



Timothy A. Mirtz, DC

Submit inquiries and galley proofs to:

Timothy A. Mirtz, DC  
3109 W. 6 Suite A  
Lawrence, KS 66049  
Tel: (913) 865-5050

\*As God-in-Man requires theological opinion to comprehend.

# The Question of Theology for Chiropractic: A Theological Study of Chiropractic's Prime Tenets

*"What was God doing before time? He was preparing Hell for those who pried into meddling questions." Luther jokingly quoting Augustine.*

## INTRODUCTION

If the tenets of chiropractic are theological (1) and based on religious proofs of the early Christian church theologians (2) the study of theology is warranted. BJ Palmer's understanding of Innate Intelligence (II). Theology presents a different method for investigating chiropractic principles. This paper's intent is to unravel the past and contemporary chiropractic tenets of Universal Intelligence (UI), Innate Intelligence (II), its related Above-Down, Inside-Out (ADIO) formulation, and examine them in the context of Christian theology. Unraveling these prime tenets will hopefully lead us to answer the question of theology for chiropractic "philosophy".

## Methodology

In the effort to answer the question of theology for chiro-

practic, the methods must be well suited. Theology exposes flaws that philosophy cannot approach in navigating through the chiropractic doctrines. Philosophy to comprehend chiropractic "philosophy" is but one way. Theology, specifically Christian theology, is an appropriate method in comprehending chiropractic "philosophy." Chiropractic "philosophy" is a field where a wide diversity of opinion exists without clear consensus. (3) Such diversity should allow the researcher to examine the prime chiropractic tenets from the standpoint of Christian theology.

The core source for this examination is from Paul Tillich's *Systematic Theology* (4). Stephenson's *Chiropractic Textbook* (5) has been a popular source of chiropractic "philosophy." However, Strauss's *Chiropractic Philosophy* (6) has become an addition to several chiropractic college's philosophy curriculum. Tillich's text will be used to compare and contrast Stephenson's and Strauss's chiropractic "philosophy" to decide the question

of theology for chiropractic. Other theological and chiropractic opinions will be given to assist in the endeavor. A theological study of BJ Palmer's concepts will be undertaken. It is a historical-critical approach to comprehend Palmer's influential notions.

### The value of theology

What value does theology offer in answering the question of theology for chiropractic "philosophy?" Keating comments that chiropractic philosophical principles are clearly those of theological tenets. (1) Donahue considers Innate Intelligence to be a religious doctrine (7) and based on centuries-old religious proofs of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Anselm. (2) Seaman states chiropractors endear themselves with a type of metaphysical theology. (8) Winterstein suggests the chiropractic major premise of UI has theistic overtones. (9) Wardwell concludes that if the concept's DD Palmer espoused were religious they are not Christian. (10) Dunn believes DD Palmer specifically designated chiropractic as a religion. (11)

On the opposite side of these opinions, Koch suggests that Stephenson's *Chiropractic Textbook* (5) neither necessarily

mystifies, personifies nor supernaturalizes the concept of a UI. (12) Strauss states that since UI and II are principles it takes them out of the mystical and religious realms. (6) One can tell there is compelling opinion, pro and con, to study theology in relation to chiropractic's prime tenets.

It appears several authors imply chiropractic "philosophy" being or not being a theology or religion. However, these authors (1, 7-12) do not go into the specifics of the "whys and how's." It is the "whys and hows" that need to be approached and examined. Christian theology provides this process.

There are four possible reasons why those critical of chiropractic "philosophy" have not drawn upon theology in studying the prime tenets. First, charging chiropractic "philosophy" as a religion or theology is much easier than demonstrating why it is. One can state that a tenet appears theological by its presentation but a loftier undertaking to say why. Secondly, researchers are more inclined to use philosophy because of its appeal, variety, and criticalness in explaining the shortcomings of chiropractic "philosophy". Philosophy

has the appeal of having an arguable subject matter which is better than theology. The third reason may be that Christian theology has many interpretations and doctrines. One may believe they must be competent in theology before pursuing such. This person may wish not to misrepresent a point of view and cause a dispute for which one feels not fully confident. With so many denominations of Christianity it is simpler not to discuss theology for concern of contradiction of a doctrinal viewpoint which may be conflicting. Political correctness not to offend someone's religion should not be a deterrent in attempting to answer the question of theology for chiropractic. Lastly, philosophy appears to be a popular topic of discussion for this journal. One probably assumes discussions of theology and chiropractic "philosophy" belong in a theological journal. There may be concern that chiropractic researchers will be labeled as religious scholars if the subject of theology is brought forth. These possible reasons are wrong assumptions for not taking advantage of theology when confronting chiropractic "philosophy". They are amiss because Christian theology comprises a tremendous amount of knowledge

which can properly ascertain the chiropractic tenets. Early Church and Reformation era theology contain key thoughts which assist in this task. Modern philosophy and theology are still influenced by the works of these theologians.

I hold the opinion that the works of theology, my own faith expression (Lutheranism) alongside other Christian theological opinions, consistent and sometimes inconsistent with this faith expression, provide valuable answers to unlocking the question of theology for chiropractic.

#### A Definition of Theology for Contemporary Chiropractic "Philosophy"

Theology simply defined is the study (*logos*) of God (*theos*). (4) But for the Christian, theology is the methodical interpretation of the contents of the Christian faith. (4) Theology is the reasoning about God (*theos*) and divine things. (4) This definition is also applicable, appropriate, and valid for all disciplines whether they are theological, religious, spiritual, or philosophical. (4) It is the understanding and knowledge of Christian theology in which we can make comparisons, contrasts, and decisions of

whether any concept is theological or not. Christian theology serves as our point of comparison. This understanding helps to formulate the decision of how non-Christian or philosophical religions work and operate. Non-Christian religious interpretations, rituals, and/or practices have a theology. This is seen in the fact in "how" they explain the workings of their deity (*Gottheit*) and/or their spirituality. If for example the god the heathen worshiped was explained by a volcano erupting to state their god was angry, they had to relay to future generations of followers why and how their god was angry. This explanation would be considered theology which is the reasoning of divine things or, for the heathen/pagan/non-Christian, of an intangible entity or existing essence. From this example it is safe to bring forth the understanding that every myth contains a theological thought which can be, and often is, made explicit. (4) An example of this would be the myth that DD Palmer cured Harvey Lilliard's deafness. It has taken on folklore and immaculate status and is designated as having no room for the believer to doubt. But before the question of theology for chiropractic can be concluded, the crite-

ria for being a theology must be determined. Two formal criteria to be a theology: Tillich's Criteria

The criteria for being a theology entail two fundamental points. These fundamental points are to be classified as the Tillich Criteria.

(A). The object of theology is what concerns us ultimately. Only those propositions are theological which deal with their object in so far as it can become a matter of ultimate concern. (4)

(B). Our ultimate concern is that which determines our being or not being. Only those statements are theological which deal with their object in so far as it can become a matter of "being" and "non-being." (4)

Criteria A and B point out are several key concepts which need elaboration. The object of theology is that item, entity, principle, concept, or definition which becomes a deeply imbedded and deep concern. A principle such as II is such an object. It is that item, entity, principle, concept or definition that is of the highest concern for the chiropractic "philosopher." The chiropractic

“philosopher” has placed the principle of II, as well as UI, in the status of an object of ultimate concern. For example, when propositions or statements attesting that “chiropractic must maintain its identity by acknowledging the principle or existence of an II” or “the very survival of the profession rests on the fundamental principle of II”, the chiropractic “philosopher” is in essence making a proposition concerning the object. These propositions become theological by their elaboration.

Definition B expands the criteria of what Definition A discusses. It proposes two concepts which can easily be confused for one. The difference is seen in that the first part is referring to those statements, propositions, or principles, which determines the nature of our existence or in reference to our being. The second part of Definition B refers to those concepts that allude to propositions that determine the existence of either a “being” or a “non-being” reference to the principle formulated by the philosophy. If the principle determines an existence of a “being” or “non-being” in its relation to the object then the proposition is to be considered theological. With regards to “being” and

“non-being,” if the existence of the object is a metaphysical speculation in which the object is determined to be “formed” as “being” or “non-being” it then proposes itself as a theological construct.

Three aspects of the “object” of theology

Theology should never make judgements about the scientific value of a physical theory or the best methods of medical healing. (4) In the case of chiropractic “philosophy,” theology can be concerned with the special sciences (*Wissenschaften*). (4) The concern is seen with the philosophical element or propositions of these special sciences. (4) It is this philosophical element which is considered the *point of contact* between theology and the special sciences. (4) It is seen when a “philosophy” makes physical, historical, or psychological insights. These three aspects help create the objects of theology. (4) A clarification is in order to comprehend this notion. The clarification is that these three insights are *not* taken from the point of view of their cognitive form. However, they *are* theological from the point of view of *their power of revealing* some aspect of that which

concerns us ultimately in and through their cognitive form. (4)

The divergent point of theology and philosophy as it pertains to chiropractic

Philosophy deserves mention in the quest to answer the question of theology for chiropractic. There is not a generally accepted definition of the term philosophy. (4, 13) Philosophy is intended to be critical. (4,13) Chiropractic scholars, such as Wardwell, Coulter, and Donahue, have made mention there can be no real chiropractic “philosophy” (10, 14, 15). The opposite opinion is seen when Strauss points out that straight chiropractors are the philosophers of the profession, the universally accepted great thinkers. (16) Strauss mentions when great thinkers of chiropractic “philosophy” are critiqued, it is not they who are in error, it is those who critique them that are ignorant. (16) In the case of chiropractic “philosophy,” this is where every philosophy proposes a definition which agrees with the interest, purpose, and method of the philosopher. (4) The idea of common ground can be said to have met the goals of the subluxation-based (Rondberg), traditional/Palmerian (Barge), and objective straight/neo-purist

(Strauss) factions which exist in our profession. With this common ground that each proposes, and in reality shares with each other, a decision needs to be determined whether they are philosophical or theological by the propositions they espouse. Philosophy and theology do ask the similar question of “being.” (4) Theology can no more escape the question of “being” as can philosophy. (4) However, theology understands the question of “being” in a different way. This *point of divergence* (4) is necessary in determining if chiropractic “philosophy” is in actuality a theological discipline rather than philosophical. The philosopher should attempt to maintain a *detached objectivity* toward being and its structures. (4) This detached objectivity is how philosophy maintains itself as critical. A critical nature means it is changeable to new insights, and subject to and of this general criticism. (4) The philosopher should be like the scientist, with every new insight, the love (*eros*) for truth is not diminished by new insights that are brought to the philosopher’s table. (4) The theologian is different. This difference is the theologian is not detached from his object but is *involved* in it. (4)

Chiropractic “philosophy” is not a true philosophy because of this lack of detached objectivity. Chiropractic “philosophers” are not detached from their “philosophy” but are intimately involved with it thereby giving them theologian status. The theologian is determined by his faith (4) with his object whereas the philosopher is not. Chiropractic “philosophy,” in all the philosophical camps, is neither critical of itself nor receptive to such. Nor is the chiropractic “philosophy” changeable to new insight(s). The chiropractic “philosopher” is determined by his faith with his object whether he accepts this relationship or not. As Keating has stated: “The philosophical notions are clearly theological tenets that can only be accepted on faith.” (1) Donahue shares this opinion: “The whole concept of innate of course rests accepting on faith the basic premises without hope of any concrete proof.” (17)

Statements by chiropractic “philosophers” that suggest non-detached objectivity

The statements listed are to demonstrate how chiropractic “philosophers” are not detached from their object but are involved in and with their

object. Although these statements do not make an outright theological comment regarding an “object of ultimate concern” or “being or non-being,” they do however show the resilient attitude that predisposes the chiropractic “philosopher” toward a theological stance.

