

RILEY HAS A WORD

If you were asked to judge the results to be obtained by any medical procedure would you judge it by its ability, or lack of it, to cure cancer, syphilitic nerve degenerations, locomotor staxia and other conditions usually considered to be incurable?

Or would you judge its effectivity by its ability to take care of the “run of mine” conditions which confront the physician, by its ability to cope with the conditions as they are usually met with in practices, they come into the office.

It seems that some are interested in SYNTONICS as a method or addition to their practices always ask, “What will it do for alternating squint”? “What will it do for cataract”? “What will it do for positive central scotoma”? And we know of one individual who says he will judge SYNTONICS, damn it or recommend it, upon the results he obtains in opacity cases. Statistics show that about six in ten cases respond, the other four do not. Let us suppose he has an unlucky run of these which cannot be helped. He damns SYNTONICS without trying it in the class of cases that it alone can help.

Frankly, SYNTONICS will go on regardless of what may be said about it by those not schooled – thoroughly, we mean in its principles, yet we would plead with you to use this technique intelligently and with a reasonable degree of fairness. The technique is not a “one-hundred-percent” method. No technique is or can be, BUT IT WILL DO MORE FOR THE WIDE RANGE OF OPTOMETRIC DEPARTURES FROM NORMAL FOR WHICH IT WAS DEVELOPED THAN ANY OTHER SINGLE TECHNIQUE. That is my claim for it, and that is all.

Let’s at least be reasonable.