



Timothy Mirtz, DC <sup>1</sup>

1

1. Private Practice of Chiropractic

Submit correspondence and requests for reprints to:

Timothy Mirtz, DC  
Spine and Joint Therapy Center PA  
Hillcrest Medical Center  
935 Iowa  
Suite 2  
Lawrence, KS 66044

Journal of Chiropractic Humanities  
©1999 The National College of  
Chiropractic

# UNIVERSAL INTELLIGENCE: A Theological Entity in Conflict with Lutheran Theology

*“He who speculates about God deals with God no differently than a cobbler judges his leather.” Luther*

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of Universal Intelligence (UI) has received little critical evaluation by chiropractic scholars. Although UI is the Major Premise in the philosophy of chiropractic, it appears that Innate Intelligence receives the most critical interest. Whether chiropractors who believe in the *a priori* existence of a UI exclusively understand its meaning (either spiritual or scientifically) it nonetheless deserves critical study. This paper examines whether the Major Premise of chiropractic is a theological construct. The use of Lutheran theology helps to contextualize where UI should be properly placed as it relates to the philosophical or theological usage of this *a priori* assumption. By presenting an understanding of Luther's theology I argue that Luther's Theology of the Cross refutes the chiropractic philosophical view of

the Major Premise of UI.

## DISCUSSION

### Methods to Study UI

Can a chiropractic "philosophy," with its belief in a universal intelligence, be more accurately called a theology? Can it be compared and contrasted against one line of theological thought (Lutheranism)? Have skeptics, who have charged that chiropractic "philosophy" is a mask for religion, been accurate? Does the notion of a "universal intelligence" contradict Christian understanding, hence creating a non-acceptance of that chiropractic "philosophy?" These questions challenge and confront the profession. A study of the chiropractic Major Premise against one theological thought process (Lutheranism) helps define why Lutheranism questions the validity of the chiropractic concept of a UI.

A logical place to begin the study of UI is from Stephenson's early definition. Since Stephenson's

1927 Chiropractic Textbook (1) is a widely accepted text on chiropractic thought it will be used as the source for investigating UI. When needed, the use of other authors' serious inquiry, along with the original Palmerian writings of DD Palmer and BJ Palmer will be used. (2) Also, to study the tenets of Lutheran theology, the eminent Lutheran scholar von Loewenich's (3) study of Luther's Theology of the Cross will be used to con-

---

**By presenting an understanding of Luther's theology I argue that Luther's Theology of the Cross refutes the chiropractic philosophical view of the Major Premise of UI.**

---

trast the opinions of chiropractic thinkers regarding UI. Luther's Works is a collection of 55 American volumes. With von Loewenich's exhaustive study of the American and German (Weimar) editions, Luther's own interpretation will be cited accordingly. The core of the Lutheran faith is derived from the Book of Concord, which contain statements of faith such as the Small and Large Catechism, The Augsburg Confession, etc., but the main and deep core of Luther's thinking will be used to help understand primary and secondary differences in the study how chiro-

practors view UI. To critically study UI from a multitude of Christian denominational thoughts in one article would be difficult and dilute the thoughts discussed here, though certainly ought to be considered for future writing.

**Theology: A Brief Explanation**

The term *theology* deserves explanation to help clarify how to examine the Major Premise of chiropractic.

Theology, simply defined, is the study (logos) of God (theos). (4) Webster's Dictionary (5) defines theology as "a study of religious faith, practice, and expression; a distinctive body of theological opinion." (5) This definition does not automatically infer that chiropractic "philosophy" fits into this definition.

However, the term can also be defined as "the methodical interpretation of the contents of the Christian faith." (4) Although we in a pro-Christian western society understand the term theology to be devoted solely to Christianity it is applicable and valid for all theological disciplines. (4) What this suggests is that anytime there is a reasoning about God, Supreme Being, or higher power, and a

Universal Intelligence (UI), it still falls under the definition of theology. The very reason this occurs is due to the fact that any non-Christian understanding of a Deity, higher power, or supernatural entity has in effect a theology. The actual definition is not limited exclusively to that of the contents of Christianity.

**Chiropractic's Understanding of God**

Stephenson described Universal Intelligence as "A UI is in all matter and continually gives to it all its properties and actions, thus maintaining it in existence." (1) This is the Major Premise of Stephenson's Thirty-Three Principles. Stephenson's noted that UI was "the Infinite Intelligence that is the Source of everything in the Universe. The Infinite Intelligence pervading all space and matter which creates and governs all things, both material and immaterial."(1)

Stephenson further noted that UI "occupies all space and matter. It has existed always. It is older, wiser, greater stronger, and better than anything in the Universe. It created everything and must have been first and infinitely superior in order to do it. It must have been and is VERY intelligent." (1) With this basic premise, Stephenson formu-

lates the qualities of UI in a simplistic logical fashion: "Having these virtues, it must have never made a mistake and therefore is always right. Being always right is always good. Being infinitely good is GOD." (1)

Does this explanation of the basic premise of chiropractic fall into the realm of a theological perspective? I believe it does.