(A) “Someday soon our truth will be shared by all, and if we don’t watch out, chiropractic will not receive the credit it rightfully deserves.” (18)

(B) “Mainstream chiropractic is service and caring for the patient through the principle of chiropractic, not the technic, but the principle.” (19)

(C) “In the past 80 years no one has been able to refute the Major Premise of Chiropractic. No one has been able to demonstrate that the reasoning is incorrect.” (6)

(D) “One of the great things about our chiropractic philosophy is the certainty of it.” (6)

(E) “We have begun with a Major Premise: There is a UI in all matter. From there we have deductively drawn conclusions which are just as valid as if we demonstrated them in a laboratory.” (20)

These statements demonstrate a non-detached involvement with the author's object. The involvement is seen that such rhetoric are extolled as absolutes.

Statements that demonstrate "involvement" with its "object"

The following statements demonstrate how chiropractic "philosophers" not only are non-detached from their objectivity and object but show they are intimately involved with the content of their object. With this intimacy the principles of chiropractic obtain the status of *objects*. These "objects" of chiropractic become theological items. It is not only because of their intimacy with the object but with the developing status of becoming an "ultimate concern."

(A) "It is necessary for us to accept the existence of UI." (6)

(B) "Sadly, too few chiropractors are excited about chiropractic as a means of restoring and maintaining the fullest innate expression of health possible." (21)

(C) "The power that created you and me is the same "power" that will regenerate you." (22)

(D) "Chiropractic works as a way of life and as a description/prescription of the effects of the world today and the things that occur within it to our well being and homeostasis." (23)

(E) "We work with the "Master Maker of the Human Body." (24)

The statements listed above substantiate Seaman's rationale of dogmatic statements. (8) However, despite the arrogance, these dogmatic statements demonstrate the lack of detached objectivity that occurs with the chiropractic "philosophy." At face value the argument could be made that these statements do not suggest a theological involvement nor that the philosopher deserves theologian status. However, it is not the actual statement but the implication and application of *involve - ment* and lack of *detached objec - tivity* that creates the ideal ground for a theological formulation. Regarding the chiropractic principles of II and UI as we will see, in the section on the Case Against Contemporary Innate Intelligence and Universal Intelligence, how much involvement chiropractic "philosophy" has with its object as well as the understanding of its existence. With the knowledge of a conjec -

tured existence of II and UI we will demonstrate the concentration of "being" and "non-being" of these two entities. The theological observations of a lack of detached objectivity and involvement begin to formulate with the chiropractic ambitions of UI and II.

Chiropractic "philosophy": the hidden theology

In attempting to resolve the question of theology for chiropractic we must strive to conclude one particular problem. The problem is simply what is the "first cause" to either reject or accept the idea of an II? Strauss brings forth a valid and similar question: "what causes two students, in the same philosophy class, for one to become a straight chiropractor and the other to become a mixer?" (6) It is obvious at one time in the chiropractor's pre-professional education they had never heard of an II let alone a chiropractic "philosophy." Nevertheless, the question that needs to be asked is what is this "first cause" for acceptance or refutation? An answer can be given by personal testimony but that does not mean a similar experience will be had by another chiropractor. However, interest to solve this problem and the question of theology

for chiropractic, only personal testimony can be rendered to comprehend this first cause. My own testimony, although anecdotal, is consistent with Tillich's view of what is known as philosophy's "hidden theology." (4)

The notion of "a hidden theology" is made evident by this view: "every creative philosopher is a hidden theologian." (4) Tillich's explains how this hiddenness works: "those who fail to "see" their philosophy as a theology are in fact concluding a type of hidden theology that is unapparent to the authors of such." (4) It is here the personal refutation is made evident as a first cause. The hiddenness is not obvious to the authors or followers of such but the theology is obvious to those who look at them with other experiences and commitments. (4) What this means for chiropractic "philosophers" is that the authors (themselves) are stating a theology that others can visualize, but the actual author is unaware of it. Those who reject Innate philosophy have different experiences or theological knowledge that can easily point out the obvious theology. This differing experience, as for personal testimony, is apparent by *not* placing the chiropractic

"philosophy" as a concrete notion. How this is explained is that the notion of the *a priori* of a UI represents the Lutheran understanding of a "theology of glory." (25-27) When personally confronted with Stephenson's remark that chiropractic "philosophy" is *not* theology (5) the theology that is actually stated by Stephenson is visualized. The same is true of chiropractic's theological deductions of an II. The reading of Stephenson's statement and proposed principles are revealed as theology whether Stephenson admits it or not. Whether this is the same for all chiropractors is unknown.

It is this "hidden theology" as to why chiropractic "philosopher's" such as Stephenson (5), Strauss (6, 16, 20, 21), Koch (12), Barge (18, 24, 29), Hofman (19), Peet (22), Innes (23), Rondberg (28), *et al*, *ad infantum*, cannot see or understand the apparent theology they are actually reading and speaking. It is from the observation of those who have not placed chiropractic's apparent theology in explicitly concrete terms. Chiropractic "philosophers" need to realize how much influence their own religious experience and knowledge, positive or nega-

tive, decides the direction of their "philosophical" understanding. A pre-existing religious knowledge must be taken under consideration in determining why one refutes or accepts the chiropractic "philosophy".

Brief summary of the makings of a theology

A summary of Tillich's Criteria will condense the subject matter in our effort to decipher the question of theology for chiropractic. What makes a "philosophy" a theology are the concepts of *detached objectivity from the object, involvement with the object, object(s) of ultimate concern, the existence of the object as a speculative metaphysical or metaphysical entity*, and whether this entity is of an *ultimate concern* to the philosophy. Whether this speculative metaphysical entity is either *being* or *non-being* and its presentation also determines its status as a theology. It is to be noted that the existence of either a speculative metaphysical or metaphysical entity the decision of if it falls into the classification as a *metaphysical ultimate* is another determining factor. The notion of the metaphysical ultimate and ultimate concern will

be realized when the discussion reaches the topics of II and UI. **The case against BJ Palmer's doctrine of Innate and ADIO**

### BJ Palmer's Theological Question

The pursuit to satisfy the question of theology for chiropractic is prompted by what can be considered "Palmer's theological question for chiropractic". This question, in statement form, is seen by this BJ Palmer quotation:

*"As I have said, there has been a problem existing in every study up to this time, and that has been a logical and practical physiological and theological problem to connect and prove that God is a reality in man."* (30)

Palmer's statement is a fundamental point for unraveling the question. It appears Palmer strived for a chiropractic model (*formuli*) that would answer the question of proving that God was a reality in man. Where a similarity occurs is with Scholastic theology. Scholastic theology asked this fundamental question: "is there in man a point of contact for the divine?" (25) What the Scholastic theologians asked is similar to Palmer's theological dilemma of attempting to prove

that God is in man. Palmer attempted the answer empirically and the Scholastic's theologically, however, the efforts are still consistently the same. The Scholastics's established the answer with the doctrine of *synteresis*. (25, 31)

### History of Synteresis

A brief history is needed before discussion can result on the Scholastic doctrine and Palmer's God-in-man notion. Its importance helps to explain where and how Palmer's thinking originates.

The word *synteresis* derives its origin from two Greek words *sun eide sis* and *eidesis* which are nouns from the verb *oida*. (32) *Oida* in Greek means "to have inherent knowledge". (32) The history of its origin in theology is debated. (25) Therefore, both historical accounts will be given.

The first argument for origin is from Jerome (345 - 420?). (25, 31) Jerome formulated the term *synteresis* (*synderesis*) from Plato's Prophecy of the three mystic animals. These three animals were called the Platonic powers of the soul. The names of these three powers of the soul are the appetitive (*to epithymetikon*), the irascible

or the will (*to thumikon*), and the rational (*to logikon*). (31) Jerome's fourth power was the eagle (*synteresis*). This fourth power according to Jerome is "the supernatural knowledge". (31) Jerome describes this fourth power as the "spark of conscience." (31) Scriptural proofs that Scholasticism used to reinforce this Platonic philosophical notion were with Romans 8:26, 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 2:11, and 1<sup>st</sup> Thessalonians 5:23. (31)

The other view is that Jerome derived the term from the Scripture text of Ezekiel. It is taken from Peter Lombard's (1100-1160) text *Sentences* in which St. Jerome interprets Ezekiel's vision (Ezekiel 1:4-14 KJV) of four living creatures coming from a cloud. (31) The fourth creature was that of an eagle which represented the "spark of conscience." (31)

The notion of *synteresis* as that "part of the conscience" is similar in both historical accounts. It is interesting that neither Plato nor Aristotle mentioned conscience. (33) The term conscience meant in early church theology (pre-Reformation) was that it was a separate faculty of the mind as a representative of God in the human soul. (34) St. Augustine of Hippo

(354-430), noted for his Christian doctrine of conscience, used Plato's philosophy in developing his theology. (34) The Neo-platonist's main doctrine was the philosophy to prepare people for the expectation of ecstasy which they become one with God. (34) With this view the Neo-platonist's suggested, God the one, is beyond rational understanding and the source of all understanding. The Neo-platonist's conjectured that God was overflowing with Divine energy that was grafted unto man. (34)

St. Thomas of Aquinas (1225-1274) considered syneresis to be habit, law of the mind. In his *Summa Theologica*, St. Thomas explained that syneresis was the natural disposition of the human mind by which we apprehend without inquiry the basic principles of behavior. (31, 33) However, St. Thomas states: "*Principia dicuntur innata quae statim lumine intellectus agentis cognoscuntur per species a sensibus abstractas.*" (Principles are called innate when they are known at once by the light of the active intellect through the species abstracted from the senses) (31) The point of

contact for the Divine (syneresis) is established by this St. Thomas thesis: "If there are some things cognoscible through their very essence and not through the species, conscience, with regard to such things may be called habit simply innate, as for example: for God is not known by sense through an image, rather, the knowledge of God is implanted in by nature." (31) St. Bonaventure (1217-1274), shed light on syneresis describing it as some habits were acquired and some were innate. (31) St. Bonaventure adds: "habit (syneresis) are innate." (31) The influence of Duns Scotus (1266-1308) caused his followers (Scotist's) to exaggerate the syneresis as the determining power of Divine will, especially so as to leave it to the choice of God indefinitely to enlarge a creature's natural faculty in a way that made it hard to distinguish the natural from the supernatural. (31) The Scotist's considered this divine contact or syneresis as a general tendency, disposition, bias, weight, or virtuality. (31) Gabriel Biel (1425-1495) described syneresis as neither habit or act, but that syneresis is

something that all events necessarily directs in general toward a right and just activity. (25) The doctrine of Biel accords that there is present in man a capacity for the divine. (25)

The history of syneresis is important in the study of Palmer's "philosophical" opinions. A historical account explains and supports that Innate philosophy is based on the religious proofs of the early Christian church theologians. (2)

A dissection of Palmer's ADIO formula

Palmer's ADIO formulation is quite simple once dissected. It should come as no surprise that Palmer's concepts of God and UI are synonymous. The Above portion easily represents UI or God. The Down portion represents man. The Inside aspect is signified by Innate Intelligence or God-in-man with the Outside aspect considered to be man's physical expression of God or the God attribute. (Figure 1) Understanding this model is important in how contemporary chiropractic "philosophy" has lessened the blatant theological model of Palmer. The descriptive

Figure 1

Palmer' ADIO Formulation

A: God; Universal Intelligence  
 D: Man  
 I: God-in-man; Innate Intelligence  
 O: physical expression of God; God attribute; improved perception of God: physical, spiritual, mental health; connection with God; getting right with God sin free existence; conversion to God

change from Palmer's ADIO model is seen in two contemporary interpretations of ADIO. (Figure 2)

Palmer's Innate Intelligence: God-in-man

A consistent theme of Palmer's understanding of II is his God-in-man doctrine. Palmer makes

this understanding of a God-in-man notion plain in these series of statements:

- (A) "Man is born with God within him." (35)
- (B) "Innate is God in human beings." (36 p. 53)
- (C) "Innate Intelligence in man is a focalized God. God personified in man, plants, and animals." (37 p. 332)

The God-in-man doctrine is a consistent theme for Palmer. Palmer did not waver from this idea as the basis for interpretation of Innate Intelligence. The God-in-man as the definitive explanation for II is consistent with syneresis. Traditional chiropractic "philosophy," not as prominent with Palmer's God-in-man doctrine, still brings forth the doctrine when confronted. Barge presents such

against this very publication (*Journal of Chiropractic Humanities*) initiated as the *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession*: "Why does Dr. Winterstein want to destroy the above-down, inside-out principle, the God-in-man innate principle that only the body heals...?" (24) Barge's protesting statement suggests that Palmer's original concept of a God-in-man has influence in today's chiropractic "philosophy". Interpreting Palmer's model theologically is a key to the question of theology for chiropractic.

