failure to build a scientific organization to organize profession-wide clinical research to scientifically test our methods, chiropractic

leadership has throughout the years failed to give chiropractic methods of practice a scientific foundation.

The present situation is critical, and unless something definite is done to provide an organization such as will establish chiropractic upon a scientific basis, chiropractic as such will soon cease to exist. In such an event, we should not blame medicine for stealing our methods but rather, we must blame our own leaders whose imprudent leadership has failed to provide the scientific organization essential to the development of an organized science of chiropractic. If the publication of this booklet is instrumental in brining about a profession-wide movement demanding that the leaders give this situation their immediate attention, it will have achieved its goal....

What is Chiropractic, Legally Speaking?

When we consider this question we find a real chiropractic problem, one which has been created largely by our own imprudent leadership....

There are a number of ironical facts regarding Chiropractic Practice Acts. First, many of our laws were written by legal counsel which specialized in chiropractic legal matters. Yet, the laws written by this specialized counsel have caused more trouble and placed greater legal restriction upon normal chiropractic progress as a science than those written by independent counsel. Second, while Chiropractic Practice Acts are of four different types as far as definition is concerned of which only one type could be considered as approaching the ideal, only the law containing a narrow specific definition has caused much embarrassment to the profession which strives to advance the science. Third, most of the effort to shackle normal chiropractic progress as a science by means of legal barriers has come from "would-be" leaders within our own profession. Fourth, while chiropractic is a science and could be well defended as such if it were better organized, chiropractic legal talent has based their defense in the past upon chiropractic as only an art. The plea of "prior art rights" is a meaningless gesture in a science since the art is subservient to the science. Further, the science of chiropractic is a separate branch of science today, but because of lack of scientific organization the fact is not as easy to prove as in other better organized sciences. Fifth, although man-made laws have little effect upon the progress of science it should be the first responsibility of our legal counsel to draw up laws and to construct substantial argument which would defend the right of the sciences to progress unmolested without legal barriers. Sixth, the one and only method of making chiropractic readily demonstrable and defensible as a separate science; namely, the organization of the science, has in the past and even today receives scant consideration by chiropractic organization. It is an absolute necessity if chiropractic is to enjoy normal progress and be enabled to fully demonstrate its claim legally as a separate branch of science.

Many of the problems which have harassed the chiropractic profession throughout the years have been the result of the bungling of legal matters by our legal counsel. While Osteopathy is little better organized as a science than is chiropractic, its legal matters have not been bungled as have ours. The science of osteopathy has had far fewer legal restrictions placed upon it. What is needed in chiropractic today is legal counsel capable of defending the right of chiropractic scientific progress. Unless this need is met our science can progress only in the face of continued legal harassment. It is the duty of our legal counsel to keep the scientific frontiers of chiropractic free of legal barriers...

1947 (June 15-17): *National Chiropractic Journal* for August [17(8): 41-2] reports:

The Oregon Association of Chiropractic Physicians held their annual convention at the Multnomah Hotel in Portland June 15, 16 and 17. Dr. JW Sargent, president, presided with Dr. Robert Wood as program chairman.

Out of state speakers on the program were Dr. Floyd Cregger, president of the NCA, who discussed 'Our National Problems' and also 'Hypothermic Revulsion.' Dr. KG Braman, of Long Beach,

California, appeared twice on the program with the subject 'Gerritt-Mejner Cancer Technic.' Dr. **CO Watkins**, of Sidney, Montana, discussed the 'Need for Tolerance.'

Among the state speakers were Dr. JW Sargent, who appeared twice with the subject 'Adjustive Technic,' and Dr. WA Budden, president of the NCA Council on Public Health, who lectured on 'The Task for the Future' and 'Cancer.'

Newly elected officers are: President, Dr. PL Poulsen; vice-president, Dr. WJ Gallagher; secretary-treasurer, Dr. Gordon V. Pefley; NCA state delegate, Dr. RD Ketchum. In addition to the above, the executive board includes Dr. JP Bray, of Morford; Dr. George Thomas, of Astoria; Dr. Clyde Dunham, of Heppner; Dr. Robert Wood, of Portland; Dr. Roy Reyholds, of Salem; Dr. JJ McCarthy, of Sweet Home; and Dr. CG Stem, of Coquille.

Mrs. Gordon V. Pefley, of Portland, was elected president of the Women's Auxiliary, and Mrs. Ross Elliott, of Portland, vice-president.

A banquet was held in the Rose Bowl of the Multnomah Hotel where a flor show and dance followed. - Reported by Dr. RD Ketchum, NCA State Delegate.

1948 (Dec 2): letter on personal stationery from C.O. Watkins, D.C. (in my Martin file):

Greetings to Chiropractic Educators:

This is to inform you that a meeting has been called for representatives of those schools who are interested in discussing a course for the formal orientation of the chiropractic student in the basic principles of science. The place of the meeting is the Sherman Hotel, Chicago. The date Jan. 5. 1949.

Of the seventeen schools I have had on my mailing list, it appears at this time, that from nine to eleven will be represented.

With every good wish to each of you, I remain

Sincerely,...

COW/ah

1948 (Dec 13): letter on CCEF stationery from Ralph J. Martin, D.C., N.D., chairman of CCEF Board of Regents, to C.O. Watkins, D.C. of Sidney MT (in my Martin file):

Dear Dr. Watkins:

Replying to yours of December 4th I wish to let you know that the California chiropractors are very much interested in the viewpoint of science as outlined in your various bulletins.

I shall be in Chicago January 5, 6 and 7 and certainly shall expect to attend the discussion of your material if the time is not in conflict with the Council on Education meetings.

At any rate, I look forward to meeting you in Chicago and hope to at least discuss the material you have organized with you personally.

Sincerely yours,...

1950 (Mar 7): letter on NCA stationery from C.O. Watkins, D.C. of Sidney MT to Ralph J. Martin, D.C., N.D., president of LACC (in my Martin file):

Dear Dr. Martin:

I enjoyed your editorial in the Chirogram. Your reference to statistical research and its need is of paramount importance. The great need, it seems to me, is not so much the statistics themselves which as you point out would give us much greater recognition, but rather we Chiropractic physicians in practice would like to have reliable measures of the demonstrable worth of our different methods of treatment on the different types of cases. This can be obtained only by organizing our profession along scientific lines and developing a responsible clinical research program.