**3** This simplistic logic that Stephenson uses is theological. He has begun to describe God and any attempt to describe God is necessarily theological. It is not metaphysical, for metaphysics stands, in a sense, as opposing religion. (3) It does so for the simple reason that it concentrates on those things that are apparent and not hidden. Metaphysics stands in opposition to religion (Christianity) for the fundamental reason that Christianity is based on revelation. Here we have a theological construct based not on the Christian understanding of God but because UI represents a "higher power". This higher power is a theological construct because UI is viewed by straight chiropractors as invisible and unverifiable.

Stephenson's description of UI becomes theological first in his capitalization of the word "Source." He obviously gives

the word such emphasis to best display his belief that the source is an all-powerful entity. His second assumption that UI is theological is his primary assumption in the creative force of this entity. When he begins to define this source, he uses the term "govern," implying a ruling quality. And if it rules, it must rule something. Stephenson's third theological assumption is the description of what it rules: the material and immaterial. We can see a theological entity emerging. Stephenson's description specifies a divine nature or a divine source.

Stephenson, in his deeper exploration of UI, leaves no doubt concerning the theological nature of UI, despite his desire to avoid the label. In his textbook under Articles, he provides the formulation of wiser, greater, and better than anything in the universe.(1) When he claims this as well and gives it attributes of being infinitely superior, creating everything and being immensely intelligent, he is speculating about God. Clearly, this is theological.

But what is Stephenson's opinion on whether UI is a theological entity? Stephenson's directs readers of his text that "The student

should not make the mistake of believing that Chiropractic Philosophy is a sort of psychology, telepathy, occultism or classic philosophy of Plato and Socrates. It is not theology." (1) He then goes further: "While it may mention those things in passing it deals with them scarcely at all. Chiropractic Philosophy pertains more to the working principles of Chiropractic." (1) It is here that Stephenson attempts to distance himself, as well as chiropractic philosophy, from any kind of theological formulation, despite his theological description of UI.

These statements by Stephenson create more confusion than explanation. By trying to dodge the theological nature of his definition of UI, he walks a narrow tightrope and falls more into the theological realm than the metaphysical. His imprecision and vacillation sets him up for criticism. This desire to escape from theology by dismissing it is neither productive nor healthy. For Stephenson to suggest that chiropractic is a separate and independent study that can break rules of philosophy, theology, and science, because it is ChiropracTIC, does not shield UI from critical analysis.

Although this concept of a "divine" entity, the Major Premise of Stephenson's

Thirty-Three Principles, is ontological (this is, it examines the study of existence), its explanation becomes theological when Stephenson attempts to elaborate on it. This attempt to describe the "divinity" of UI puts Stephenson in theological hot water. Lawrence points out that any idea of Innate Intelligence as a metaphysical construct as an explanation of its existence is simply wrong. (6) The same is true of UI. Donahue makes this same observation in a different manner when he explains that Innate Intelligence is clearly a religious doctrine. (7) Again, the same is true of UI. UI falls more into the theological realm of speculation than metaphysical. Metaphysics can be a part of some religions but not of Christianity. Natural theology is essentially based on metaphysics, whereas true theology of Christianity is as revealed by God. The revelation that is apparent in Christianity transcends the metaphysical. It becomes deeply embedded in theology when Stephenson uses explanations such as "infinitely good." It also embeds itself deeper when Stephenson discusses the Character of Universal Forces. (1) This Character is consistent with his Eleventh Principle, where he states: "The Forces of UI are manifested as physical laws, are unswerving and

unadapted and have no solicitude for structure of matter." (1)

When Stephenson, in Principle 11, makes the assertion that UI has no concern or anxiety for structures he attempts to bind this theological concept to physical laws. Stephenson uses deductive logic, although incorrectly, to determine the functional expression of this principle. With the concept of anxiety Stephenson uses a purely human quality (anxiety) to bind this principle. The use of a human expression Stephenson then binds to the expression of God in an anthropomorphic understanding.

With Principle 16, he gives UI a "giving" quality, for "UI gives force to both organic and inorganic matter." (1) This graciousness aspect falls into being with the "always good" quality he describes with his Major Premise. Therefore, this quality contradicts itself with Principle 11, leaving Stephenson with a problem. If UI is "infinitely good" and "intelligent" what makes Stephenson think that God has no concern for his creation? What gives Stephenson this concept of a destructive creator? These two principles (11 and 16) do not mesh well with his

major theological premise because the supposed deductions contradict them self from the a priori existence of a universal intelligence. Its contradiction is seen in how a "wise" and "infinitely good" intelligence can have no concern for its creation.

### Present Day Chiropractic Understanding of UI

But can UI safely be considered akin to God despite the obvious error by Stephenson? Today's chiropractic "philosopher" still relies on the notion that God and UI are not synonymous. (8) Chiropractic "philosophy" still attempts to distance itself from God by presenting UI as being a quasi-acceptable entity acceptable by all faiths. For chiropractic "philosophers" to assert the crucial distinction that God is a being, person, or Trinity whereas UI is a principle is simply wrong. This either demonstrates UI as a quality or attribute of God, which makes it theological, or it is a different God that is in opposition to Christian understanding. If a different God, then chiropractic has its own God to follow or it is part of a pantheistic system that informs us that the Christian God is not the one, true God. Chiropractors may argue that God transcends earthly physical laws while UI is bound to

them. Yet this argument highly suggests that UI is a theological construct.