Biblical support for the God-in-man doctrine

Attempting to conform Platonic philosophy to their theology the Scholastic's used Biblical verses for support. Philosophy makes the error by having the philosophical notion constructed then looks for that Biblical passage to support it. This attempt is evident in Palmer's "philosophy." By having the God-in-man doctrine to describe his metaphysical invention Palmer uses a Biblical passage to elaborate it. Exegesis (Scriptural interpretation) is the process that formulates the interpretation from the Scripture. Palmer's exegetical state-

Figure 2

Two Contemporary Interpretations of ADIO

Example One

A: Brain  
 D: Spinal Cord: Consciousness  
 I: Innate Intelligence  
 O: Physical manifestation of Innate Intelligence

Example Two

A: Mind; Consciousness  
 D: Body; Physical  
 I: Innate Intelligence: Innate Consciousness  
 O: Physical, mental, spiritual; Higher level of consciousness

ments are seen in the following:

(A) “The “Kingdom of God is within you.” (36 p. 117)

(B) “Those ideas, devices, inventions, and practices which flow from within without are simple and single in concept. They come from the Kingdom of God within you.” (36 p. 130)

(C) “If there be truth in that trite saying “The Kingdom of God is within you”, then chiropractic is the one INTERNAL Innate knowledge that PERMITS Innate to be natural, normal, and free flowing.” (37 p. 60) (author’s emphasis)

(D) “He can know whether he has unlocked the health reservoir “Of the Kingdom of God within us” by unlocking the cause of interference.” (38)

(E) “One of the most contemptible of these apostles of affirmation of God and denial of Innate is an ax-preacher of a religion. One day of the week-Sunday-he speaks the Kingdom of God within you”. Other six days he appears before chiropractor, denying the “Kingdom of God within you”, holding contempt for the Innate in man.” (37 p.171)

Seaman’s study of these Palmer quotes states that with good reason these explanations

are unacceptable to chiropractors. (8) The focus shifts to why this is. Palmer does not just mention this phrase “Kingdom of God within you” as a mere passing notion. This “Kingdom of God within you” quotation is mentioned extensively (28 times in seven volumes) in his texts. Close examination of this phrase by Palmer reveals that its origin is Biblical. It is found in the *Holy Bible* as Luke 17:21. (39, 40) The Luke 17:21 quotation can be considered his prime Scriptural support for his God-in-man doctrine. The use of Biblical support for the already established philosophical model is no different from that of the Scholastic theologians. When the Scholastic’s took Plato’s philosophy and made the fourth animal they tried to link it with already existing Biblical verses. When a philosophical notion uses a passage from the Bible to elaborate a principle, it thus ceases to be a philosophy. It takes the form of a Biblical theology.

The knowledge of Palmer’s use of the Bible, coupled with his God-in-man doctrine, chiropractic “philosopher’s” (Strauss) make the *faux pas* of concluding “that Palmer used great wisdom in developing a new vocabulary that kept chiro-

practic separate from theology”. (6) Suggesting Palmer avoided assigning similar meanings to chiropractic and theological concepts is simply not true. Regarding exegesis, the person who encounters a Biblical text is guided by his religious understanding of it from past generations. (4) However, Palmer is different. His interpretation of II was not Biblical in origin meaning he did not cite Luke 17:21 and *then* devise an II. Palmer reversed the exegetical process. Palmer instead cites a Biblical passage to elaborate his already conceived assumption.

How Palmer solves his theological question

Palmer attempts to prove that God is a reality in man by solving the question through the workings of the nervous system. But is the adjustment of subluxation key to the solution? Palmer demonstrates the answer by stating: “Adjustment makes more of God perceptible in man’s education.” (36 p. 645) This statement informs the chiropractor that God can be interfered with and the chiropractor is needed to help man obtain a clearer knowledge of God. However, it contradicts the notion Palmer possesses when he uses the “Kingdom of

God within you” quotation and states “that no third or fourth person is needed.” (36 p. 481) Nevertheless, the statement by Palmer suggesting “adjustment makes more of God perceptible” is but one example of how he solved this question of how the adjustment of subluxation connects the physical to the spiritual.

It is this connection of the physical (man) with the spiritual (God) that satisfies Palmer. It gains further clarity when Palmer states: “Chiropractic today does what all creeds, sects, denominations, preach about, wishes they could do, try to do, viz., unite God into man, and physical man in tune with abstract God.” (36) Palmer’s statement, an obvious implication of chiropractic as a religious expression and experience, solves the theo-physiological question he believed was prevalent in theology.

Why synteresis does not work in Christian theology

Where the Scholastic doctrine of a “divine contact in man” met its demise was with Luther (1483 -1546). Luther’s view against Aristotlean and Platonic influenced theology of the early church is a prime reason why Luther detested phi-

losophy. The Reformation of Medieval Europe was not centered on the errors of indulgences of Papal Rome alone. It was also centered against the philosophically influenced theology that pervaded the Roman Church of Luther’s time.

Protestant thinking (Lutheran and non-Lutheran) is still influenced by Luther’s theology.

Luther’s Theology of the Cross is important in determining Palmer’s misconceptions.

Luther’s explanation can answer Seaman’s conclusion of why the Biblical reference of a “Kingdom of God is within you” is rejected by chiropractors. (8) It will shed light as why the God-in-man mind set is theologically inept.

Sifting our way to answer the question of theology for Palmer-influenced (Palmerian) chiropractic, tracing Luther’s development of refuting synteresis is required. Its requirement lends credence why contemporary theology refutes Palmer’s foolishness.

Luther, during his monastic training, adhered to the doctrine of synteresis. (25) This is seen prior to 1516 when Luther surmised that synteresis is a natural inclination of man (25, 41). Luther’s comment at the time: “It is like the admonish-

ing voice, a concentrated yearning for the good, and for God.” (41) Biel’s doctrine of synteresis influenced Luther. Biel’s position was: “man is in principle capable of recognizing and desiring the good. He only needs the acts corresponding to this aptitude.” (25) Luther’s position in 1516 was that this natural inclination (synteresis) of man cannot be extinguished but crowded out by other impulses. (41) Luther referred to synteresis as simply conscience, the admonishing voice that prevents man from being at ease. (41) Luther begins to reject this vitalistic notion of a divine attribute in man by concluding it as merely a postulate. (25) Although Luther attempted to be loyal to the Augustinian notion of a divine attribute in man he later rejects this doctrine entirely. The rejection is when Luther surmises that there is no disagreement between God and man regarding the goal but regarding the way to the goal. (25, 26)

The definitive rejection of synteresis by Luther occurs in 1517 with the Disputation against Scholastic Theology. (26) The thesis points of this disputation state that a divine contact in man is impossible due to the concept of inherited sin. (26) What destroys syntere-

sis is the absolutization of the “thing in itself.” (25) This “thing in itself” is determined to be phenomenalist (25) meaning that the conscience of man becomes “being” all its own. Man leads himself to destruction if man builds himself upon the synteresis or “being” itself contained within man. (25)

Palmer’s synteresis meets trouble in three other ways. The first is the lack for the need of God and Christ. The God-in-man doctrine of Palmer’s brings forth the notion of not needing Christ. Palmer makes this known when he states: “If God is everywhere and the Kingdom of God is within you then no third or fourth person is necessary.” (36 p. 481) Palmer’s statement suggests that Christ is not the intermediary for man. This, for the Christian, is unacceptable and quite heretical.

The second reason is the lack of the concept of humility. Man cannot come before God unless man has demolished his own pride, self reliance, and works. The notion of inherent sin destroys any God-in-man concept. Palmer’s entire doctrine of metaphysics and human internal divinity falls apart due to genuine reality.

What this implies is that man is a sinful being which dare not be absolutized in their “being.” (42) Palmer’s speculative theo-physiological metaphysical assumption (II) makes a significant error in metaphysics. Luther exposes this error by stating that “genuine metaphysics must proceed in principle that creatures or creations of man dare not be absolutized.” (42)

The question that obliterates Palmer’s God-in-man doctrine is: “If God is in man, and man sins, does this mean God is sinful?” It is a stumbling block question that cannot be answered reasonably: Scripturally or philosophically. The third reason is that it commits what Luther considered two situational errors. The first error is known as *facere quod in se est*. (27) This is literally interpreted as “doing what lies within one’s power.” (27) It is the false spiritual awareness in which man uses a self-described internal entity that sets itself above God. It is man relying of a self awareness of a conjectured something more powerful within himself. This attempt, so natural to man, is based on the assumption, equally natural, that “the natural powers are unimpaired.” (43) The second error is

known as *ex puris naturalibus*. (27) It is interpreted as the “abilities of man in his natural state that exist without the assistance of grace.” (27) Natural man’s abilities are nil without the assistance of grace because of natural man’s inherent ability to sin. Palmer’s God-in-man bypasses the need of undeserved, unconditional love of and from God (*grace*) and fails to address the concept of sin adequately. (\*Note: Palmer attempts to answer the question of sin in the *Green Books*. However, a study of this cannot be undertaken due to its length).

Palmer’s God-in-man doctrine creates the environment for these two theological situational errors. The reliance on this type of spiritual awareness sets a New Age religious precedence. The precedence rises above the need for grace.

A God-in-man doctrine essentially blocks grace, sets itself above God, and eliminates the need for Christ. The notion of God-in-man is detrimental because of the reliance of a self guided spiritual awareness. Palmer’s original question of linking the knowledge of God and the nervous system is a failed endeavor. According to Luther: “man wants this direct

connection to God and does not want God to be God.” (26) Instead man wants this divine essence to be contained within him so man can have some semblance of control of and over his destiny. Palmer theologically absolutizes man’s essence which sets itself above God. In other words it sets limits on God by creating a formed divine entity in man. Palmer’s model in reality attempts to place God at the disposal of the chiropractor. Palmer is essentially making the bold assertion that without the chiropractor to adjust away man’s subluxations God cannot be realized. It is these reasons why Christian theology denounces such notions of a God-in-man as silliness.