The Medical physician enjoys the benefits of an organized science. Regardless of the type of case which comes to his office he can go to his literature and find were other doctors, perhaps very much like himself, have tested particular methods of treatment on that particular type of case. Indeed, no treatment gains much acceptance in medical practice until it has been tested by Clinical research upon a

reasonable number of cases. Thus, the medical physician always has available a fairly reliable measure of the worth of every method. The Chiropractic physician across the hall is entirely upon his own, and while he might find Clinical research upon a series of cases of sciatica, with a particular type of treatment, he cannot hope to do Clinical research covering all types of conditions and testing all the different methods. The result is that we have no scientific measure of the demonstrable worth of any method of Chiropractic care. To me it is a disgrace to Chiropractic that even after 50 years we do not have a Clinical research program, and must practice by empiric knowledge.

You mention the efforts of the P.S.C. along these lines. I doubt that any statistical work they would do would be of much value. The type of Chiropractor they work with is not of free mind. In the educational process at the P.S.C. they indoctrinate the students mind with fixed concepts of disease and its remedy. They are convinced that their particular method of treatment represents the alfa [sic] and omega of patient care and consequently to them there is no purpose to investigate and test different methods in different types of cases. Chiropractors who have had their minds arrested by this type of indoctrination cannot be expected to do impartial research, and certainly unless Clinical research is done with a free mind it is not reliable – nor the type of research which I should care to choose my methods from and to risk the life or health of my patient with. Their **interest in statistical research is only for the purpose of proving to others what they already believe** which to me is a useless and silly reason for research. I, and a great majority of Chiropractic physicians today, do not base our method on a fixed belief in a particular method. We know that there are better methods if we could but find them, we know that thru scientific investigation the methods of today should become obsolete tomorrow and we know that if there is to be scientific progress in Chiropractic we cannot give ourselves to the Cultist attitude and base our practice upon faith in a fixed concept of any particular method. Since there are but few if any Chiropractors under C.B.H. [sic] influence who do not follow the Cultist attitude, I doubt that we can expect much reliable Clinical research from that source.

Since the N.C.A. has with in its group all the free minded Chiropractic physicians it is here we must look for a Clinical research program. For the past eight years I have been trying with all the energy I could command to get the N.C.A. to develop a Clinical research program and there by bring about an organized science of Chiropractic. It is a simple thing to do but despite that fact nothing has been accomplished in that direction. Of course, there has been a great cry to support the so called N.C.A. research program that does not actually exist. Indeed, the N.C.A. does not have a Chiropractic research program even on paper let alone in effect. The money collected in the name of research has evaporated or gone somewhere but no effort has been made to organize Chiropractic as a Clinical science.

A great mistake was made about eight years ago when after considerable agitation for a research program by the field the N.C.A. decided to do something about it. The idea of developing a research program was officially adopted and a committee was appointed to put the program into effect. Unfortunately, the committee was made up of past Executives of the N.C.A. Men who themselves were of the Cultist rather than the scientific turn of mind. Men who had directed the N.C.A. along the Cultist pattern thru out the years and could not themselves understand the purpose and worth of the methods of science. To place a research program in such hands was to assure its death. Today after the original promotion brought forth no benefit to Chiropractic, we are just where we started except that Chiropractors have been "taken for another ride" by their own leadership, and have again had their hopes built up and shattered.

Today I understand the research program has been turned over to the colleges. Why I do not know. The purpose of a college is academic training. If they do any research at all, as they do in other fields, it is either basic research to support academic training, or academic research to better explain that which has already been

demonstrated in Clinical research. They are in no position to do Clinical research and we must remember that Chiropractic is a Clinical science above all else. We in the field are not interested in academic solutions. We want practical methods tested for demonstrable value thru Clinical research under conditions similar to those we practice under.

I would give much more credence to a Clinical research work done by an ordinary fellow practitioner in the field who was of free mind who treated 50 cases of goiter with a particular method of care and run up the general law himself then the same Clinical research done under the conditions of a college clinic. The same is true of Clinical research under institutional care because the facts brought out by the general law would possibly not be true except under the same circumstances.

If you will read medical literature you will find that only a small percentage, if any, of their Clinical research is done in Medical colleges or college clinics. It is true that much of their Clinical research is done in hospitals but a great majority of the medical physicians practice is also conducted in hospitals. In Chiropractic most cases are cared for in the office and that is the place our Clinical research must take place. You will also note that 99 percent of Medical research is done by the average practitioners. The same must be true in Chiropractic and the task of Clinical research must be left to the clinicians. If you will check any issue of the A.M.A. Journal you will find all the above facts are true.

Therefore, the turning over of Chiropractic research program to Chiropractic colleges as I understand has been done, reflects only a lack of understanding of the purpose of research in a Clinical science and can only result in disappointment in the end.

I point this all out to you because I believe something must be done about it. The fact is, after fifty years, Chiropractic has no research program. Even after some ten years of agitation in the name of research the N.C.A. still has no program on paper or otherwise. In fact we have no more prospects of a program then we had ten years ago and unless something is done we never will have a program. In my estimation this means taking the program out of the hands of past Executives and appointing a committee on research to study the question, draw up and submit a plan.

Medical organization is built around the purpose of Clinical investigation, testing and sharing of knowledge which will help the individual physician in his care of the patient. That is the basic purpose of organization in any field of science.

For many years Chiropractic organizations have served only the Cultist purpose of uniting Chiropractors around one or another fixed concept of disease and its remedy and the promotion of that particular concept. That is true of the C.B.H. [sic] and almost as true of the N.C.A. today. The only difference being, that in the N.C.A. its leaders follow the Cultist method in their leadership while much of its membership follows the attitude of science in their practice which results in the peculiar situation in which the membership is far ahead of the leadership and actually the leadership is often at cross purposes with the field.

This is a long letter but I have noticed that you boys in California seem to be showing evidence of far better leadership then we have on a National level and I would like to see you take a active part in straightening out our unfortunate national situation.

Again thanking you for your editorial,

I remain,...

COW/jah

1950 (Sept): **JNCA** (20[9]) includes:
-L.M. Rogers, D.C. authors "Highlights of national convention" (pp. 12-9, 60, 62, 64); includes:
...A resolution urging the Veterans Administration to provide chiropractic services to disabled veterans on the same basis as medical treatment as now made available to them.

A recommendation that a Committee on Clinical Research be established for the purpose of drawing up and carrying out a program of clinical research to effectuate an organized science of chiropractic.

A recommendation that all representations of chiropractic to the public and its agencies describe chiropractic as a **free science without any particular fixed concept of the cause of disease or its remedy...**

1950 (Nov): **JNCA** (20[11]) includes:

-George A. Smyrl, D.C., president of NCA, authors "Personnel listing of committees of the National Chiropractic Association" (pp. 31, 70); includes:

Committee on Chiropractic History

Dr. James N. Firth, Chairman, 633 N. Pennsylvania Ave., Indianapolis, Ind.; Dr. Lillard T. Marshall, 313 Citizens Bank Bldg., Lexington, Ky.; Dr. A.B. Cochrane, 39 S. State St., Chicago, Ill.; Dr. C.E. Schillig, 514 Riverdale Drive, Glendale, Calif.; Dr. C.M. Kightlinger, 152 W. 42nd Street, New York.