Strauss suggests that UI can be deduced from God. (8) If so, then this supports the idea that UI is a theological construct. It indicates that the concept of the Christian understanding of God is needed to formulate the a priori existence of a universal intelligence.

Rondberg points out that “there are some who equate UI to God. If this makes you comfortable, this theory works as well as any.” (9)

5

This potpourri of opinion amongst chiropractic “philosophers” show us that they themselves are confused. There is essentially no difference between UI and God; both mean essentially the same thing. When chiropractic thinkers attempt to distance themselves from UI being God they demonstrate what Luther referred to when he suggested that philosophy was the clumsy apprentice in the tentmakers workshop. The apprentice is trying to put the pieces together but has no idea of how they fit or even what he is doing.

If UI is eternal, unchangeable (immutable), omnipotent (creator), omniscient (all science and knowledge), omnipresent (ever-present and everywhere), then it must be God. Strauss

even describes UI and its relation to God as: “God is omnipresent, unswerving, without solicitude, immutable, all of which are characteristics of UI.” (8) This again supports the idea that UI is God and that UI is a theological construct. Chiropractors must now decide how they are to understand God (UI). It is important for the profession to decide if chiropractic is to undertake the role of concluding the existence of a “higher power” as a part of its role in the healing arts. Because if chiropractic is to make speculative assumptions of a higher power that is either God or needs God to be established then the philosophy of chiropractic has become a theological discipline.

### UI's Peculiar Quality

Nevertheless, if Stephenson's thoughts are derived from DD Palmer's original premise of UI, is Palmer in theological error? Keating's brilliant study on Palmer's evolution of his hypothesis describes the direction of construction of UI. (10) This study demonstrates the theological formation by Palmer. It also displayed the most peculiar quality that UI has. What Stephenson fails to discuss is Palmer's "metamerization" of UI.

Keating elaborates upon Palmer's metamerization and Donahue's (7) questions about the validity of this peculiar quality.

This may be the only mysterious quality of Palmer's UI thought. Metamerization is "any of a linear series of primitive similar segments into which the body of a higher vertebrate or invertebrate is divisible." Good points out that Palmer's original hypothesis consisted of transcendental monotheism. (11) However, this metamerization notion breaks the rule of monotheism by being pantheistic if the original author tried to put the UI and Innate Intelligence into each metamere. If this were the case, this idea of metamerization is better described as a transcendental pantheism.

Stephenson fails to incorporate metamerization into the working principles of chiropractic philosophy. Most likely this was because it would signify his Major Premise of UI as “divisible”. In Article 49 of Stephenson’s First Step of the Normal Complete Cycle , in which UI is the first step, UI has no boundaries. (1) If this were the case, metamerization, to be divided into its respected metameres, must have a dividing point. Therefore knowing there is a dividing point actually creates a boundary to discern when UI divides.

This peculiar property of UI gives chiropractic “philosophy” significant theological problems.

### Similarities to Theology

If UI is theological how can it be related to any religious or doctrinal thinking? How does it differ from Lutheran thinking? Is there a name to this brand of theology until we determine the proper designation? Good points out that when chiropractic “philosophy” is compared with many currently held beliefs (such as Christianity) the basic elements (Supreme Being) are strikingly familiar. (11) Lawrence describes the chiropractic concept of innate as fully in the realm of speculative metaphysics, then goes on to suggest that this construct is wrong. (6) Donahue describes Innate, and possibly UI, as a metaphysical assumption (2) and clearly a religious doctrine. (7) Clearly, there is some argument or possible confusion where to properly place UI. I believe, from the study of Palmer, Stephenson, Strauss, and Rondberg (see above) that UI belongs in the realm of theological speculation.

Wardwell discusses what DD Palmer’s meant about UI “...that the Universe consists of Intelligence and matter. This Intelligence is known to

the Christian world as God.” (12) Wardwell concludes from this study that if this is religious it is certainly not Christian. (13) However, it could be understood that Palmer used Christian understanding, although incorrectly, to devise his theology. Stephenson and Palmer offered no proof texts (sources of external texts) to support their concepts of UI. Most likely in their haste not to be defined as Christian they did not quote Biblical sources of inspiration. Keating is quick to point out how Palmer felt that a non-denominational character of his spiritual views were not in conflict with any chiropractor’s individual theological preferences. (10) This notion by Palmer was more than likely to keep chiropractors from questioning him about any theological inconsistency.

But Palmer himself gives clues to the theological nature of UI that leaves no doubt about the theological premise of UI. He states: “The New Theology enunciated by me more than ten years ago as the basis for chiropractic, is the identification of God with Life-Force...God the UI. The Life-Force of Creation.” (14)

Palmer’s son, obviously inspired by his father’s origi-

nal concept of UI, took this one step forward into irrational spiritualism by asking “How can we reach God, How can we contact God?” (15)

### Deductive Theology?

Stephenson notes the process by which the Major Premise of chiropractic originates. This process is by deduction from the premise of intelligence, that there is an intelligent creator who created matter, attends to its existence and gives to it all that it has. (1)

It is through deduction that since the Major Premise is known, whether facts support it or not, that the qualities of a divine entity exists. It is through deduction that if the Major Premise is correct then the conclusions must also be correct. The deductive method by Stephenson is not sound. There is no such thing as a purely abstract knowledge apart from observation.(3) Deriving the qualities of a divine source from the observation of nature is not correct theologically. The human use of logic and reason can be obscured along the way to understanding this “higher power”.