#### Palmer’s ADIO “philosophy”: the watchwords

The Palmer model creates a “formed being” of II that resides in man. This internal “being” of man is considered to be God in residence. The inside portion (I) of Palmer’s doctrine is intended as a direct connection to God. However, it stands no chance of success in the empirical realm of the question. Palmer not only fails with the foolish approach to empirically prove the existence of a God-in-man but in the ‘philosophi-

cal” concept of the whole ADIO alphabet soup. Palmer’s synteresis points to the direct way to God. It is refuted because for the Christian, the Cross of Christ is the paradigm, the true encounter with God (43) Palmer’s God-in-man is repudiated because man cannot simply insert a notion of God within himself. It cannot be used as the foundation to be built upon. (25) Instead it is the foundation of man (pride, works) that needs to be tore down (humility) before the aspect of grace can be given by God. Where Palmer makes the error with ADIO is that his watchwords are “inside” and “turning inward.” (25) With the Christian understanding the watchwords are “turning around” and “beyond.” (25) Man must turn himself around and look beyond if man is to receive the gift of grace. The humility of man is this turning around. The watchword “beyond” implies that man look beyond himself. Its meaning is the hope with faith that is *beyond* man’s power of reason. These watchwords create a nonacceptance for the Palmer ADIO model amongst Christian theologians.

Palmer’s ADIO model of man’s self awareness of God and healing is what endears

chiropractors to incorporate spiritual dabbling into patient care. Chiropractors surmise if self-healing can be made through their efforts then why not spiritual healing through chiropractic? Palmer’s reckless theology is the influential cause of why chiropractor’s practice absurd forms of metaphysical healing. And it is a glowing embarrassment upon the chiropractic profession.

#### The case against vitalism and contemporary ADIO “philosophy”

##### The Doctrine of Vitalism

In search of an answer for the question of theology for chiropractic, vitalism is a doctrine that can assist us. It would fall in the category of a special science because it incorporates a scientific notion to formulate. Chiropractic “philosophers” believe that the doctrine of vitalism is what explains the role of chiropractic. Webster’s (44) definition of vitalism: “The doctrine that the processes of life are not explicable by the laws of physics and chemistry alone and that life is in some part self determining.” (6, 44) How chiropractic “philosophy” interprets this doctrine is that life is more than just chemical actions. (6) How vitalism is

determined is that there is an un-explicable factor that cannot be seen or created in a laboratory. (6) Chiropractic “philosophy” establishes vitalism in the role that processes of life are self-healing and self-regulating.

#### Vitalism: Chiropractic’s mis-translation

A critical look at the contemporary ADIO model in relation to the term vitalism we see that there is an inconsistency. The inconsistency is with the chiropractic assumption to the actual definition and is discrepant with the actual chiropractic application. Vitalism needs to be separated into *true vitalism* and *chiropractic vitalism*. True vitalism would indicate that the processes of life are self determining and are unexplainable. It would indicate that the human body or life in general works without the empirical knowledge of how it works. Where chiropractic “philosophers” twist this doctrine is in the aspect of self-determination. Nowhere in the doctrine does the term suggest “self healing.” Self determination does not automatically imply self healing. It can imply self regulating and self adapting to environmental stresses but it does not conclude a self heal-

ing notion. Chiropractic “philosophy” purposely manipulates vitalism as “the body is self healing.” Chiropractors conclude a self healing notion by the example of bone fracture. However it is not a *true* self healing notion because of callus formation and scar tissue. Therefore, the self healing notion is not entirely correct due to failure of returning to an original configuration. A truly self healing organism would imply a return to an original configuration with no signs that injury had occurred.

Chiropractic vitalism has a problem from the standpoint of reason. If chiropractic vitalism implies that the body is self regulating and self healing then the procedures (adjustment) utilized by the chiropractor would be unnecessary. Why would chiropractic intervention be required if the body can heal itself even if a conjectured interference existed? The problem is that chiropractic “philosopher’s” *want* the interference to occur thereby reinforcing their notions of a subluxation. The conclusion can be drawn that chiropractic vitalism is not a true vitalistic doctrine. The more appropriate description of chiropractic vitalism should be *assisted vitalism*. This description

makes it no different from other New Age healing arts. Assisted vitalism would include the therapeutic goal of the patient to return to optimal health but attempts to understand how the therapeutic goal empirically works.

Chiropractor’ will rebut against such a definition because of the statements that chiropractic is non-therapeutic. An innovative tactic but one not worthy of serious consideration. Nevertheless, the assumptions chiropractic “philosophy” uses regarding vitalism, the inference makes hardly any sense. Chiropractic vitalism by literal interpretation coincides with New Age mind-body healing. The coinciding of mind-body healing endears chiropractor’s as “faith healers.” Any relationship with mind-body rhetoric points only to faith healing. It is precisely this faith healing that chiropractic “philosophers” relay to the general public when discussing vitalism and non-therapeutic approaches.

The inconsistency of the ADIO model and chiropractic manipulation

If chiropractic desires a sensible vitalistic doctrine the term ADIO needs to be clarified. Up front it is a confused model for

Figure 3  
 What chiropractors are really saying: Outside-In, All-Around, Out

O: Chiropractor  
 I: Subluxation  
 AA: Innate Intelligence  
 O: Physical, mental, spiritual health or Blend of propositions

patient care. The only person that really benefits from ADIO is the chiropractor.

The term vitalism in effect has no real bearing on the chiropractic “philosophy.” A critical study of it in relation to patient care is needed. If chiropractic “philosophy” wants a model that will adequately explain its vitalistic rationale (assisted vitalism) a change in the present alphabet is required. To reflect assisted vitalism the term ADIO needs to be changed to OIAAO. This combination of letters stands for Outside-In, All-Around, and Out. (Figure 3)

It is this alphabet configuration that chiropractic “philosophers” are stating. The chiropractor is the Outside (O) portion utilizing the adjustment (manipulation) in which he or she is supposedly correcting the subluxation (In or I). The hypothesized

correction of this entity would free up the interference the chiropractor *wishes to exist* allowing for II to work. II would not just be isolated to one specific clinical condition. It would go where the chiropractor *hopes* this supposed self-determining internal wisdom will travel to perform its wonders. Knowing this the chiropractor can patiently sit by and let II do what they *think* is going on.

The travels of II would represent an All-Around (AA) aspect. Chiropractors can then conclude the patient is expressing this imagined internal wisdom in the form of good health. This response would thus be the Out (O) portion. A change to this model would indicate that chiropractic “philosophy” is an evolving philosophical discipline. Such a new model would endear itself to becoming a philosophical model than a theological (neurotheology) model. However, it remains a theological model if the connection of a UI (God) remains. It will remain a theological model if II is described as an object of a formed “being” or formed “non-being.”

Contemporary ADIO: the lifestyle

A study of the chiropractic lifestyle is needed. A lifestyle

based on principles can help answer the question of theology. The “expression of a theology” (religion) is usually manifested in the way a person conducts himself. Chiropractic “philosophers” consider ADIO an approach to living as a human being. It (ADIO) is not confined as a technical way of explaining the vitalistic approach of patient care. It is to chiropractor’s a “way of life.” Strauss expresses the view that “objective straight chiropractic philosophy is part of a larger philosophy of life what we call above-down, inside-out (ADIO) philosophy.”(45) However, the implication is in this statement by Innes: “Chiropractic care is a way of life and this way of life demands that all aspects of it be treated.” (23) If this is correct then aspects demanded would include theology, religion, and spirituality. Moreover, this vitalistic approach to health and well-being takes a new dimension when applied to other areas. Strauss reinforces the ADIO philosophy as a way of life by stating: “The ADIO philosophy encompasses just about every facet of the human experience. It is a thinking process which gives a person a particular perspective of life.” (45) The ADIO thinking not only applies to physical functioning but

Strauss suggests it can be applied to law, politics, sociology, psychology, and theology. (45) Since our quest is to solve the question of theology for chiropractic, the ADIO philosophy in relation to theology is expressed by Strauss: "The close proximity of health, human potential, and certain theological concepts to chiropractic makes the boundaries fuzzy at times." (45)

7 Propagation of the ADIO philosophy as a way of life, encourages spiritual dabbling. Strauss's statement encourages the chiropractor to incorporate theology into chiropractic "philosophy". This is another instance of the hidden theology of the chiropractic "philosopher".

The collapse of the ADIO lifestyle: the question of death and suffering

If chiropractic "philosophy" answers the question of life (5, 6) does it answer the question of death? Stephenson (5) was eager to tell us what "life" is but rather vague about death. (7) But the question remains. If II controls the functions of the body then what happens to II in the state of death? If II is just merely an organizing principle does this mean II has no

control over the body in the case of accidental, diseased, or natural death? These are difficult questions that cause chiropractic "philosophers" to retreat into another subject or make illogical statements to dodge the inquiry. Examples of such statements could be: "death is not the preliminary concern of chiropractic;" "the theologians are best equipped to handle that issue;" "we only care about the role of II in 'living' matter;" or "speaking of death, did you know that medicine ends the lives of more people?" Such escapes from the question of death indicate that the chiropractic "philosophy" is an incomplete and unsound doctrine. Christian theology is better equipped to answer the question concerning death, however, it does not instantly suggest that chiropractic is *not* a theology. Contemporary chiropractic "philosophy" (6) only approaches the question of death with this answer: "At death, there is 0% Innate Intelligence." (6) The question now becomes "is that it"? The certainty of death is real. There is no escape from this reality. What is puzzling about II is that chiropractic claims II is perfect 100% of the time. (5, 6) A 100-point drop at death obviously suggests that II is

predictable. At the unsuspecting moment of death, II is not perfect. The problem with this is despite good or bad health II would be 100% leaving chiropractic "philosophers" with a huge problem. Any interference with II is not going to inflict much of any harm on II. Therefore, deductive logic would inform us II cannot be interfered with. This creates problems for chiropractic and their misunderstanding of vitalism. If chiropractic "philosophy" can speculate that at the moment of conception an II is formed or begins they must answer what becomes of it during the process to death and at death itself. Why the question of death and II is not addressed is because if chiropractic "philosophers" did have an answer it would solidify chiropractic "philosophy" as a religious doctrine. Their apprehension is respected, however, it does not preclude them to leave this question unanswered.

The chiropractic "philosophy" can only address to those patients who follow the rules enacted by the chiropractic "philosophy." If the patient presents with a terminal situation or in the midst of suffering the predictable chiropractic "philosophical" response is one

of “your innate is too weak”; “you are past the state in which the wonders of chiropractic can help;” “we only adjust subluxations;” “had you been to a chiropractor sooner this would not be taking place;” or “speaking of suffering, did you know that medicine ends more lives?” Such dodges are convenient to the chiropractic “philosopher”. The responsibility is shifted to the patient’s internal fault of not following the chiropractic doctrine from the cradle. The chiropractic “philosopher” thus has eluded “philosophical” embarrassment again. But the question of suffering and death cannot be adequately explained set forth from the ADIO formulation. It therefore collapses under the rigors of the question. Questions of death and suffering put too much exertion on an already structurally weak doctrine.

Another problem for ADIO “philosophy” is if the chiropractor becomes incapacitated with a grave or serious illness. ADIO-influenced chiropractors have to struggle to answer why this is. The point here is the good health that the ADIO chiropractor enjoys is not based on the chiropractic assumptions. They are fortunate to have good health. If an ADIO chiropractor becomes seriously sick

with cancer or another illness, other chiropractors will simply not understand why. The ADIO doctrine fails to address this reality. In cold hard reality, the ADIO chiropractor will likely not live long enough to disrupt the ADIO based mentality of other ADIO chiropractors. It is interesting to note that Palmer died of cancer when he strongly believed the human body healed itself. (46)

Chiropractic “philosophers” can no longer retreat into standard knee jerk responses of “to those who lack understanding” (18) or “you do not understand” (*du verstehe ist nicht*). Lack of solid, well-grounded answers to questions of this variety suggest the doctrines purported are weak, inefficient, and clumsy. The clumsiness of chiropractic “philosophy” is why Luther referred to philosophy as the clumsy apprentice in the tent maker’s workshop. (25, 47) Luther, in a backlash against philosophy’s lack of depth on questions of death, states: “The fools of philosophers look at God’s creatures: but they see only what *is in itself* and how it is equipped but have no thought whatsoever for the end for which it was created.” (43, 47) (emphasis mine)

Contemporary ADIO “phi-

losophy”: Faith

Faith is an important aspect of theology. The question of theology for chiropractic must investigate faith because it is the one overriding factor of how chiropractic “philosophy” works. An in-depth study on the question of faith for chiropractic cannot be performed at this time. However, examination of the faith investment into ADIO thinking can be made. Faith is what drives the ADIO formulation.