Committee on Educational Standards

Dr. E.H. Gardner, Chairman, 2757 S. Vermont Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. W.B. Wolf, 207 W. Main St., Eureka, S. Dak.; Dr. N.E. Osborne, 2 Broadway, Hagerstown, Md.; Dr. G.A. Bauer, 1608 Bull Street, Columbia, S.C.; Dr. John J. Nugent, 92 Norton Street, New Haven, Conn...

Committee on Clinical Research

Dr. C.O. Watkins, Chairman, Richland National Bank Bldg., Sidney, Mont.; Dr. Lee H. Norcross, 610 S. Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. J.B. Wolfe, 2222 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn...

1951 (Jan): **JNCA** (21[1]) includes:

-C.O. Watkins, D.C. of Sidney MT, chairman of NCA Committee on Clinical Research, authors "Clinical research in chiropractic" (pp. 22-3, 72, 74)

1951 (Apr): **JNCA** [21(4)] includes:

-C.O. Watkins, D.C., chairman of NCA Committee on Clinical Research, authors "Modernizing the practice acts" (pp. 13-4, 66, 68, 70):

The Chiropractic Practice Act was placed on the statute books of Montana some thirty-three years ago. Chiropractic was young at that time and the future nature or needs of the profession could not be anticipated. The result was legislation which served well in some respects to advance chiropractic; in other respects it harassed the progress of the profession and made offenders of many members.

The primary purpose of every Practice Act is to provide the instrument necessary for a profession to regulate its own educational and ethical standards. That is the scope of Practice Acts regulating all other professions. When it extends beyond that and attempts to govern practice methods, it becomes a menace to public health and an obstacle to professional and scientific progress. Furthermore, to delegate to medicine the indirect control over the care of the chiropractic patient can result in creating a hazard to public health, a stifling of scientific and professional progress, and a continually strained relationship between chiropractic and medicine. For these reasons we decided this year to divorce chiropractic from medicine by removing from our act those features which made us subservient to medicine and which interfered with a free science of chiropractic, and we drew up a bill for that purpose.

The intent of this article is to set for the case we prepared so that other states may consider it, profit by it, and perhaps improve upon it. In drawing up this bill we had but one thing in mind: To divorce chiropractic entirely from medicine and thus bring about a free profession and science of chiropractic so that in the future we might set our own sails and steer our own ship.

The two sections of the Practice Act which were affected were the ones entitled, "Definition of Chiropractic" and "Rights and Limitations." Following herewith is stated the wording of the

original act together with that of the amended sections, their several features being numbered to facilitate discussion.

Definition of Chiropractic (Original Act)

Chiropractic is the science that teaches that disease results from anatomic disrelation and teaches the art of restoring anatomic relation by the use of the hands. No other means of securing health shall be construed to be chiropractic except the inherent qualities at the time in the patient or appertaining to the chiropractor.

Definition of Chiropractic (Proposed Amendment)

1. Chiropractic is a science which is a separate and distinct branch of the healing arts, having its own colleges, college-accrediting agency, its own scientific organization and Practice Acts. 2. The basic principle of chiropractic is the restoration and maintenance of the structural and functional integrity of the human body. 3. The practice of chiropractic consists of all necessary means to carry out this principle.

Rights and Limitations (Original Act)

1. Chiropractors licensed under this act shall have the right to practice that science defined as chiropractic under Section 3144 of this code, in accordance with the method, thought, and practice of chiropractors, and they shall be permitted to use the prefix Dr. or Doctor as a title, but they shall not in any way imply that they are regular physicians or surgeons. They shall not prescribe for or administer to any person any medicine or drugs, or practice medicine or surgery, or osteopathy; except, that the use of antiseptics for purpose of sanitation and hygiene to prevent infection and contagion shall be permitted.

Rights and Limitations Governing Practice (Proposed Amendment)

Chiropractors licensed under this Act shall have the right to practice that science defined as chiropractic under Section 3144 in accordance with the method, thought, and practice of chiropractors and they shall be permitted to use the prefix Dr. or Doctor as a title but shall not in any way imply that they are medical physicians or surgeons.

(The remainder of this Section was to be deleted from the Act.)

Since the purpose of a definition is but to describe accurately that which is being defined, in (1) we set forth in the definition that chiropractic is a separate school of healing with those facilities necessary to maintain itself as such. In (2) we defined the purpose of the practitioner in his practice. It is but a true statement of fact. The part (3) was ill advised, no doubt, and should not have been in the amendment. It was pointed out that technically it might legally give to chiropractic the exclusive use of all the methods it uses. Although this was doubtful, since neither the medical nor osteopathic acts in Montana prohibit the practice of chiropractic, it was not our purpose to obtain a de facto patent on certain areas of knowledge or methods, the very thing we were fighting against on the part of medicine.

Perhaps instead of (3) another paragraph, worded as follows, defining how the methods of patient care are arrived at should be used:

“The methods used in chiropractic care are determined by examination of those factors inherent in each individual patient’s problem, together with the individual chiropractic physician’s ability competently to apply the methods of care required in each case according to his school of practice.

“The limitations of practice and the referring of patients for specialized care is the responsibility of the individual chiropractic physician who is delegated full responsibility of the patient under the common law.”

In defining chiropractic, as in defining anything else, one must make certain to describe honestly what chiropractic care actually consists of. To give an erroneous description can result only on a poor and perhaps untenable definition.

Since methods of care are not determined by statute, the definition need not necessarily describe the nature of each individual’s practice but must cover all and be general in nature. Chiropractic in Montana,

as elsewhere, is divided upon two principles: The cultists, whose practice methods are somewhat predetermined by the various doctrines they adhere to, and followers of the free science concept, who hold no doctrine or method in reverence but base their methods of care entirely upon inherent problems in each individual case according to the basic principles of science. While the cultist end of chiropractic in Montana is small, yet they, too, would have been free to care for their patients according to their system of practice under the proposed definition.

By far the most important part of the proposed amendment and the one which meets the greatest opposition is the removal of the clause “They shall not prescribe for or administer to any person any medicine or drug nor practice medicine or surgery” from the Section on Rights and Limitations. Chiropractic cannot be a free science so long as this clause remains in the Practice Act.