According to Stephenson the concept and premise of UI is proven through thousands of observations. (1) This is a patently ridiculous statement .

7

What this suggests is that God is made known to man through observation. It is as if man can see God face to face. Also, it is as if God is on the same level with man, with man dictating to God who God is. This observation by Stephenson shows a pure theological thought of UI, although it does so incorrectly. When Stephenson makes assumptions that God has been “proven” by endless observations, he places God in empirical form. This empirical form alludes to God being tested experimentally, which cannot be done.

This observational status by Stephenson is not philosophical. (3) God is not readily apparent in the sense that Stephenson understands. God can never be readily visible or even apparent to man. God cannot be subjected to pure or abstract empirical methods or be discerned empirically. (16)

If philosophy does understand the invisible it is only through speculation not of contemplation. This can be simplified by this statement: philosophy arises at a knowledge of the invisible only by the process of deduction, while theology sees the invisible. (3) This is expressed by the distinction between “speculation” and “contemplation”. But this speculation is to be considered theological in nature because

of its study or preoccupation with God.

Stephenson, who used his own intuition of a higher power to deduce theological-ly from the concept of God, actually uses faith to begin the statement of the Major Premise of chiropractic.

There can be no logical deduction of God using the human aspect of reason. Nor can there be sense perception of God. Human reason cannot perceive or attempt to understand God. Man’s natural conception of God is confused and unreliable. (17)

Reason uses sense perception, which can be deceptive. Stephenson states that it is logic that leads to the Major Premise and its qualities. (1) However, it must be noted that his rationale is incorrect. Stephenson has actually used faith and belief to derive his premise of intelligence. This “natural” inclination of Stephenson cannot stand on its own merits of logic because this “theological” entity he uses as his Major Premise is based on belief. This belief at the same time uses faith that there is a divine. This is seen when Stephenson describes his deductive rationale: “by assuming a Major Premise that there is a UI which governs all matter..” (1)

Stephenson goes on further in description of his Major

Premise: “it is not necessary to see all the parts to be accurate, for the real premise was not made by man, but by a Higher Power.” (1) This again tells us that UI is God and is a theological construct.

This natural inclination of Stephenson concentrates on God as the Creator of the world and universe. This natural inclination of Stephenson, which is actually a natural theology, sees the visible things from an invisible entity. This natural theology fits the Major Premise of chiropractic well. For it observes this intelligence from the standpoint of creation. Article 309 of Stephenson’s text makes this statement with regards to UI: “In the beginning it created matter.” (1) This tells us that UI is God. This would lend support to the notion that chiropractic “philosophy” is referring to UI as being God, thus lending more credence to support it as a theological construct.

There can be no such thing as a deductive theology, although Stephenson performs it. Deductive theology is just as much a misnomer as is chiropractic “philosophy”. (2,13) For faith and belief are the starting points, not logic and reason. Human logic and reason can be easily fooled since they are human standards. It is here that faith is to be exer-

cised in its contemplation of God. Faith leads to knowledge. (3) Man cannot use deduction of a theological premise and expect to understand God. Stephenson uses the intellect of man to bring God to his level, which is theologically impossible. So the disposition of faith is to be exercised not the philosophical intellect in speculation of the divine.

Luther makes this statement: "For Divine Righteousness has to be incomprehensible if it is to be divine. If it were to be judged by human standards, it would clearly not be divine and would not differ from man. For God to be the one true God, God must be incomprehensible and inaccessible to human reason." (18)

This comment explains why there can be no such thing as a deductive theology, although Stephenson attempts it. I will later discuss what Stephenson's natural theology is called.

But has the deductive process of chiropractic changed since the advent of Stephenson's text? Strauss informs us that deductive reasoning is the basis for the philosophy of chiropractic. (8) The Major Premise is supposed to start from a self-evident truth, an axiom, or an a priori statement.(8) But this is highly confused when the actual start-

ing point occurs for the Major Premise. The Major Premise of UI is still the same in 1994 as it was in 1927. The definition has changed very little. What is confused or contradicted from the notion that the Major Premise is a fact or truth is this comment by Strauss: "It is necessary for us to accept the existence of UI. Without acceptance of the Major Premise you cannot have any principles." (8)

If the a priori assumption is a fact, where are the records, charts, graphs, references, bells and whistles, to prove this? If UI is a fact, how is it demonstratable to make it irrefutable? This is where the entire chiropractic concept of UI crumbles upon itself.

Why would anyone have to go through the process of accepting the Major Premise if it were a fact? This acceptance of the Major Premise, as discussed earlier along with Stephenson deductive rationale, is based on faith. This is accomplished through man's natural ability of intuition. Strauss defines intuition as a form of perception that claims a knowledge of truth from an unknown source. The person can't explain why he knows but that he knows. It is purely subjective and without

verification.(8)

The belief in the existence of God by some is part of man's intuitive knowledge and is a natural inclination. With this knowledge we can assume that the Major Premise is not based on facts that man can understand but rather on faith. What we can verify by natural means cannot be the object of faith. (3) This means that God, who is inaccessible to man, cannot be verified by natural observation or be a verifiable object. The faith in what we see as real cannot be an object of man's faith. Faith alone enables the understanding to comprehend the invisible. (3)

Another aspect of chiropractic's deductive process, as Strauss notes, is that chiropractors try to distance themselves from the idea that UI is God through the thinking that: "God is love, justice, and has personality, none of which UI has."(8) Just because chiropractors did not deduce these qualities does not automatically mean a complete separation of UI and God. Who are chiropractors to say that their deductions are correct? This suggests that faith is the starting point and that UI is God. It also demonstrates that UI is an invisible entity that needs faith to be established. This establishment describes UI as a theology that uses deduction to formulate qualities, attrib-

utes and characteristics of God. Present day chiropractic “philosophers” are still adhering to a deductive theological process.