The ADIO “philosophy” is a model of self-invested faith. It is a prime part of the historical, psychological, and physical insight that can become an object of theology. The primary assumption is not whether or what you believe is true, but whether or not it works for you. (48) This self-invested faith is a “faith within a faith” model. The certainty of death creates the problem for this faith within one’s own faith doctrine. The failure of the Palmer ADIO doctrine and contemporary ADIO is similar. The faith invested in ADIO forces the person to deal with life’s problems, the uncertainty of the future, by taking refuge within oneself. (48) This refuge is precisely where all the trouble exists. (48) This “power of positive thinking”

means nothing more than talking yourself into something, making yourself have faith by telling yourself there is nothing to fear. (48) This type of religious expression is not faith in anything concrete (48) except the concrete things the ADIO influenced chiropractor wants or feels obligated to believe. It is similar to the lucky rabbit's foot that one carries around. (48) It is nothing more than faith in your own faith. (48) Chiropractic "philosophy" essentially has no bearing or influence with this faith in faith. (48) It (chiropractic "philosophy") is the lucky rabbit's foot. According to such a belief chiropractic could be all but eliminated, refuted, and/or dis-proven and the ADIO chiropractor will still be able to state that "chiropractic" makes things happen. It is because of the so-called power of their own faith. (48) This is essentially nothing but the power of mind over matter. (48) The chiropractor keeps hold of the controls-their own controls. (48) Luther described this type of faith investment as *inchoate* faith. (25, 49) It is a faith that is imperfectly formed due to its reliance of looking for those things that appear based on "signs and wonders." (25, 50)

Chiropractic "philosophy" influences inchoate faith because the adjustment (manipulation) is "believed" to produce some type of miracle of internal wisdom. This speculative "miracle of internal wisdom" is revealed when the chiropractic "philosopher" becomes overwhelmed with self-gratification. The self-gratification comes with an observation that reinforces his preconceived bias of a patient's physically expressed response. The patient has not done anything in the way of a miraculous physical or mental response. On the contrary, it is the mis-observation of the patient's apparent response or the "wanting to see what one wants to believe is happening" or "wants to happen". It is this blind-faith in a speculative metaphysical entity that helps to reinforce a patient's conceived response even if there is no response at all. The mis-observations of blind-faith, shrouded by the influence of an intellectually-lacking and misguided "philosophy," is what reinforces mainstream healthcare opinion of chiropractic as unscientific and cult-like. It is this way with all New Age health care systems. It is because metaphysically influenced New Age health frauds are based on bias *before* any

patient comes into contact with it. Chiropractic "philosophy" works for the patient if chiropractic "philosophy" can be sold to the patient.

Chiropractic intervention: nihilism or supposition?

The ADIO model of intervention for a person's "internal wisdom" should be known as "therapeutic supposition". It is defined "as the intended intervention of a therapeutic or non-therapeutic procedure to stimulate a speculative metaphysical assumption or existing "non-being" aspect in lieu of explanation." It is thus named because the follower believes it is "supposed to work this way" because it is *assumed* to be real or true for the sake of explanation.

A strong argument in relation to manipulation and innate intelligence could be "therapeutic nihilism." (51) Therapeutic nihilism can be described "as that intended therapeutic or non-therapeutic intervention that does nothing to stimulate a speculative existing "non-being" entity because it does not work in the way it was hoped to work." Since the chiropractic adjustment of manipulation is intended to stimulate a vitalistic compo-

ment, no proof has or ever will be shown that it works the way it was hoped. Also there is no reliable proof that such intervention produces the desired result or manifestation that is stated to be expressed.

A theological position on nihilism is needed in relation to vitalism. It points out the failing of vitalism. Bonhoeffer states: "Vitalism cannot but end in nihilism, the disruption of all that is natural." (52) Vitalism, as chiropractic understands it, is movement of a natural formed life, is movement without end and without purpose, movement into nothing." (52) This type of vitalism that chiropractic embraces arises from the misconceived absolutization of an insight (II). (52) If II is portrayed as fact, it is absolutized as a "formed being." The question of death and its relation to II is left unsolved. Bonhoeffer's comment is influenced by this Luther statement: "For the "true being of things" does not lie in their existence but in their final purpose." (25, 53) Chiropractic's doctrine of vitalism is nihilistic. Luther describes the nihilism of speculative metaphysical entities: "as things that suffer under their own essences." (41)

### Vitalism: Help or Hindrance?

Koch asks the question "is vitalism a help or hindrance to the chiropractic profession?" (12) The answer: it is an unequivocal hindrance to the profession of chiropractic. Its hindrance is seen in the false allusion of hope that it gives to the unsuspecting patient. Its hindrance is evident in combination with a theistic notion of a UI and absolutizing of II. This absolutization of II that creates a spiritual want, desire, and dabbling. To steal an idea from Keating: "spiritual gobbledegook." It is a hindrance because chiropractic does not work with a true vitalism but an assisted vitalism. Assisted vitalism as stated previously is no different from any other New Age healing art. If chiropractor's state that the human body is a self healing organism then no intervention from anyone or anything can influence it. The only thing that can influence it is if chiropractors place a theological opinion of God's intent. If the body is a self-healing organism what makes a chiropractor think he will make any difference? If the body can heal itself, then the body should be able to overcome a deduced physical encroachment (subluxation) upon its self. It is a hin-

drance due to the misguided philosophy that exists from the original writings of Palmer. From this New Age religious overtones are set that harms the profession's growth as a respected scientifically based healing art.

### Palmer's answer to death in relation to his ADIO formulation

Palmer does attempt to tackle the issue of death in relation to the ADIO doctrine. However, this topic will not be covered due to its length. Palmer's concept of reincarnation and movement of Innate Intelligence is interesting and noteworthy.

### The case against contemporary Innate Intelligence

### Contemporary understanding of Innate Intelligence

Contemporary chiropractic "philosophy" has strived to lessen the overt theological character of Stephenson's text. But does the theology carryover into the contemporary understanding? The question of theology for chiropractic must approach this new interpretation of chiropractic "philosophy".

Strauss's (6) understanding of

II is the subject of critical study. Strauss suggests that since II is a principle this automatically infers to its lacking personification. (6) From this Strauss concludes that this takes II out of the religious or mystical realms. (6) Where Strauss first runs into problems is with delineation of II from the metaphysical. Because of Innate's immateriality Strauss suggests, it can neither be seen, touched, felt, nor measured. (6) This is a perfect description of a metaphysical entity that Strauss is speculating. However, real problems occur for chiropractors who claim the effects and manifestations of II can be seen. Chiropractic "philosophers" state that just because it cannot be seen, felt, or measured does not lessen its existence. (6) How they analogize this confusion is with gravity. Gravity is typically a chiropractic "philosophy" design (*teleology*) analogy to elaborate an "orderer." (2) Critical examination of the gravity/II analogy shows it is laughably weak. According to Strauss gravity cannot be seen and because of this it does not lessen its existence. (6) The problem with such flighty assertions is the lack of scientific knowledge the chiropractic "philosopher" brings to the argument. Gravity

can be measured and it can be felt. Any combat pilot knows that G-forces above 7.0 can cause black outs. (54) Such would indicate that gravity is measurable and felt if exceeded. (55-57) Mathematics can determine the existence of gravity. (55-57) Gravity can manipulate time given that two atomic clocks, one at sea level and one at a mountain top, will reflect different times. (55-57) None of these is claimed with II. Logic used by chiropractic shows it is fallacious. Analogies of this sort to support a speculative metaphysical entity (II) end in disaster once legitimate scientific fact is introduced. The disaster is when the chiropractic "philosopher" brings *his* science into the "theological circle" or what is considered to be the domain of theology. (4, 43) The chiropractic "philosopher" *hopes* of rationally explaining that which faith alone can only understand. Not that it is wrong, but that it is superficial, inept, and useless. (43)

#### Innate Intelligence: A Metaphysical Ultimate of Ultimate Concern

Philosophy has always asked the question of form and dynamics. Every form forms

something. (4) The question is: "what is this something?" (4) Chiropractic calls this something Innate Intelligence (II). Chiropractic "philosophers" allude to II as having form when they define life "as the expression of intelligence through matter." (5, 6) Two errors arise when chiropractic "philosophy" considers this "something." These errors are intimately connected to and arise from each other. The two errors of II are the "metaphysical ultimate" and the "ultimate concern."

The first error of II is known as the metaphysical ultimate. (4) This first error is the explanation of II. Chiropractor's explain II as a speculative metaphysical entity. However, once this speculative metaphysical entity is given concrete status, it becomes that "ultimate" in which it achieves the primary focus of attention. The concreteness is what embeds it as a "metaphysical ultimate." (4)

When a philosophy or theology establishes a metaphysical entity or principle as either its *a priori* or a quality deduced from a theistic, metaphysical entity or principle, it impresses itself as a metaphysical ultimate. When the metaphysical

ultimate becomes that absolute necessity, its becomes to that philosophy a concrete notion. Without concrete status, the very existence of the “philosophical” structure cannot sustain itself. All theologies, except Christianity, have as their centerpiece of tribute, worship, reverence, or “tells the why’s of what we do” (6, 58) as this metaphysical ultimate. Once a philosophy takes this metaphysical ultimate and makes it the centerpiece of their knowledge, function, approach, and/or depend on this centerpiece for their very existence, the philosophy loses its status as a philosophy. This loss of status is replaced as a theology or a religious structure. Tillich points out that “all metaphysical ultimates, although speculative, are religious ultimates.” (4)

The next error arises from the first and is known as the “ultimate concern.” (4) Once the “philosophy” establishes a metaphysical ultimate (II) in concrete terms (never changing, never leaving) it becomes an “ultimate concern”. (4) When the “philosophy” embraces the concrete metaphysical ultimate (II) and establishes it as its necessary part for survival the metaphysical ultimate becomes an “ultimate concern”. (4) An

ultimate concern replaces the notion of purely philosophical explanation. The ‘philosophy’ thus transforms itself in a religious context and perspective. Reification of the metaphysical ultimate as an ultimate concern sets the stage for the acquisition (deductive method) of knowledge (theology) to be obtained. Although II is not the *a priori* of chiropractic, the knowledge gleaned from the ultimate concern (II) therefore transcribes itself as a theological exercise.

The notions of an II achieve these two errors. Although the concept of II is a speculative metaphysical assumption deduced from an *a priori* theological entity, it has the makings of a metaphysical ultimate of ultimate concern. It is because it has the power of revealing something of ultimate importance and value

Chiropractic “philosophy” will still negate such claims of II being a metaphysical ultimate of ultimate concern. The rebuttal will be that the concepts of an II do not make it a religious discipline. Where the error in thinking occurs is from the theological rule that was discussed earlier. Tillich’s rule for review: “all metaphysical ultimates are religious ultimates.” (4) When

the already concrete entity is further reified into an immovable principle, its status as an “ultimate concern” becomes a religious reality.

