Correspondence

Report from a State Medical Association on Fighting the Federation of State Medical Boards (FSMB)

I just spent two grueling days at our state medical society’s House of Delegates meeting. I had introduced a resolution opposing the Interstate Medical Licensure Compact, which was discussed in the spring issue.1 My resolution was supported by my whole district. However, a member who has had previous connections with the state medical board spoke against it, as did the president of the American Academy of Dermatology. It ultimately was referred to the Council.

Another resolution called for the state medical board to quit its membership in FSMB. The language was modified to call for “monitoring” the situation, significantly weakening it, but the message came out loud and clear that physicians are not happy about Maintenance of Certification/ Maintenance of Licensure. It was vigorously opposed by a previous president of the American College of Emergency Physicians and by the president of the American Academy of Dermatology. I guess once people move into positions of that type, they contract some sort of deadly virus.

Of greater concern than the resolutions is the direction in which “organized medicine” is headed. My district and I are united in fighting an effort that seems to be sweeping the rest of the country as well, which is eliminating the state medical society’s House of Delegates and replacing it with a council of a few people who are largely appointed by the few “leaders.” Apparently this is being tried in Iowa and Minnesota. It reportedly failed by a small margin in Pennsylvania. It was utterly frightening to see the medical students and residents argue for this huge bylaws change. I don’t think medical students and residents should be voting members. I do believe they should be encouraged to be observers, but they either don’t know enough to vote, or they have been thoroughly indoctrinated by the collectivists. They obviously do not believe in democracy.

The result was that the Reference Committee recommended rejection of this initiative, probably realizing they didn’t have the two-thirds majority to get it passed. But it will be back. The end result of this is likely to be a bunch of hospital doctors running “organized medicine” under the direction of a lawyer. The future is downright scary, but that is the reality.

Kenneth D. Christman, M.D.
Dayton, Ohio

Erratum

There is a reversal error in Dr. Graveline’s article in the spring issue.1 Atorvastatin, simvastatin, and lovastatin are lipophilic statins, and rosuvastatin and pravastatin are hydrophilic, not the reverse as was stated.