**Systematic or Speculative Theology?**

It is also noteworthy that since the Major Premise of chiropractic is theological this indicates that the 33 Principles fall in line with what is known as a Systematic Theology. A Systematic Theology can be defined as a branch of theology whose aim is to reduce all revealed truth to a series of statements that together shall constitute an organized whole. (19) Although this theology, as I will argue later in this examination, falls in the speculative realm of theology because it is influenced by speculation or metaphysical philosophy, it creates an almost new system of theological thought. It appears that the 33 Principles fits the systematic theology but also the speculative model as well. It would thus be safe that the best overall theological system to place the Major Premise and the 33 Principles would be as a “speculative systematic theology”.

Chiropractic “philosophers” will argue that true theology is based on revelation and chiropractic is not “revealed” in the sense that Christian theology understands. They are correct

that true theology is revealed and not natural but incorrect when their false theological construct is revealed to them by the “higher power” that Stephenson suggests. The theological qualities of UI are revealed to chiropractic thinkers through their observation of earth and universe.

**The Theology of Luther**

One must study the theology of Dr. Martin Luther (1483-1546) to understand where to properly place the apparent theology of Palmer, Stephenson, Strauss, and Rondberg. A study of Luther will seek the answers to dismiss Palmer and Stephenson as theological speculators.

For Luther, the Theology of the Cross (theologia crucis, the cross of Christ), rejects the notion of speculation as way to knowledge of God. Metaphysics does not lead to a knowledge of true God. (3) Luther felt that all religious and philosophic speculation of God is a Theology of the Glory (theologia gloriae). This Theology of the Glory is condemned by Luther because it does not signify true Christian thought of Christ. This is probably the main difference between Luther and Palmer/ Stephenson. Luther's knowledge of God comes from the

cross of Christ whereas Palmer/Stephenson's was void of that, nullifying any real knowledge of God. This theology of Luther is where God is actually revealed, not by the intuition of the senses and deduction as Stephenson performs.

The Theology of the Glory that is represented in the concept of UI is based upon the "works" of creation. This aspect was made evident in Stephenson's explanation seen earlier. von Loewenwich points out that Luther fundamentally rejects this Theology of the Glory because it speculates about God through creation or the physical things we can see. God's essence cannot be simply derived from the works of creation. (3) The basis for this rejection is because it lacks revelation.

Although Lutheran theology does respect aspects of a Theology of the Glory, it is not the basis of the Lutheran faith. The First Article of the Augsburg Confession lists attributes of God such as eternal, indivisible, infinite power, infinite wisdom, infinite goodness, and Creator and Preserver. (20) These attributes seen in this Confession are familiar to Stephenson's UI, but are different in that Luther derived his attributes from Sola Scriptura (Bible alone). According to Luther, these

attributes cannot by themselves be the foundation of Christian belief. For these attributes of God to be wrongly integrated without the Theology of the Cross can lead to disastrous results. These attributes, which are essentially the same as Stephenson's, cannot be derived with the pre-conceived notion of a divine entity without the Cross of Christ. For these attributes to be wrongly integrated or formulated from nature leads to fundamental theological errors.

These errors are seen in how the expression of this theology is used by chiropractors and in what means they use this expression. If the expression of this theology is used in the chiropractic "way of life" then it becomes a religious experience.

A rebuttal to this notion is the comparison to people who are exercise enthusiasts. Exercise can be a "way of life" for such people. This is true but how many exercise enthusiasts have a neat and tidy set of "philosophical" principles based upon a concept of a "higher power"? And then use those handy principles to describe their personal and/or professional objectives?

I have shown that the Major Premise of chiropractic is theological. The qualities and/or

attributes of this "higher power" are theological, falling under the classification of a Theology of the Glory. This Theology of the Glory is further reinforced when one becomes aware of God's glory by contemplating the external laws of nature and using these laws of nature to identify God. (3) As Stephenson alludes to by suggesting that UI created matter, a Theology of the Glory attempts to reach the knowledge of God by way of creation (works of creation). (3)

Chiropractors, in defending UI, make statements such as: "I see in the world that there is organization and where there is organization there is intelligence." This strongly indicates a Theology of the Glory, for they see God everywhere. (3) Rondberg leaves no doubt that the Major Premise is a Theology of the Glory: "Now, this premise (UI) isn't a matter of blind faith or religious faith on the part of chiropractors. It is based on physical evidence seen in the real world." (9)

A Theology of the Glory, according to Luther, sees God as based by the physical laws of nature. The use of these external laws to describe or "see" or understand God supports this

Theology of the Glory.