Almost every chiropractic law, as well as many osteopathic laws, have a similar clause. Its effect, as interpreted by the courts, is to medicine a de facto patent and the exclusive use of every method of patient care used by medicine. By this clause the medical profession achieves a monopoly far greater and more vicious than any conceivable trade monopoly because it gives medicine a monopoly over the use of certain areas of knowledge and methods of doing things, a situation unheard of in other fields. It puts into effect the principle of Prior Arts Rights, a principle which has never been recognized in other fields by American courts.

In many chiropractic acts a broad definition of chiropractic has been used to regain for the chiropractor the privilege of using certain specific methods such as diet, physiotherapy, etc., but in not state does he have the privilege to determine freely by himself his methods of patient care. Under a so-called straight or cultist definition he is still a slave with certain liberties. Thus, we had the choice in Montana of being slave, half slave, or entirely free of this vicious medical monopoly; we chose to write legislation to make ourselves entirely free. That is why it was imperative that we remove this clause entirely from our Practice Act.

Like the cat with its mouse, political medicine had no intention of permitting us to gain our freedom. Of course, we anticipated that they would insist that we were trying to enter the “back door of medicine” or that we wanted to practice medicine and surgery and that as a consequence we might wreck the public health; accordingly, we prepared our case to meet such arguments. Actually, we did not wish to enter medicine through any door. All we wanted was entirely to divorce ourselves from medicine and to legalize the methods we were already using. We also wanted freedom to grow as a science and to develop better methods of patient care. We did not believe that medicine has a basic right to interfere legally with our normal, natural growth as a profession of the healing arts.

The big question was: What effect would this change in the statute actually have upon the public health? The opposition pointed out that with this amendment a chiropractor could **legally** take out an appendix or a thyroid or do other major surgery. That, of course, is a true statement, but that fact alone could not make possible or even probable something that was otherwise impossible or at least highly improbable. There would be no threat to public health because the chiropractor does not represent himself to be a surgeon. The public would not go to him for surgery. Due to another medical monopoly, there is no hospital in Montana wherein a chiropractor can care for a case according to his own school of practice, let alone perform surgery.

In the medical profession a pediatrician, even though he may never have seen brain surgery done, has every legal right to perform such an operation; and political medicine would contend that that fact does not jeopardize public health. The pediatrician holds himself out as a surgeon and has every facility to perform surgery. If a danger to public health exists in our case, a far greater actual danger exists in the case of medicine because there are few, if any, surgeons who are competent to cover the whole field of surgery today.

There is far greater possibility that surgeons are injuring patients today by attempting surgery beyond their capabilities than there is that the chiropractor would attempt surgery. This is true because it is impossible for the public to determine the specific scope of an individual surgeon's capabilities, while anyone who would go to a chiropractor for surgery would certainly evidence lack of judgment. Furthermore, the whole future of the chiropractic physician depends upon his judicious care of the patient. Because of his close surveillance by political medicine, which is always trying to "get something on him" he is, perhaps, the most careful physician in the field of public health. To conclude that because he was free to care for his patients according to his own judgment he would attempt to exceed his capabilities and thus injure his patient is to conceive of him as a reckless, irresponsible individual, unworthy of assuming responsibility for a patient. If such were his nature, certainly he should not be licensed to care for the sick at all. The fact that such is not his nature is amply proven by the fine services rendered by the public by the chiropractors in Montana. Even though a great majority, if not all, offend the statute, in the thirty-three years since the enactment of Montana's Chiropractic Act we have had but three cases of malpractice for patient negligence, and two of these are still undecided by the courts.

In any event, if one were to assume that some chiropractor on some dark night by some weird means might capture a patient and attempt some major surgery, it would certainly be an individual problem and one our profession could easily cope with by make such irresponsibility grounds for revocation of license along with the use of narcotics, etc. The probability is so remote that it is not even worthy of consideration. Too, the patient has every protection from such chiropractic irresponsibility in the common law courts just as he has from medicine. Actually, this particular clause protects nothing except the monopolistic tendencies and "cat and mouse" acts of political medicine.

Furthermore, this clause, if we were to adhere to it, is a threat to public health, the individual patient, the chiropractic profession, and scientific progress. It is contrary to a long-established principle of the free use of knowledge and methods of doing things. The common law delegates the responsibility for the patient's welfare to the chiropractor but under this statute he is not free to assume it. Every time the chiropractor gives his diabetic patient a diet he is placing himself under double jeopardy. If he prescribes the diet he offends the statute; if he does not and the patient is injured, he is guilty of negligence before the common law court. One could continue almost endlessly pointing out where in this clause is not in the interest of the patient or the public health. There are a great any good reasons why this clause should be removed from Chiropractic Practice Acts and no good reason why it should be left therein.

I am certain that even the political power of organized medicine cannot prevent the repeal of this clause when its true significance is made clear to the public. Perhaps a strong enough case against this type of monopoly could be built in courts, which, if taken to the Supreme Court, might result in similar clauses in all Practice Acts being declared unconstitutional. Certainly within the next few years we must unite and build our case to free our profession from the effects of this untenable legislation either through court action or legislative appeal.

Today, when half the peoples of the world must subscribe to Marxism and have lost their freedom of self-determination, it is ironical that in our free society a situation can exist wherein the chiropractic physician assumes the full responsibility of the welfare of his patient, and yet is not legally free to provide the best possible care he is capable of for his patient.

The public is already well aware of the social arrogance of political medicine. We are not the only ones they push around. Indeed, political medicine spends more time and displays greater interest in pushing the rest of society around and providing for the maintenance of their own artificial social position than in caring for the public health.

The history of chiropractic is full of struggle against the domination of political medicine. That struggle will continue until chiropractic is a free and independent school of practice privileged to determine for itself its own destinies in our society. Only when the chiropractic profession is entirely free from subservience to political medicine will the best interest of the individual patient, the public health, and scientific progress be served, and only then can the struggle end. We, in Montana, have every intention of continuing that struggle until eventually we shall win our freedom.

1951 (June): *JNCA* [21(6)] includes:

-W.A. Budden, D.C., N.D., prez of WSCC & prez of NCA Council on Public Health & Research, authors "An analysis of recent chiropractic history and its meaning" (pp. 9-10); includes:

...That the private ownership of the institutions in a measure militated against a generous and wholesale upsurge to finance this idea is true and must be taken into account in appraising the situation prevailing at that time. Only an optimist, however, and one quite unfamiliar with the economics of chiropractic schools and colleges would suggest that, by advancing scholastic requirements, more money could be made. The facts being quite the contrary, as we have intimated, the "school men" as a group hesitated. Some suggested that while the idea was a good one, the time was not yet. Nevertheless, Dr. E.J. Smith, young graduate of the National College and of Western Reserve University in 1921, gave the first real impetus toward what is now so far developed by establishing a four-year school in Cleveland, Ohio. The Metropolitan College of Chiropractic opened its doors to the first four-year students and the new era had begun. Shortly after this pioneer effort, the National College proclaimed that it would issue certificates of graduation "cum laude" to those who successfully negotiated its thirty-two months course. The writer of this article initiated this action and signed as "Dean" the first diplomas. It should be stated here, and with no sense of derogation of those who took a leading part in this advance, in the case of the N.C.C. certainly, the fact that a medical board of examiners held sway over chiropractic activities in Illinois, and to some extent in Ohio, tended powerfully to fertilize the soil in which the actual four-year course took root.