Innate Intelligence: no different from other metaphysical speculations

But is this “something” any different or special to chiropractic “philosophy”? A study of philosophy’s attempt to name that “something” we see that chiropractic’s II is really nothing new. Throughout history philosopher’s have attempted to define this “something” in the form of a metaphysical speculation. That something, also described as “that which cannot be named,” is seen as *Urgrund* (Boehme), will (Schopenhauer), will to power (Nietzsche), the unconscious (Freud, Hartman), *elan vital* (Bergson), strife (Scheller, Jung). (4) The problem that these speculations of the internal workings of man have is that they are *not* to be taken conceptually. (4) This is the first problem that arises from a metaphysical ultimate of ultimate concern such as II. The first problem is when the speculation transforms itself as a conceptual model and is not considered *symbolic*. (4) This is an area in which the metaphysical speculation (II) from a

standpoint of philosophy intrudes the field of theology.

Where the second error occurs for chiropractic “philosophy” and II is how this speculation is approached. If II, just as the other philosophical speculations listed, could be named properly it would become a “formed being” besides other beings. Palmer’s model of II has become this formed being by its absolutization of a God-in-man. II can only point to “that which cannot be named” only as a symbolic gesture. (4) The approach that Palmer and current chiropractic “philosopher’s” take creates the second error of the metaphysical ultimate of ultimate concern. The error lies in the notion that this God-in-man is not pointed as a symbolic notion but appears as a reality or formed being. The error for contemporary chiropractic “philosophy” (Strauss) is that it is an explanation of life itself. (6) This “life within life” is no different from the desire to understand the divine in man. It also creates this “formed being” that resides in humans to explain “that which cannot be explained or named.” The main problem for chiropractic and its assumption of an II is that they try to dodge the theology by stating it is “non-being” or principle. (6)

However, critical examination demonstrates that it is a theological construct because the explanations given indicate it as “formed.” As mentioned this formed non-being becomes theological when it is presented as “being” or “non-being.” Its status as a theological construct is evident when this “formed non-being” entity becomes an object of ultimate concern. The status as a theology is further embedded when this object not only becomes an ultimate concern but because of its description as a speculative metaphysical assumption. The intimate involvement by chiropractors with II and referring to its supremacy over the human mind (46) reinforces it as a theological “formed non-being.”

Errors of the metaphysical speculation known as Innate Intelligence

Innate Intelligence (II) is no different from other philosophical attempts to name that “something which cannot be named.” Where errors are made by chiropractic “philosopher’s” is evident by these three reasons. First, the non-symbolic concept of II is derived from the immediate experience of something ultimate in value. (4) II is deduced from the intu-

itive truth of a UI (God). The chiropractic “philosopher” has placed UI as something ultimate in value. Without God the chiropractic “philosopher” cannot derive II. The second error arises in attempting to understand this speculation as either “being” or “non-being” deduced from which one can be intuitively aware. (4) Lastly, an error is made in that II is a creation of man in a way to use the material in nature to explain what he cannot explain through science. (4) What this means is that man uses the material given by nature to create technical forms that transcend nature. (4) Chiropractic “philosophy” has done such to name that “something” in the form of II. As examined this “something” is given the technical name of II that transcends the bounds of science. The chiropractic “philosopher” courts II as an existing entity that has some power of revealing something of man’s essence. The metaphysical speculation of II can only be believed by the invested inchoate faith. The intimate involvement by chiropractors with this speculative non-personified formed entity and referring to its supremacy over the human mind (46) reinforces it as a proposition that is theological. Just because II is not given per-

sonification does not lessen chiropractic's explanation of II's existence as a formed entity (non-being).

The Triune of Man: hidden theology of the chiropractic "philosopher"

Strauss (21) brings forth the view that man is in effect a "Triune." This triune of man is different from his triune of life description in *Chiropractic Philosophy* (6). The triune of life is defined: "life is a trinity having three necessary united factors namely intelligence, force and matter." (6)

Stephenson (5) also describes a triune of life. However, the Strauss notion of a triune of man is consistent with "a hidden theology." It is also a case study of how chiropractic "philosophy" is clumsy and naive.

The Triune of man is defined: "man is a triune consisting of a physical, spiritual, and innate." (21) The physical is defined as "pertaining to the material part of all things." (21) The spiritual pertains to a "nonmaterial part of man" (21) whereas the innate portion applies to "a nonmaterial part of all living things." (21) Where the hidden theology lies is in the delineation of spiritual and innate. If the spiritual is nonmaterial in

man and innate is nonmaterial for all living things, would not innate be considered the spiritual in man? If man is this living, physical being, then does man have both a spiritual *and* innate nonmaterial aspect? Chiropractic "philosophers" may affirm this question, however, do they realize the hidden theology provoked by the insistence of a difference?

Anyone who has not placed II as an object of ultimate concern can see that this triune of man hardly makes any sense at all. The idea of entertaining thoughts of spirituality informs us that chiropractor's efforts are in vain. These efforts are clumsy attempts to delineate spirituality from II. Strauss's attempts to distance chiropractic "philosophy" from religious expressions by making the assumption that theology deals with the spiritual solely and medicine deals with the physical. (21) This is all well and good, however, Strauss aims to stake chiropractic's claim on the physical/innate realm of humankind. (21) This demonstrates the very thin line chiropractic walks in its attempt to be a distinct "philosophy." However, by using explanations that are theological find themselves in folly. The thin line is in the explanation that innate is

in all living things and that man is just spiritual. Strauss answers the question without realizing he is the deliverer of the message that creates the confusion: "Medicine has been less effective in the area of physical problems, however, this does not justify the chiropractor from entering the realm of physical problems." (21)

The hidden theology in the elaboration of a Triune of Man raises this Strauss response: "Another, less common area of inappropriate practice, is that of chiropractor's attempt to using chiropractic to alleviate man's spiritual problems." (21) Although Strauss realizes that "this spiritual mixing is much more insidious and dangerous" (21), nevertheless, it is the message the Triune of Man contains which provokes such spiritual nonsense to occur in the first place. If chiropractic, as Strauss states, is not effective in the spiritual realm, no more so than in chiropractic treating physical problems, (21) the question is "what then is chiropractic good for?" If it does not attend to physical manifestations but that of a speculative assumption of "internal wisdom" would this not be the spiritual? Questions of this type are a cause of "spiritual mixing." The Triune of Man idea

leads chiropractors to move into spiritual mixing realms. Efforts to delineate the spiritual from II are a wasted effort. The effort confuses and leads the audience in the wrong direction. The Triune of Man ideology is not only a silly effort but an intention that goes totally wrong. The hidden theology contained directs misinterpretation for chiropractic disaster. The clumsiness is satisfied because the chiropractic “philosopher” sees the individual pieces but has no idea of how to put anything together and explain rationally what he is doing.

### The Case Against Contemporary Universal Intelligence

#### UI: A Theological Entity of Ultimate Concern

A strong argument can be given that chiropractic’s notion of a Universal Intelligence is a speculative metaphysical construct. My opinion is that UI is synonymous with a speculative theological notion because its really meaning God. Metaphysics can belong to the religious realm, however, it stands in opposition to Christianity. (25) This opposition is because true theology is revealing whereas natural the-

ology can have aspects of metaphysics but lacks in revelation. Tillich has stated “that those propositions that concern us ultimately are objects of theology because they have the power of revealing something to us.” (4) Technically, natural theology lacks revelation nonetheless there are aspects that essentially reveal something. The problem here is the object of theology reveals something needs to be classified as a true revealing notion. UI, although not a true theology, still has the power to reveal something of ultimate value to the chiropractor. It (UI) supposedly contains those items (II, ADIO) that are revealed “something’s” that concerns the chiropractor. It therefore is that speculation that is of ultimate concern to the chiropractic “philosopher.”

#### UI: No Different From Philosophy’s Past Attempts To Name God

The history of religion is full of human attempts to participate in divine power and use it for human purposes. (4) Palmer’s notion of UI and God-in-man doctrines are essentially no different. The attempt by Palmer to participate in divine power is seen by these statements: “Adjustment

makes more God in man,” (36) and “how can man get right with God if his sublaxations are not corrected.” (37) Palmer, like other men throughout history, have continued to use the power of their god by asking him favors. (4) These men (chiropractic “philosophers”) demand a concrete god, a god with whom man can deal with. (4, 25) Tillich’s view is supported by Luther, who stated such in his Disputation against Scholastic Theology. (26) Thesis point 17 states: “man is by nature unable to want God to be God. Indeed, he himself wants to be God, and does not want God to be God.” (26)

But is the concept of a UI anything special or new in the history of philosophy? (4)

Chiropractic “philosophers” conclude that UI is unique because BJ Palmer was careful not to mix theological concepts with chiropractic concepts. (6) This presumption is simply not true. Palmer’s understanding of God as UI is no different from those historical attempts by philosophy to name God. Past attempts by philosophy are seen in these *a priori* attempts which directs the deduction. (4) These *a priori* “philosophical” attempts have been seen as “being itself”

(Scholastics), “universal substance” (Spinoza), “beyond subjectivity and objectivity” (James), “identity of spirit and nature” (Schelling), “universe” (Schleiermacher), “cosmic whole” (Hocking), “value creating process” (Whitehead), “progressive integration” (Wieman), “absolute spirit” (Hegel), or “cosmic person” (Brightman). (4) Tillich points out that these “philosophical” names for God are based on an immediate experience of something ultimate in value. (4) It is also to be considered an “ultimate concern” for each “philosophical” discipline. Like UI the theology derived from them is determined by the “hidden” theology contained in each. (4) It is the *a priori* of UI that motivates the deductions of an II, subluxation, and eventually the ADIO formulation. Since UI cannot be demonstrated empirically, it must be based on intuition (*Anschaulich*). The intuition that leads to the *a priori* of UI is no different from other religions that formulated notions of a divine existence. Also, UI is no different from other religions that devised divine entities from observation of the workings of nature (theology of glory). Strauss defines intuition to be “the form of perception that claims a knowledge of truth from an unknown source.

The individual cannot explain why he knows, just that he knows.” (6) UI and II are based on this method of perception because UI and II are unverifiable and entirely subjective.

Chiropractic “philosophers” attempt to counter criticism of UI by stating this logic: “There is the universe and there is organization. Where there is organization there is intelligence.” (6) This logic is described as fact begets fact, organization bespeaks intelligence. (6) The question now becomes “how does anyone know that organization is intelligent?” No one to be exact. Science is what throw these “philosophic” statements of fact off track. If there is intelligence at the atomic level in the universe does this mean that the Levy-Shoemaker 9 comet that broke up due to Jupiter’s gravitational field display this intelligence? The theistic “principle” of UI meets its demise by attempting to answer questions of quantum and astrophysics. Science is again called upon to refute chiropractic’s fallacious arguments of logic. Scientific questions threaten chiropractic “logic.” Not only do science and philosophical reasoning cause the chiropractor’s logic to be easily refuted by competent undergraduate philosophy stu-

dents (2) but a theology student’s common sense refutes the obvious theology contained in the chiropractic major premise.

### Contemporary Chiropractic’s A Priori of a UI: Confused Theology

The theology of the chiropractic “philosopher” is so apparent it sometimes baffles the mind why the chiropractic “philosopher” cannot realize it. Nevertheless, our question of theology for chiropractic must look at the *a priori* of UI. Chiropractic fails in its realization that their *a priori* is God. As we have seen with the historical attempts of philosophy we now need to ask “does contemporary or “evolved” chiropractic “philosophy” make similar errors?” What has happened in history is no different for today’s explanation of chiropractic’s *a priori*. Strauss (6) makes six fundamental errors in determining the *a priori* that leads the deductions:

- (a) “One may use deduction to establish the existence of UI if the existence of God has already been made.”
- (b) “God is omnipresent, unswerving, without solicitude, immutable, all of which

are characteristics of UI.”

(c) “If one accepts by faith the existence of a Christian God, then UI can be deduced.”

(d) “Although not demonstrable (UI), we can say it is universal and therefore, everywhere.”

(e) “...universal intelligence can be deduced from God.”