### UI: Spiritualistic Idolatry

Luther's concepts rejects UI as predicated by Palmer and Stephenson. Luther states "A knowledge of God that does not understand itself properly is the root of all idolatry. (21) "Men have abused the knowledge of God on the basis of his works." (22) These two statements by Luther point out several things. One, that by using a Theology of the Glory, derived from a natural theology, that the potential for idolatry exists. What this means is that chiropractic's UI, with its connotation with God, creates a spirituality that leads to false interpretation. Secondly, it points out "abuse" that Palmer/Stephenson's UI actually leads to a "spiritualistic idolatry" that only focuses on the "works" of God without a true knowledge of the revealing gifts of God.

In fact, there is no such thing as a natural knowledge of God. (3) This "natural" knowledge is based on the creation aspect of God, the things we can see. The cross, according to Luther, is where God is truly revealed. For God will never disclose himself to direct metaphysical contemplation. (3, 21, p.370) Luther states: "For we understand things metaphysically, that is, according to the way we

understand them, namely, as things that are apparent and not hidden". (21, p. 370) It is to be understood with a Theology of the Cross is where God is revealed. With this revelation comes the doctrine of "concealment". For God has to be hidden/concealed in order to reveal himself.

Although Palmer/Stephenson's UI looks more like a Theology of Glory, Luther warns of "flighty thought," of seeking God anywhere else than the crucified Christ. Speculation that endeavors to plumb the depths of God in reality places itself above God. (21, p. 167)

Palmer and Stephenson used a Theology of Glory to construct their doctrine of UI. For a Theology of Glory prefers works to suffering, glory to the cross, power to weakness, wisdom to foolishness, so philosophy would rather investigate the essences and actions of the creation than listen to their moans and groans and expectations. (21, p. 362) How can philosophy deal with these moans and groans when it has no ear for the mercy/forgiveness of and from God? Hunzinger notes that philosophy discloses the invisible world; theology contemplates it. (23) What Stephenson and Palmer actually conceived from this UI is a contemplation of the invisible, thereby

giving themselves a speculative view.

Stephenson's own explanation within Principle 11 on the Character of Universal Forces states: "the plan of UI that this be so, in order to maintain life; for structures must be destroyed in order that living things continue to live." (1) Luther points out that this thinking is wrong. The death of the people may not be traced back to the preached God. His work is not to kill but to create life. (24) It is relatively safe to say that Stephenson's endeavor to contemplate or speculate about God devised a wrong function for his Major Premise.

Luther makes this observation in the Large Catechism on the understanding of the First Commandment: "The god of the heathen is the creature (creation) of their own dream and fancy, and they trust in that which is absolutely nothing. So it is with all idolatry. For idolatry does not consist merely in the act of erecting an image and praying to it. It consists chiefly in the state of a heart that is intent on something else and seeks help and consolation from creatures and (ideas of their own making)." (25) (parenthesis mine)

## UI: Chiropractic's Naked God

Palmer/Stephenson's UI, without Scriptural proofs for their creation, is actually called by Luther the "naked God". This "naked God of the philosophers" is opposed by Luther since an absence of the Word of God (Bible) when contemplation of God happens is wrong, and that an absence of faith with the Word and gaining God through speculation is incorrect. For with God, the Word, and faith, you will find the "clothed" God. (3) Luther warns that the speculation on the high majesty of God is repudiated as dangerous, even devilish activity. (26)

## The Aspect of Reason in Theology

Reason, law, and logic are human works. For reason plays blind-man's bluff with God. In its blindness reason gropes this way and that, and misses God who it knows exists. (27)

How is reason blind? For the wisdom of the flesh (man) and the wisdom of the spirit (God) stands opposing each other. (28) This opposition is an unreconciled direct relationship. The saving aspect of grace (the undeserved love of and from God) is what connects the key element in this direct relationship. This is seen

in the revelation of God displayed from the cross of Christ. This suffering of Christ is where works such as reason and law are demolished. They are demolished in the sense that man's wisdom can not understand the full impact of this suffering.

The capacity of human reason is distinct in two realms of human existence. It is that man's reason is self-sufficient in relation to the Regnum Rationis (realm, rule of reason) but fails man totally in Regnum Christi (realm, rule of Christ). (17) For reason and law are the two foundational pillars which support the Theology of the Glory. (3) Stephenson uses reason and logic and incorporates physical laws into the formulation of UI. Both are in essence toppled by Luther's Theology of the Cross, in which the hidden God (absconditus Deus), beyond our pitiful understanding, God reveals Himself through Christ's suffering and promise. It is this thinking that explains that Palmer/ Stephenson's UI is actually a theology, a Theology of Glory that speculates on the high majesty of God. Contrary to Palmer's belief that UI was non-denominational and would not contradict a chiropractor's individual faith, this style of speculation is repudiated as dangerous by Lutheran doctrine.

Chiropractic, as stated earlier, uses reason, which can't be used in the understanding of God. But today's chiropractor understands the use of reason to mean that if the principle is true in the perceptible realm, then it is true in the imperceptible. (8)

This idea is totally a theological exercise. For it suggests that if chiropractors view an invisible entity such as UI from the physical aspects that they can observe from nature (works of creation), then the invisible (God) can be seen. This is a theological point of view that reinforces the notions of a Theology of Glory. Reason is the primary human work that is used to devise a Theology of Glory and it is severely flawed.