Almost simultaneously with these events, the new idea appeared in Colorado. The late Homer Beatty, head of the college in Denver and author of the well-known text, "Anatomical Adjustive Technique," now began to raise his voice calling for thirty-six months training. A vigorous advocate of any cause he espoused, the impact of his personality and propaganda soon began to make itself felt. Dr. Beatty, however, was not alone. Associated with him in this crusade were several of the teachers of the school, notably Dr. Niel Bishop, as well as a number of men "in the field." Behind them all, however, and adding powerfully to the growth of the movement, loomed the figure of Professor Jones, dean emeritus of Northwestern University, School of Psychology, and doctor of chiropractic of National College.

Now another voice from the far west was added to the growing debate. The pages of the *National Journal* began to reflect the views of C.O. Watkins of Montana. Logical, incisive persistent "C.O." hammered away at the bulwarks of the short-course school of thought. There can be no doubt that his rapid rise to a leading place in the councils of the NCA brought powerful aid and comfort to the four-year idea.

1951 (Sept): *Journal of the NCA* [21(9)] includes:

-**photo** of Gavel Club members' breakfast at **NCA** convention, including GM **Goodfellow**, CM **Kightlinger** and CO **Watkins** (p. 13)

-**photos** of **NCA** convention in Detroit (pp. 42-3) include **CO Watkins** seated next to **LM Rogers**

PHOTOGRAPH



C.O. Watkins, D.C., 1955

1968 (May): **ACA Journal of Chiropractic** [5(5)] includes:

-Ted L. Shrader, D.C. authors "A change in attitude" (pp. 21-22); notes the writings of C.O. Watkins, D.C. and Roy W. Hildebrandt, D.C. on need for clinical research in lieu of dogma

1975 (July): **ACA Journal** [12(7)] includes:

-**photo** of William H. Dallas, D.C., president of ACA, who publishes "Clinical trials: a new chiropractic research priority" (pp. 13-4)
-notes that C.O. **Watkins**, D.C. of "Sidney, was presented his 50-Year Golden Service Plaque by Dr. Lloyd Bowman." p. 30)

2001 (July 24): e-mail from Don G. Hariman, D.C. (DGHariman@aol.com):

When George Hariman began his chiropractic career the healing professions were in a state of flux in the United States. The Flexner Report on medical education had just shown that the standards of medical school education was deplorable and that the licensure was not standardized. There were many healers and healing strategems available from the magnetic healers to the various forms of manipulators and homeopathic vs. allopathic medical controversy. Anything seemed possible and even the practitioners were uncertain of what practice would evolve into.

Chiropractic, of course, was at that time, divided and defined in two camps. D.D. Palmer and his son, B.J. Palmer of Iowa on the one side with their adherents as well as the people like Harper, Haring, Drain, Logan et al who had left Palmer and would eventually start their own schools defined the very conservative but radical wing of the profession and espoused the "one cause- one cure theorem" as it evolved. On the other extreme was W.C. Schulze, a medical physician who was leader of the National College of Chiropractic in Chicago. This was a school more in the tradition of a medical faculty with connections to Cook County Hospital, lecturers of some note and featured basic science education including dissection. These were dubbed the "mixers". There was a high degree of concern for diagnosis in its day and the school remained a leader in scientific introspection and investigation within the profession.

When George Hariman began practice, he had the adjuncts of physiotherapy which included long wave diathermy (a dangerous but effective heat source for therapy) contractile currents for muscular reeducation (called a sine wave because of the multiplicity of currents available which basically showed the sine curve made by the McIntosh Company) heat lamps and a rudimentary adjusting table

made by the Zenith Company. The x-ray was the open wire type with available factors of about 15 ma and 85 kvp. A far cry from modern equipment and only somewhat better than the original Roentgen lab equipment. There was a hand held flouroscope which provided as much or more radiation to the operator as the patient and no idea of the dangers of radiation. The largest danger was the high tension exposed cables which occasionally shocked the operator. Long exposures were the rule and film was surprisingly readable but usually motion was present producing a blurring.

When George Hariman became interested in the NCA it was because he was active in the North Dakota Chiropractic Association. Someone "had to" go to the convention in Philadelphia about 1933 or 34 and George volunteered. He became interested in the benefits of a national voice for the profession. Expenses were almost non-existent in those days so it was a personal expense. As the organization evolved, he was a voice for the formation of hospitals and also was known as a level headed doer. Before he was elected to the Executive Board it was a very loose organization which was operating under the aegis mainly of L.M. Rogers of Iowa and Lillard Marshall of Kentucky and Jim, Slocum. In many ways it was to their personal benefit.

Many others were able to "use" the NCA for personal satisfaction and some gain. Emmett Murphy ingratiated himself as a Washington Lobbyist for NCA first by saying that he just wanted to help for no fee. Then he had a subscription list of the profession and finally was hired on staff. He was an adequate person and he served as well as could be expected but his performance was always somewhat less than his promise and he was often the victim of the process in making promises that could not be completed. The incident of the Tolan bill comes to mind. Mr. Tolan was a congressman from California and the chiropractic bill that he introduced in multiple congresses was always in committee but never saw the light of day. Much money was given to the congressman for his efforts or lack of same. Meanwhile Emmett's greatest claim to value was to get tires during the war for chiropractors from the rationing boards. John Nugent was also an individual who was purported to have an independent income and served as the spokesman and titular head of the education wing of the NCA. He made a wonderful appearance but was not a great planner or thinker. He served us well in his small niche. John Schnick of Ontario was the apparent spokesman for Canada. Since the organization was loose, he was the only member from Canada present and he enjoyed being the debonair bon vivant. Being unmarried he was a great man with the ladies with his manners and air of sophistication. The men were unworried about him since they got the picture that he was a homosexual. I am unaware that he ever contributed much beyond his presence.

George determined that there was a need for a good national journal and he was a leader in the push to buy a printing plant. The plant was in the home town of L.M. Rogers and George was one of several who gave the money to the NCA as a "loan" to buy the plant. To my knowledge, he was never repaid this loan and he chalked it up to professional needs.