(f) “the intelligence of the universe is omnipresent, not limited by limitations of matter, not confined.” (6)

These six errors point out two things. First, the knowledge by faith of God is needed to formulate the existence of UI. Apparently a theological understanding is needed to ascertain UI. Secondly, these statements strongly suggest UI is God. The notion of UI being strictly a principle is sadly mistaken. Contrary to Strauss’s opinion that “for the past 80 years no one has been able to refute the Major Premise of Chiropractic” (6) Lutheran theology not only refutes it as a theological entity but also admonishes it as a weak attempt of intrusion into the field of theology. It is refuted because the knowledge of God cannot be gathered from the observation of nature.

### Chiropractic “Philosophy’s” Deductive Theology

What is known as a theological impossibility is the misnomer “deductive theology”. It is a process the chiropractic “philosopher” performs in his “philosophical” attempt to deduce from God the conjectured principles of an II and sublaxation. Tillich states: “attempts to elaborate a theology as an empirical-induction or a metaphysical-deductive “science”, or combination of both has given ample evidence that no such attempt can succeed.” (4) The deductive approach of a speculative theological entity (UI), like all metaphysical ultimates, are religious ultimates as well. (4) The same is true of pseudo-theological and quasi-theological ultimates as well. What was mentioned earlier as the “hidden theology” of chiropractic “philosophy,” the deductions from a theistic *a priori* such as UI, shows that no attempt is possible. The deductive theology of chiropractic is a misnomer just as the term chiropractic “philosophy.” (10, 15) As seen with chiropractic “philosophy,” this so-called scientific theology or special science, the point where individual experience, traditional valu-

ation, and personal commitment, decides the issue of its relevance. (4) We have seen that the chiropractic *a priori* is based on a confused theological notion. This confusion leads to the principles of an II, sublaxation, and ADIO formulation. If the *a priori* of chiropractic is a theological entity which is central to the whole of the philosophy of chiropractic its status as an ultimate concern is set in place. It is the object in which the parts (other objects) are derived from. UI is the key to the whole of chiropractic “philosophy”. It is also its Achilles Heel. UI leads the deduction, not only of the “philosophical” (theological) notions but is the primary conjecture of determining the “whys of what we do.” (6, 58) Therefore if any concept within chiropractic is more important to the chiropractic “philosopher”, it is the notion of UI. Due to this status, it is now more embedded as an ultimate concern.

### UI: Further Errors of the Chiropractic “Philosopher”

Chiropractic “philosophers” make two theological mistakes with their *a priori*. With regards to the UI/vitalism connection the two mistakes are the Christian doctrinal points

of the “hidden God” and “secrets of God.” Luther’s notion of the “hidden God” (doctrine of concealment) (25) is the key point to the whole of Cross Theology. It is here the concept of revelation occurs. Luther’s claim that God is hidden only to be revealed is Scripturally (59-62) and theologically valid. (4, 13, 25-27, 41-43, 48-50, 52, 53, 63-68). Where chiropractic “philosophers” make the mistake is attempting to reach a knowledge of God through observation of the laws of nature. The chiropractic “philosopher” makes the fumble of trying to “force” God to reveal himself by “wanting” certain things. Chiropractic’s *a priori* error is best stated by Luther: “God is so well hidden that He appears as pure nothing.” (25, 67) Chiropractic’s error is no different from that of atheism. It has been said that 78% of astrophysicist’s are atheist. (69) How astrophysicist’s devise such atheistic opinions is from their mathematical models. Although mathematics has always been hostile to theology, (70) after working through these models they come to the conclusion of mathematical fact that there can be no God. Whereas the chiropractor sees the universe then announces that there is intelligence and

concludes it as fact. The chiropractic “philosopher’s” only argument is from empirical analogies. So who is right and who is wrong? No one. Science throws the chiropractor “philosopher’s” logic out of order. However, science cannot prove or disprove the existence of God. The Christian knows God is hidden only to be revealed to man through Christ’s suffering which is beyond reason and logic. The Christian relies on faith not reason. The atheist and chiropractic approaches are similar because both are silly attempts of reason and empirically proving/disproving or what is sensed to be the existence of God. And both approaches are based on faith to explain logically that which can never be explained through reason. Who would have thought that to be an atheist you had to have faith?

The second error of the chiropractic “philosopher” relates to vitalism. The doctrine as stated is that the human organism runs on an unexplainable process. Where the error occurs is when the chiropractor “believes” that UI reveals something of ultimate value. When chiropractors devise deductions from UI they are stating a secret of God. Luther again states it best: “The

secrets of God will never be penetrated.” (25, 71)

Chiropractors devise notions of vitalism as a way to unlock the secrets of God without having to take responsibility. The chiropractor can exalt the wonders of II without having to explain that their notions are revealed to them from a theistic entity. A clever tactic but one that costs them dearly when ultimately confronted with scrutiny.

#### Tillich’s Criteria: a Case Study

This section is a case study to demonstrate how chiropractic “philosophers” are in reality forwarding a theology. Strauss’s text *Refined by Fire* (46) demonstrates the Tillich criteria adequately. A critical study of Strauss’s statements will put some semblance of this examinations effort to answer the question of theology for chiropractic. Critical assessment will support researcher’s allegations (1, 2, 7-11) that chiropractic “philosophy” is theological and religious.

Strauss informs the reader: “those who oppose the use of the chiropractic philosophy and feel it has no place in a scientific profession fail to understand....that people apply them

(chiropractic principles) to every aspect of their lives.” (46) This notion reinforces the ADIO lifestyle. Where the theology begins developing is when Strauss states that these principles cannot be divorced from the vitalistic principle of reality. (46) Strauss, in reference to the ADIO lifestyle, states that divorcing these principles is impossible if those principles have a basis in the “spiritual” aspect of man. (46) Our suspicion that the Triune of man as a spiritual model is satisfied. If Strauss wonders why chiropractor’s experiment or dabble in metaphysical spiritual mixing (21), statements of this type invite it. Nevertheless, if one wishes to see’s the Tillich Criteria combined to demonstrate the theology of chiropractic, one need not go further than this statement: “In addition to the logic that attracts people to Straight Chiropractic there is also the belief system.” (46) As with any belief system or faith-based religion there must be an object that becomes an ultimate concern. The object of ultimate concern for the chiropractor is satisfied when Strauss states: “As long as people believe there is a Wisdom, Power, or Being, that runs this universe, they will believe that He instills into living things a

principle that runs, heals, and maintains this organism.” (46) This statement informs us that UI (God) is a theological entity that is of ultimate concern to the chiropractic “philosopher.” It also shows us that there is an intimate involvement with an object (UI a.k.a. God). Strauss’s statement implies theology to the chiropractic model of vitalism. Also, Strauss’s understanding of God instilling a “principle,” is no different from our discussion of synteresis. The aspect of whether II is a speculative metaphysical entity has been satisfied, however, its power as a “formed being” itself, whether chiropractor’s know it or not, is also satisfied. II is such a formed being that take on the status as an ultimate concern. If God (a.k.a. UI) instills *His* power as a principle it then becomes a “formed being” no different from Palmer’s God-in-man. Once this occurs its status as a philosophy thus shifts to that of theology. The status of II as a “non-being” or “being” is further reified to the chiropractic “philosophy” when Strauss states: “Recognition of the supremacy of II of the body over one’s educated brain is an absolute necessity to maintaining a straight perspective.” (46) Not only did Palmer absolutize the concept of God-in-man, but

contemporary chiropractic “philosophy” unknowingly absolutizes II into “being” status by alluding to its supremacy over man’s cognitive awareness. Anything that has that much supremacy over the human body can only be understood as a “formed being or non-being”.

A quick review of this case study demonstrates a large part of the Tillich Criteria. There is a *lack of detached objectivity, intimate involvement with an object, a speculative metaphysical entity as an ultimate, an aspect of revealing something of importance, an ultimate concern to the philosopher, faith in the object, the object as a formed being, and lastly the hidden theology that everyone but the philosopher can realize.*

The Question of Theology:  
To Resolve,  
We Must Consider

*A definition of religion for contemporary chiropractic “philosophy”*

Religion is a term similar to philosophy. There are numerous definitions that indicate there may be no generally accepted term for it. Religion is derived from the Latin *religio* meaning “service or wor-

ship". (44, 47, 72) Pertaining to chiropractic and the ADIO "philosophy", religion can be defined as *not* the object of a single fixed meaning (God, Christ) but rather an aspect of human experience that interacts, incorporates, and transcends aspects of life. (72) Tillich provides a similar definition: "Religion is the state of being grasped by an ultimate concern, a concern which qualifies all other concerns as preliminary and which itself contains the answer to the question of a meaning in our life." (73) As seen, chiropractic "philosophy" and its congruent ADIO formulation, contain several key points consistent with Tillich's definition. The first is chiropractic states it has the answer to life. (5, 6) The second is this answer to life contains some meaning to the life of the chiropractor. In other words the chiropractic definition of life helps develop the ADIO formula which reveals a world view. Thirdly, chiropractic is grasped by two ultimate concerns: UI and II. Chiropractic "philosophers" attempt to use reason in place of faith to conclude a metaphysical entity. This metaphysical ultimate has become that which is grasped as an ultimate concern. Reason by chiropractic "philosophers" is used in a metaphysical religious

sense as a principle of a world view. (25) This world view and speculative metaphysics are consistent with the ADIO model as a religious expression.

#### *Contemporary Chiropractic "Philosophy": Pseudo-Religion or Quasi-Religion?*

The terms *pseudo-religion* and *quasi-religion* need delineation. Tillich states it is imprecise to describe a pseudo-religion as a quasi-religion and vice-versa. (73) A pseudo-religion indicates an *intended* but deceptive similarity. (73) A quasi-religion contains similarities, *not* intended, but based on points of identity. (73) Chiropractic "philosophy" is a quasi-religion. The chiropractic "philosopher" does not intend for the prime tenets to be religious expressions. However, the "philosophy" has similar points of identity.

The defining point of a quasi-religion is the *ideocracy*. (73) It is defined as the "rule of an ideology". (73) Tillich's definition: "a movement of a social or religious group that does not allow for individual criticism (suppression) and glorifies the principles of which the ideology exists." (73) Challenging BJ Palmer was an open challenge to chiropractic and vice versa.

(14) Chiropractic "philosophy" is no different from the "rule of an ideology" and has changed very little since Palmer's death. Individual criticism of the prime tenets is negated as ignorant attempts at medicalization of chiropractic. Any criticism to chiropractic "philosophy" is met with volleys' of reflexive and scripted assaults from the faithful. These reflexive utterances are "statements of suppression." The suppression of criticism is an ultimate goal of chiropractic "philosophy." Such suppressive acts are consistent with idolatry of a principle. (74) Until the chiropractic "philosopher" realizes this, all criticism of his glorified standards appears to him as treason. (74)

#### Chiropractic "philosophy": The Kergyma

A point of consideration in resolving the question of theology for chiropractic is the message relayed by chiropractic "philosophers". We must consider what is known as *kergymatic theology*. (4) This term is defined: "as related to a fundamentalism or orthodox thinking in so far as it emphasizes the unchangeable truth of the message (Kergyma). (4) The message of any theology or religion is believed to be truth.