**Philosophy vs. Theology: Why Luther Disputes Philosophy**

Dr. Martin Luther, a philosophically trained theologian, despised the notion of philosophy as a way to knowledge of God. Luther was opposed to philosophy since philosophy avoided the Bible for revealed truths. Luther stood to combat philosophy, not because of anti-intellectualism, but because of philosophy's intrusion into the field of theology.

Theology is concerned with the affairs of heaven and faith, whereas philosophy deals with affairs of earth and human reason. These two disciplines are to be distinguished on the basis of their subject matter. (17)

Philosophy, according to Luther, had nothing to do with man's salvation. Philosophy, such as Aristotle's, was the great corrupter of Christianity. Luther's point is that philosophy would rather investigate the essences and actions of the creature than listen to its groans and expectations. (21) For things essentially suffer under their own essence. (21) With philosophy, there is a pride in its scholarship. This scholarship stands in contrast to the need for deliverance that exists in the creature world. (21) According to philosophy, God cannot be spoken as both creator and creature, as both God and man. This statement alone tells us of the theological impact of Jesus Christ. For Christ cannot be spoken in terms that philosophy would understand or permit.

Philosophy will also speak of God as "universal existence." (3) But this designation cannot be used to infer to God. Instead of Supreme Being, as philosophy uses, theology speaks of God as the most individual entity (singularissima res) (3) Stephenson uses

this “most singular” thinking in devising the Major Premise of chiropractic.

Luther makes this comment against philosophy which aims straight at the chiropractic misuse of “philosophy”. Luther’s Works Volume 38:249: “Argument 7: Philosophy attributes to God incomprehensible matters. Luther’s response: If it attributes infinite qualities to God, then it is not philosophy. But they (philosophy) have said that the world has its own course and is carried along its own way and that there is an Intelligence which governs the entire mechanism of the world.” (29)

It is astonishing for a medieval theologian to predict that man in his elusive hunt for God will still use terms such as “intelligence which governs” just exactly like the chiropractors of the past and today. This indicates not a prophetic gesture but the human need to seek God using means disguised as philosophy in order to understand God.

Luther uses this reason why philosophy and theology need not be intermingled: “Philosophy deals with visible matters, but theology deals with invisible matters.” (29) This reasoning by Luther is essentially why philosophy and theology are two separate

realms that cannot be intermingled. (3)

### The Aspect of Faith

The aspect of faith in this UI must be formulated. Luther describes faith from his Hebrews 11:1 proof as: “faith has to do with things not seen.” (18) Another view of faith may be “belief without evidence”. Stephenson is silent on this aspect in his book, most likely due to the potential for chiropractic being considered a faith-based logic, or because he could not devise a formulation for such a thought. I believe he was immersed in theological hot water from the beginning and by adding a faith aspect to it would have plunged him in the depths of a theological treatise. But Stephenson gives clues as to why the aspect of faith wasn’t used in his premise formulation. Most likely it was due to the fact that Stephenson’s logic was based on what we have already discussed as his “deductive” rationale. But as we have seen this reasoning put him in serious trouble.

However, one chiropractic “philosopher” gives us insight into the nature of faith within UI. Peet describes faith and the connection with UI as “There is no one that can connect you

to UI. That is your responsibility. You must do it yourself. The power that created you and me is the same “power” that will regenerate you. The more Faith, the closer you connect and you will become more powerful.” (30)

Bachop’s assertion that chiropractors are not true philosophers, but true believers, is correct. (31) We see in the above quote by Peet that to believe one must have faith. There again faith is an aspect that factors into the equation of UI. It is here again that we see when a speculation about the invisible is neither philosophical nor natural, but theological and freely given. (3) This aspect of faith being freely given versus being self-directed goes along with the Lutheran thinking of faith as a gift, out of the control of our own power of reason. Peet’s thought is incorrect theologically; also, that faith is in control of human reason. Luther rejects this “free will” aspect. The rejection of this is that faith is not in the control of human reason. Faith is a gift of God through the power of the Holy Spirit which directs faith to man. Man cannot come to faith or to God without the assistance of the Holy Spirit. How can anyone know God if God did not make himself known or revealed?

Peet goes on to state: “Our

faith in UI has given us authority over the natural."

(30) Bachop shows that this is false. The workings of the laws of nature are independent of human assent and dissent. (31) They operate whether we have knowledge of them or not. Our use of this self concept of our control over nature with the use of UI is theologically incorrect and false.

Faith, in the Lutheran sense, comes directly from heaven and so can in no way be anchored psychologically. (3) This is the theological error of chiropractic's misuse of the faith/UI connection. For this type of faith that chiropractic theology embraces is actually a puny, unformed (and uninformed) faith that remains ineffective in life. (18, P. 181) This unformed faith is essentially classified by Luther as inchoate (imperfectly formed). (32) This description of faith corresponds well with chiropractic's UI. UI is an imperfectly formed theological construct and the faith that goes with it is imperfectly formed. Luther describes this kind of faith with a Theology of Glory because it is directed to signs and wonders. For chiropractors to believe they come to UI Sola fide (by one's own power of faith) is incorrect; faith, according to Luther, has its origin in Christ. (33) This imperfectly formed faith also fits well with spiritualistic

idolatry.