Several men who served on the Executive Board with George were good friends beginning with C.O. Watkins of Montana who was an early mentor. These included Schwietert of South Dakota, Wheaton of Connecticut, Goodfellow of California and to a lesser extent Cregar of California

George was also involved with the school people and when he gave money for the founding of the FCER he began to take an interest in schools since they were the main beneficiaries. While he was enamored by W.A. Budden, he lost some of the enthusiasm when his son went to Western States College and was less than impressed. Janse of National College was always well received and George made a contribution and served on the building board for the new campus of his alma mater. He had respect for Leo Spears and worked with him as best he could to promote other hospitals but they remained almost exclusive as hospital builders.

George was always looking for ways for accommodation between the mixers and the straights, especially at the higher levels. While he disdained B.J. Palmer, He had high regard for David Palmer. He wanted to include Logan and Harper and was very pleased when Lincoln College and Jim Drain became allied with NCA. His experience with coexistence was colored by the efforts which had been so successful in North Dakota. He felt we needed to make strong united statements in order to survive. (personal note: he would be, as I am, dismayed with the cacaphony which persists as to what is the place of chiropractic in the healing arts.)

He served two terms on the Board of Governors or Executive Director and against advice he ran for a third term and was defeated. He could have been elected President but he couldn't see that this was the office he should take. He continued to be a delegate to the ACA for many years after this and he worked tirelessly in North Dakota as a lobbyist for the association during turbulent times.

During this time the NCA continued its concern with scientific investigation. Considerable effort was placed on the use of full spine radiography as an investigative medium and positioning was much talked about by pioneers such as Vladeff, Logan and others as well as diagnosis by Wunsch, Giammarino, Rich, Janse and others. In addition they funded the work of Fred Illi in Switzerland investigating the sacroiliac region and pelvis for mechanical problems and function. Its successor, the ACA carried on the Councils of Radiology and Hospitals and Education and expanded them into specialty programs in Orthopedics, Radiology and others attesting to the continued interest in excellence in therapeutic approach

He was very effective at the endeavors he undertook because he always gave it all he had. He was willing to back his enthusiasm with his purse regardless of the condition of the purse and while he did not take criticism or defeat lightly, he never held a grudge. He asked for no medals and generally received none. But he was highly regarded and knew it and that was enough.

2002 (June 17): e-mail from Herb Vear, D.C. (hvear@idirect.com):
Jo:

Thank you for copying me with this unique letter by C.O. Watkins from March, 1950. I was still in my first year of practice at that time and struggling to make a living, and had very little time or resources to even know that this man Watkins even existed. I am sure that if you ask Herb Lee, he probably didn't know about him either. His letter of the past is surely here to haunt us, since there is still a large gap between what we think we know and what we actually know.

In my Principles lectures during the 1970's, I made reference to my experience in examining Letters to the Editor section of the British Medical Journals circa 1890 -1895. My point was that MB's from across the UK would write to the Editor and in some detail would write on a particularly confusing case and the clinical findings after treatment and asking has any one out there if they had a similar experience? The next month there would be one or several responses to that letter and all with opinions of diagnosis and treatment plans. It was apparent to me at that time, that the BMJ served as a modern version of today's websites where information and clinical opinion could be exchanged. And then the entire profession could benefit. Each month there would be several letters from the field and all on different topics. Everyone wanted to learn new clinical science. And I am sure several new textbooks on medicine came from these treasures. Now isn't that a unique idea.

I remember talking to DCS about this unique discovery and wondered can we do something similar with the JCCA? The problem we faced was how would we explain to the GP in chiropractic the objective we visualized. To make a long story short, the idea fell on it's proverbial "ass" because the field did not want to give away "secrets". However, the students, who had university education prior to entering CMCC, thought that the idea was logical and that we would all benefit. What I did was to have interns bring difficult cases

to class, sometimes with the patient present and we would listen to the case history, the intern and the patient if present. You would be thrilled by the opinions and suggestions that came out of that experience. Sadly my time became so filled with administration that I had to hand the idea over to others and it soon disappeared.

Watkins was a unique person and I wish there was some way the profession and/or a college could perpetuate his memory and intelligence by forming something like "The Watkins Society for Scientific Clinical Research"

Please keep me advised of any new discoveries. Herb

2002 (Sept 26): e-mail from Tom Lawrence, D.C. (Tlaw4201@aol.com):

Hello Joe,

No, it is not a loaner - it is a gift. Keep it or do with it what you wish. I think I gave a copy to Dr. Leach, if not, you might want to lend it to him. It might be helpful in his research.

The NCA gave Dr. Ligeros financial, promotional and marketing support for this publication. Dr. C.O. Watkins, Dr. L.M. Rogers and my father backed him with enthusiasm. Dad also helped sponsor the support by the NCA for Cash Asher when he wrote "Stark Corridors" and "80 Million Guinea Pigs."

Tom

Watkins Bibliography:

- Watkins CO. Organization. *Montana Chirolite* 1931; March 20: 4-5
 Watkins CO. The new year. *Journal of the International Chiropractic Congress* 1932 (Mar); 1(4): 14
 Watkins CO. The new offensive. *Montana Chirolite* 1934; May: 3-7
 Watkins CO. The new offensive will bring sound professional advancement. *The Chiropractic Journal* (NCA) 1934; (June); 3(6): 5, 6, 33
 Watkins CO. Facts and figures from the annual report of the AMA. *The Chiropractic Journal* (NCA) 1934 (Sept); 3(9): 18
 Watkins CO. Must we petition? - The reasons behind this militant position. *The Chiropractic Journal* (NCA) 1935 (Feb); 4(2): 8, 40
 Watkins CO. Chiropractic legislative highlights for 1935. *Montana Chirolite* 1935; April: 1-3
 Watkins CO. Facts! On educational standards. *Chirolite*, n.d. (circa January, 1938), pp. 8-10
 Watkins CO. Educational standards must be raised for public acceptance. *The Chiropractic Journal* (NCA) 1938 (Jan); 7(1): 122, 54, 56
 Watkins CO. Physical education should be emphasized in our profession. *The Chiropractic Journal* (NCA) 1938 (May); 7(5): 9, 56
 Watkins CO. What the editor thinks. *Chirolite* (no date, 1938, first issue of what was previously the *Montana Chirolite*; pp. 3-4)
 Watkins CO. Facts! On education standards. *Chirolite* (no date, 1938, first issue of what was previously the *Montana Chirolite*; pp. 9-10)
 Watkins CO. Guest editorial. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1939 (Sept); 8(9): 6, 53
 Watkins CO. Onward, ever onward! Leaders must look forward - not backward! *National Chiropractic Journal* 1939 (Mar); 8(3): 25
 Watkins CO. Democratic principles must be maintained to assure professional progress. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1940 (Feb); 9(2): 9-10
 Watkins CO. The science, art and philosophy of things natural - chiropractic. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1940 (Mar); 9(3): 9, 49
 Watkins CO. Guest editorial: What about unity - how can we unite for greater progress? *National Chiropractic Journal* 1940 (May); 9(5): 6, 27
 Watkins CO. Graduate education amendment will bring greater advancement. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1940 (Oct); 9(10): 9, 54
 Watkins CO. The dawn of a new era. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1940 (Nov); 9(11): 10
 Watkins CO. Chiropractic writing. *Chirolite* 1943; Nov: 5
 Watkins CO. In reply. *Chirolite* 1944 (Feb); 13(11): 4-5