Chiropractic “philosophy” conforms to this kerygmatic theology because the principles of a UI, II, sublaxation, and ADIO, are orthodox and fundamentalistic. It is considered truth to the chiropractic “philosopher.” Chiropractic “philosophers” will argue that their’s is not fundamentalism in the Protestant sense. Webster’s defines fundamentalism to be “a movement or point of view marked by rigid adherence to basic fundamentals.” (44) Even with the term “evolving” added to the overall advertisement does not save it from being classified as orthodox or fundamental. If chiropractic “philosophy” is this evolving philosophy would it not have grown out of its roots into a different structure? Would it not have evolved to a point that parts of it would have become extinct? A question that is easily answered. The basic concepts contained in Palmer’s and Stephenson’s text have not changed one iota to today’s falsely advertised “evolving philosophy” of Strauss’s. The only change is how they explain it. However, the message of II and UI is still a fundamental aspect of the chiropractic “philosophy.” Moreover, without it chiropractic would be unable to set forth any statements they believe

keeps the profession distinct. It is thus orthodox and fundamental (kerygmatic) placed into a theological package advertised falsely as “evolving” chiropractic “philosophy.”

#### The Chiropractic Doctrine of Inerrancy

If traditional chiropractic is true to its name then *everything* penned by DD Palmer (the founder) and BJ Palmer (the fountainhead) is to be considered the *modus operandi* or doctrine of chiropractic. If one wants to be a true or traditional chiropractic “philosopher”, they must be champions of the orthodox, fundamentalistic, classic vernacular of chiropractic in order to understand and express the unadulterated, uncontaminated, unaltered tenets of original chiropractic. (75) A statement of this type is impetus to either suggest a canonization of the Chiropractic *Green Books* or establish the Doctrine of Chiropractic Inerrancy. However, what comes with this doctrine of Palmerian Inerrancy (irrefutableness) is Palmer’s baggage. The baggage is Palmer’s negative opinion of Biblical and Christian practices that he used to elaborate chiropractic “philosophy.” Palmer’s exegetic of Luke 17:21 would

be named as the official explanation of Innate Intelligence. If traditional chiropractic “philosophy” is true to its name, Luke 17:21 puts chiropractic “philosophy” as a Biblically-supported theology. These opinions would be classified as doctrinal statements.

If the notion by Barge (18) “that BJ Palmer was a great thinker” is assumed, do Palmer’s confused Christian views endear him as such a great thinker? If BJ Palmer is this great thinker, how come it is virtually impossible to locate his works in a bookstore? Why do his texts fail to be recognized amongst other great thinkers such as Descartes, Keirkegaard, and Kant? A medical conspiracy of why bookstores fail to display Palmer’s texts has become worn out as a convenient excuse. This realization is painful to the image of Palmer as a great thinker of men.

Contemporary chiropractic “philosophers” such as Strauss reinforce the doctrine of inerrancy when discussing Palmer’s and Stephenson’s contributions. Strauss states: “The chiropractic philosophy is today the same as it was when BJ Palmer and RW Stephenson set it down.” (6) If this is true

then chiropractic “philosophy”, as advertised, is not this evolving philosophy.

## Conclusion

In attempting to answer the question of theology for chiropractic a tremendous amount of material has been presented. Only a lengthy academic study can demonstrate that the charges of chiropractic as a religion and theology are correct. The conclusive evidence is simple: Chiropractic “philosophy” is a theology; The ADIO “philosophy” as a lifestyle is a religious expression. My opinion on both is beyond a reasonable doubt.

The question that Palmer asked is easily answered: It cannot be accomplished. Not only because it is impossible but because man will foolishly continue attempts to prove that God does exist in man. This attempt to control God in future attempts will fail miserably.

But what is the theological question for contemporary chiropractic “philosophy?” The question is: when will chiropractic “philosophy” realize that it has the makings of a theology? Will chiropractic “theologians”, as they are to be described, change their opinion

on the theological notions of an II or UI? More than likely not. UI and II have so been reified and esoteric that no changes in thinking will occur. As noted, it is this very reification that places chiropractic “philosophy” in the status as a theology. Reification is the seemingly impenetrable obstacle. As long as a strong apologetic stance remains, influenced by Palmer’s Apology of Chiropractic (36 p. 65-66), no change is foreseeable. The effort to demonstrate adequately that chiropractic “philosophy” is a theology is difficult to the already convinced believer. The unconditional removal of chiropractic “philosophy” from professional and academic environments is the only real solution. It will save the profession from being embarrassed by spiritual and religious propositions. These propositions have no place in clinical practice.

Chiropractors may argue that a patients spirituality is important in healing. The problem with this is “are chiropractors properly taught to deal with issues that belong to seminarians?” And whose spirituality? The chiropractor’s “philosophical” assumptions or the patients existing belief system?

If the profession wishes to gain

public confidence it must eliminate its quasi-religious “philosophy” as it exists today.

## Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Joseph Donahue DC for his critical review and the contribution of his research. Personal thanks to Jeffrey Gibler for his knowledge in mathematics and physics. The opinions contained in this examination are solely my own.

## References

1. Keating, JC. Beyond the Theosophy of Chiropractic. *J Manipulative and Physiol Ther.* 1989. 12 (2):147-150.
2. Donahue, JH. Dis-ease in our Principles: The Case against Innate Intelligence. *Am J Chiropr Med.* 1988.1 (2):86-88
3. Lawrence, D. Editor: A Call for Papers. *J Chiropr Humanities.* 1998; 8 (1):i
4. Tillich, P. Systematic Theology, Volume One. Chicago Press. Chicago, IL. 1951.
5. Stephenson, RW. Chiropractic Textbook Volume 14. Palmer College of

- Chiropractic. 1927.
6. Strauss, JB. Chiropractic Philosophy. Foundation for the Advancement of Chiropractic, Levittown, PA. 1991.
  7. Donahue, JH. The Trouble with Innate and the Trouble that Causes. *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession*. 1992. 2(1):21-25
  8. Seaman, D. Philosophy and Science versus Dogmatism in the Practice of Chiropractic. *J Chiropr Humanities*. 1998. 8 (1):55-66.
  9. Winterstien, JF. Is Traditional "Chiropractic Philosophy" Valid Today? *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession*. 1991 1(1):37-40
  10. Wardwell, WI. Chiropractic "Philosophy". 1993. 3 (1):3-8
  11. Dunn, M. Is there a chiropractic science? *J Manipulative and Physiol Ther*. 1990. 13 (7):412-416.
  12. Koch, D. Has Vitalism Been a Help or Hindrance to the Science and Art of Chiropractic? *J Chiropr Humanities*. 1996. 6 (1):18-22
  13. Edwards, P. Pap, A. A Modern Introduction to Philosophy. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Free Press. New York. 1973.
  - 14 .Coulter, ID. Uses and Abuses of Philosophy in Chiropractic. *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession*. 1992. 2 (1):3-7
  - 15 Donahue, JH. Palmer's Principle of Tone: our metaphysical basis. *J Chiro Humanities*. 1993. 3 (1):56-61
  16. Strauss, JB. The Pivot Review. Foundation for the Advancement of Chiropractic Education. 1987. 3 (2):1-4
  17. Donahue, JH. DD Palmer and the Metaphysical Movement of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. *Chiropractic History*. 1987. 7 (1):23-27
  18. Barge, FH. Personal Thots: Homo-mythofabricans, *Today's Chiropractic*, 27 (2):100
  19. Hoffman, J. A View From the Field: The Heart of Healing. *Dynamic Chiropractic*. ChiroWeb DC Archives, June 5, 1995.
  20. Strauss, JB. Pivot Review. Foundation for the Advancement of Chiropractic Education.1986: 2(4):1-4
  21. Strauss, JB. Pivot Review. Foundation for the Advancement of Chiropractic Education. 1989: 5(3):1-4
  22. Peet, NR. Tell Our Chiropractic Story. *Chiropractic Pediatrics*. 1994. 1 (1):3-4
  23. Innes, K. What If..? Dynamic Chiropractic. ChiroWeb DC Archives, May 6, 1994.
  24. Barge, FH. After Philosophical Constructs-What Do We Have Left? Dynamic Chiropractic, ChiroWeb DC Archives, Nov. 6, 1992.
  25. vonLoewenich, W. Luther's Theology of the Cross. Augsburg Publishing. Minneapolis, MN. 1976.
  26. Luther, M. Luther's Works. Volume 31. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, MO. 1957.
  27. McGrath, AE. Luther's Theology of the Cross. Blackwell Publishing, Cambridge, MA. 1985.
  28. Rondberg, TA. Chiropractic First. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition. *J Chiropr*. Phoenix, AZ. 1995.
  - 29.. Barge, FH. Life Without Fear. Eldridge, IA. Bawden

- Brothers. 1987.
30. Palmer, BJ. History Repeats. Volume 27. Palmer College of Chiropractic, 1951.
31. Rickaby, J. The Catholic Encyclopedia: Conscience. Encyclopedia Press, Electronic Version. 1996.
32. Dano, B. Conscience. Whitco Website. 1996.
33. Langston, D. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Medieval Theories of Conscience. Electronic Version. 1998.
34. Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia. Infopedia Electronic Version. 1994.
35. Palmer, BJ. Conflicts Clarify. Volume 26. Palmer College of Chiropractic, 1951.
36. Palmer, BJ. The Bigness of the Fellow Within. Volume 22. Palmer College of Chiropractic, 1949.
37. Palmer, BJ. Up From Below the Bottom. Volume 23. Palmer College of Chiropractic, 1950.
38. Palmer, BJ. The Subluxation Specific-The Adjustment Specific. Volume
18. Palmer College of Chiropractic, 1934.
39. The Holy Bible: (King James Version) Luke 17:21
40. Strong, J. Strong's Exhaustive Concordance. World Publishing, Grand Rapids, MI. 1986.
41. Luther, M. Luther's Works. Volume 10. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, MO. 1957. p. 197.
42. Luther, M. Luther's Works. Volume 16. Wiemar Edition. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, MO. 1957.
43. Loeschen, JR. Wrestling With Luther. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1976.
44. Webster's New College Dictionary II. Houghton Mifflin. New York. 1995.
45. Strauss, JB. Pivot Review. Foundation for the Advancement of Chiropractic Education. 1999:15(2):1-4
46. Strauss, JB. Refined By Fire: The Evolution of Straight Chiropractic. Foundation for the Advancement of Chiropractic Education. Levittown, PA. 1994.
- 47.. Luther, M. Luther's Works. Volume 25. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, MO. 1957.
48. Heinecken, MJ. The Meaning of the Cross. Muhlenberg Press. Philadelphia, PA. 1962. p. 9-11
49. Luther, M. Luther's Works. Volume 1. Weimar Edition. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, MO. 1957.
50. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 33: American Edition, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, MO. 1957.
51. Bonner, TN. The Kansas Doctor. University of Kansas Press. Lawrence, KS. 1959. p. 71.
52. Bonhoeffer, D. Ethics. The MacMillan Company. New York. 1949. p. 149.
53. Luther, M. Library of Christian Classics: Volume 15. Westminster Press. Philadelphia, 1969.
54. Tarver, WJ. Military Aviation Physiology. Fighter Tactics Academy Website. J. Lindberg, 1997-1999.
- 55.. Davis, P. About Time. Orion Productions, Simon and

- Schuster. New York. 1995.
56. Nahin, PJ. Time Machines. AIP Press. Berlin, Germany. 1993.
57. Einstein, A. Relativity. Estate of Albert Einstein. Crown Trade Paperbacks. New York, 1961.
58. Nutz, J. Editorial. *J Straight Chiropr.* 1995. 1 (1):2
59. Holy Bible: (King James Version) Exodus 33:18-23
60. Holy Bible: (King James Version) Isaiah 45:15
61. Holy Bible: (King James Version) Genesis 6:5
62. Holy Bible: (King James Version) Matthew 11:25
63. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 17, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1957.
64. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 8, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1957.
65. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 4, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1957.
66. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 2, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1957.
67. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 6, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1957.
68. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 7, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1957.
69. Odyssey Channel. Faith and Reason Special. December 17, 1998.
70. Luther, M. Luther's Works: Volume 38, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1957.