- Watkins CO. The chiropractor's place in society. Presentation to the annual convention of the Montana Chiropractic Association, July 17, 1944, Helena MT (cited in *Chirolite* 1944 (July); 13(7): 5)
- Watkins CO. The president's message. *Chirolite* 1944 (Sept); 13(9): 1
- Watkins CO. The role of infection in low back pain. *Chirolite* 1944 (Oct; 13(10): 1, 4
- Watkins CO. The need of basic unity in chiropractic. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1944 (Nov); 14(11): 17, 47
- Watkins CO. *The basic principles of chiropractic government*. 1944, self-published, Sidney MT; reprinted as Appendix A in Keating JC. *Toward a philosophy of the science of chiropractic: a primer for clinicians*. Stockton CA: Stockton Foundation for Chiropractic Research, 1992
- Watkins CO. Subluxation in lumbo-sacral region. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1945 (Jan); 15(1): 13-4, 61-2
- Watkins CO. Etiology associated with subluxations. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1945 (Feb); 15(2): 17-8, 53
- Watkins CO. Medical politic *Chirolite* 1945 (Feb); 14(2):1,4-5
- Watkins CO. Interference with nerve function. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1945 (Apr); 15(4): 19, 20
- Watkins CO. The basic principles of Chiropractic government. *Chirolite* 1945 (June); 14(6): 1, 5, 10-11
- Watkins CO. The treatment of sciatica. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1945 (July); 15(7): 17-8, 56
- Watkins CO. Teeth as a source of nerve irritation. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1945 (Dec); 15(12): 16, 56
- Watkins CO. Nature of the chiropractic movement. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1946 (Mar); 16(3): 15-6
- Watkins CO. Dentition, a source of nerve irritation. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1946 (May); 16(5): 18, 52
- Watkins CO. Our victory convention. *Chirolite* 1946 (July); 15(7): 3
- Watkins CO. Is chiropractic unity possible? *Chirolite* 1946 (Dec); 15(12): 3, 12-4
- Watkins CO. Is chiropractic unity possible? *National Chiropractic Journal* 1946 (Dec); 16(12): 29-30
- Watkins CO. The chiropractic practice acts, Part 1. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1947 (Jan); 3(7): 6
- Watkins CO. The chiropractic practice acts, Part 2. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1947 (Feb); 3(8): 7, 20
- Watkins CO. The chiropractic practice act. *Chirolite* 1947 (Feb); 16(2): 3, 5, 13-5
- Watkins CO. Eclecticism and chiropractic. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1947 (Feb); 17(2): 27, 48
- Watkins CO. The "big three" of chiropractic. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1947 (June); 17(6): 33, 63
- Watkins CO. Prudent versus aggressive action. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1947 (Sept); 3(??): 6, 22
- Watkins CO. The great mistake in chiropractic. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1948 (June); 4(12): 11, 23, 25, 27
- Watkins CO. Experimental methods of science. *National Chiropractic Journal* 1948 (Sept); 18(9): 22-3, 58
- Watkins CO. The legal side of chiropractic. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1950 (July); 7(1): 21, 23, 28
- Watkins CO. The case against chiropractic. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1950 (Sept); 7(3): 19-20, 26
- Watkins CO. Chiropractic surgery. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1950 (Nov); 7(5): 7
- Watkins CO. Basic principles of chiropractic education; distributed to chiropractic leaders, December 7, 1950 (Palmer Archives)
- Watkins CO. Basic principles in chiropractic education. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1951 (Jan); 7(7): 5, 21, 23
- Watkins CO. Clinical research in chiropractic. *Journal of the National Chiropractic Association* 1951 (Jan); 21(1): 22, 23, 72, 74
- Watkins CO. Modernizing the practice acts. *Journal of the National Chiropractic Association* 1951 (Apr); 21(4): 13, 14, 66, 68, 80
- Watkins CO. We must specifically define the purpose of chiropractic. *Journal of the California Chiropractic Association* 1952 (Mar); 8(8): 3
- Watkins CO. *The Watkins' plan to stop communism*. Sidney MT: the author, 1953 (NWCC Archives)
- Watkins CO. A new attitude is blossoming. *California Chiropractic Association Journal* 1955 (Mar); 11(8): 10, 15
- Watkins CO. "Free" science. *California Chiropractic Association Journal* 1955 (June); 11(10): 14-5
- Watkins CO. A study of posture and its relationship to disease. *Journal of the National Chiropractic Association* 1959 (Nov); 29(11): 21-2
- Watkins CO. Routing the John Birchers. Invited presentation to the National Education Association's 41st annual meeting, July 1963, Denver CO
- Watkins CO. Dr. D.D. Palmer - man of science. *Journal of the American Chiropractic Association* 1965 (Mar); 2(3): 23, 46, 48
- Watkins CO. Scientific progress. *Journal of the American Chiropractic Association* 1966 (Oct); 3(10): 24, 44
- Watkins CO. Clinical research as the basis for chiropractic practice; distributed to the ACA Committee on Research, ACA Committee on Accreditation, and accredited colleges, March 7, 1966; posthumously published in two parts in *Dynamic Chiropractic*, November and December issues, 1986
- Watkins CO. The importance of discovery. Unpublished, distributed to the ACA Committee on Research, ACA Committee on Accreditation and accredited colleges, January 18, 1967. NWCC Archives
- Watkins CO. We can meet the challenge of medicine. Unpublished, distributed to the ACA Committee on Research, ACA Committee on Accreditation and accredited colleges, January 18, 1967. NWCC Archives
- Watkins CO. Some basic considerations in chiropractic. Unpublished; distributed to the ACA Committee on Research, ACA Committee on Accreditation, and accredited colleges, March 20, 1967
- Watkins CO. More about clinical research. Unpublished; distributed to the ACA Committee on Research, ACA Committee on Accredited Colleges, and accredited colleges, November 17, 1967; NWCC Archives
- Watkins CO. Chiropractic must have promise to survive. Unpublished, circa 1967. NWCC Archives
- Watkins CO. Chiros needed. *Billings Gazette* 1970; May 30, morning edition, p. 5

References:

- Keating JC. C.O. Watkins, D.C.: a photo history. *Chiropractic History* 1989 (Dec); 9(2):7-9
- Keating JC. C.O. Watkins, D.C., grandfather of the Council on Chiropractic Education. *Journal of Chiropractic Education* 1988 (Dec); 2(3):1-9
- Keating JC. C.O. Watkins, D.C., F.I.C.C., Doctor of Humanities. *Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association* 1988 (Dec); 32(4):199-202
- Keating JC. C.O. Watkins: pioneer advocate for clinical scientific chiropractic. *Chiropractic History* 1987 (Dec); 7(2):10-5. Reprinted in abridged form in *News in Chiropractic* (Montana Chiropractic Association) 1988; March:6-7
- Keating JC. C.O. Watkins, D.C., a philosopher of the science of chiropractic. Invited presentation at the Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, May 10, 1991
- Keating JC. C. O. Watkins: why didn't they listen 50 years ago? Presented at the Palmer College of Chiropractic/West FRIDAY FORUM SERIES, February 17, 1989
- Keating JC. C.O. Watkins, D.C., a philosopher of the science of chiropractic. Presented at the seventh annual CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF CHIROPRACTIC, June 6, 1987, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington MN
- Keating JC. Historical note: C.O. Watkins, D.C. *The Hotline* [LACC Student Newspaper], 16 September 1996 (No. 1), pp. 8-9; reprinted in

New York State Chiropractic Association Journal 1996-97; Winter: 19-20
 Keating JC. Historical perspective: C.O. Watkins, D.C. (1902-1977). *Journal of the American Chiropractic Association* 1996 (June); 33(6): 56-8
 Keating JC. Dr. Watkins would be pleased. *Dynamic Chiropractic*, January 29, 1993, pp. 40-1
 Keating JC. Watkins propositions: forty years later. *Dynamic Chiropractic*, February 15, 1987, pp.34-5
 Keating JC. Watkins on chiropractic unity. *Success Express* 1986; Fall:53-7
 Keating JC. Watkins and rational science in chiropractic. Presentation to the National College of Chiropractic, 23 June 1995
 Keating JC. A "ghost" editorial: An early science journal of chiropractic technique. *Chiropractic Technique* 1989 (Feb); 1(1):9-12

Officers and Board of Directors of the National Chiropractic Association, 1930-1963

Year	President	Vice-Pres	Board Chair	Board	Board	Board	Board
30-31	LT Marshall	Cecil E Foster	Paul H Strand	TW Snyder	JH Lege	BF Gilman	Ruland W Lee
31-32	LT Marshall	Cecil E Foster	Paul N. Hanson	CM Guyselman	W Lawrence	AW Schweitert	JH Durham
32-33	LT Marshall	HK McIlroy	Paul H Strand	TW Snyder	JH Lege	BF Gilman	Ruland W Lee
33-34	LT Marshall	HK McIlroy	Paul N. Hanson	CM Guyselman	W Lawrence	AW Schweitert	JH Durham
34-35	Ruland W Lee	OL Brown	AW Schweitert	CM Guyselman	W Lawrence	OA Ohlson	JH Durham
35-36	CS Cooley	GM Goodfellow	JH Durham	AW Schweitert	W Lawrence	OA Ohlson	JH Durham
36-37	GM Goodfellow	FL Wheaton	OA Ohlson	AW Schweitert	W Lawrence	OA Ohlson	CM Guyselman
37-38	FL Wheaton	KC Robinson	CM Guyselman	AW Schweitert	W Lawrence	Ruland W Lee	CM Guyselman
1938*			AW Schweitert*			EM Gustafson	CS Cooley
38-39	KC Robinson	John A Schnick	CS Cooley	CO Watkins	W Lawrence	EM Gustafson	Frank O Logic
39-40	JA Schnick	WH McNichols	CS Cooley	CO Watkins	W Lawrence	EM Gustafson	Frank O Logic
40-41	WH McNichols	HK McIlroy	Frank O Logic	CO Watkins	W Lawrence	F Lorne Wheaton	CS Cooley
41-42	HK McIlroy	WG Poehner	W Lawrence	CO Watkins	GM Goodfellow	F Lorne Wheaton	Frank O Logic
42-43	WG Poehner	CL Tennant	CO Watkins	Cecil D Strait	GM Goodfellow	F Lorne Wheaton	Frank O Logic
43-44	CL Tennant	EA Thompson	GM Goodfellow	Cecil D Strait	GE Hariman	F Lorne Wheaton	Frank O Logic
44-45	EA Thompson	Floyd Cregger	F Lorne Wheaton	Cecil D Strait	GE Hariman	GM Goodfellow	Frank O Logic
45-46	EA Thompson	Floyd Cregger	F Lorne Wheaton	Cecil D Strait	GE Hariman	GM Goodfellow	Frank O Logic
46-47	Floyd Cregger	Robt J Jones	GE Hariman	Cecil D Strait	FLorne Wheaton	GM Goodfellow	Frank O Logic
47-48	Robt J Jones	F Lee Lemly	F Lorne Wheaton	JL Prosser	GE Hariman	GM Goodfellow	HK McIlroy
48-49	F Lee Lemly	Harry R Bybee	JL Prosser		GE Hariman	GM Goodfellow	HK McIlroy
49-50							
50-51	Geo A Smyrl	Geo F Kelley	Justin C Wood	JL Prosser	GE Hariman	GM Goodfellow	HK McIlroy
51-52							
52-53							
53-54							
54-55							
55-56							
56-57	Harley Scanlan	Frank Plourde	MI Higgins	Clyde Martyn	Justin C Wood	AH Shafer Jr.	Hilary Pruitt
57-58	Frank Plourde	WA Watkinson	AH Shafer Jr.	Clyde Martyn	Cecil L Martin	MI Higgins	Hilary Pruitt
58-59	WA Watkinson	Earl Liss	Clyde Martyn	Hilary Pruitt	Cecil L Martin	MI Higgins	JE Dupre
59-60	Earl Liss	PL Poulsen	Cecil L Martin	Clyde Martyn	AM Schierholz	MI Higgins	JE Dupre
60-61	PL Poulsen	RT Leiter	Clyde Martyn	AM Schierholz	Cecil L Martin	MI Higgins	JE Dupre
61-62	RT Leiter	RD Moulton	AM Schierholz	Clyde Martyn	Cecil L Martin	PL Poulsen	JE Dupre
62-63							
1963							

*Schweitert succeeded Guyselman, who died in office