**UI: God in a Box**

The character of universal forces, as defined by Stephenson, are disputed by Luther's concepts, because Stephenson attempts to bind God by physical laws. Luther described what he called the Deus Exlex, the God bound by no law. (34) Luther points out that "He is God, and His Will there is no cause or reason". (34) One of the great attributes of God is his freedom. (3) This holds true for this very aspect about the faith invested in UI; speculation that endeavors to plumb the depths of God into reality places itself above God. (21) This is precisely what the speculative theological premise of chiropractic's UI brings out. It creates those things that are sins to God who is beyond human reason. This sin is spiritualistic idolatry which we discussed earlier. This is the same thing as placing "God in a box". Chiropractic's UI is the same thing as placing God in this box when used by chiropractors by placing limits and boundaries upon God as Stephenson alludes to. It is as if chiropractors can call God when they want by opening the box. This "opening of the box" can be

described as the adjustment of subluxation.

**The Spiritual Subluxation: Open the Box**

It is beyond this examination to discuss the spiritualistic implications of the subluxation and its adjustment. Yet if one would probe deep into its theological pretense as discussed by B.J. Palmer, the adjustment is what connects the physical to the spiritual. Therefore this aspect will not be covered due to its depth although B.J. Palmer's theological position of chiropractic is noteworthy.

**Luther's Personal Character of Polemics: A side note**

This brings us now to the character of Luther and his personal flavor in dealing with those whose polemics were to him "weak". If Palmer/ Stephenson and Luther were to square off in a head-to-head dual of the written word, the most likely suggestion Luther would have made to the chiropractic tandem would be to take a much needed rest in Anticyra. (Anticyra: a name of the three Grecian health resorts in Thessaly, Phocis, and Locris, famous for the hellebore which grew there which was in high repute as a

medicine to clear the brain and cure stupidity). (35) Luther possessed a fiery temperament of conviction that went with his polemics.

**CONCLUSION**

**Key Points**

Here is a summary of the main points of this examination.

1. Taking into consideration the key terms and reviewing a variety of chiropractic philosophers writings and Luther’s thinking, it is apparent UI is a theological entity.

2. Despite chiropractic’s best efforts, UI and God are synonymous.

3. According to Luther, this theology is a Theology of Glory, and its continuing use within chiropractic thinking is detrimental for professional progress as a healing art.

4. For all religious, theological, spiritual, and philosophical speculation of God is a Theology of Glory. (3)

5. This type of theology of UI is a false theological entity. This false entity is restricted to human laws and works. This entity creates spiritualistic idolatry.

6. Faith, a factor in any belief system, is imperfectly formed

as it relates to UI. In articles of faith, the disposition of faith is to be exercised, not the philosophical intellect. (29, p. 239)

7. Faith, not fact, is the starting point of chiropractic’s a priori belief in the existence of UI. This faith is based upon man’s intuition.

8. UI is not only false in its theological presentation, but is an imperfectly formed thought.

9. The correct term to describe chiropractic's UI is the theology of chiropractic.

10. Theology and philosophy are two separate realms which must not be integrated. (3)

Secular philosophy does not deal with the expectation of creation. (3) In its knowledge of the world, philosophy is like the clumsy apprentice in the shop of the tentmaker: he sees the individual pieces, but has no idea of how they should be put together. (21)

This paper started by asking questions. I hope that the reader will gain some insight and possibly some answers to these questions. It is through the process of asking further questions that I conclude this examination.

By using this type of format, I hope new questions that may lead future authors to research theological thought as it applies to chiropractic’s use of “philosophy”.

**The Chiropractor Who is a Christian**

This examination reveals several delicate questions which must be brought forward. Only by confronting them can we truly appreciate their merits.

Are chiropractors who are Christian to renounce their Christian faith in order to follow the absolutes of pure chiropractic doctrine? How do chiropractors who are Christian operate under a philosophy that runs counter to much of traditional Christian belief? Since chiropractic follows along the lines of a theology does this now interfere with chiropractic’s understanding of Innate Intelligence?

These questions cannot be answered here. Further research by those chiropractors who adhere to the strict beliefs of Palmer and Stephenson’s doctrine, as well as the neopurist (objective straight) model, need to confront these difficult theological questions.

**Positive or Negative?**

Good makes the comment "it is obvious that having a belief

system empowers and enthuses people. It transforms individuals and motivates them and this ultimately helps the practice of chiropractic." (11)

Nevertheless, is this type of enthusiasm destructive? If an enthusiasm for a false belief system is seen, would it be incorrect to be using it?

Good also makes the assertion: "this not only attests to the genius of the discoverer of chiropractic, but also to the utility of traditional chiropractic philosophy". (10)

Good's account on the genius of Palmer is incorrect. I believe that it does not take a genius to mistranslate the divinity of God. My own study shows that this is possible. Also, it does not take genius to mistranslate this divinity for one's own selfish goals and purpose. To use a false theology courts disaster. Taking into consideration that Millenianism is a rapidly developing fascination, one must take into account the dangerous aspects of a mistranslation of this divinity. The proliferation of cults shows how theology may go astray.

Although this situation has not been seen in the chiropractic profession, it still has the potential for misuse. This misuse occurs in the individual notions of chiropractors. With

these potential individual notions it would seriously harm the profession's advancement as a respected member of the healing arts. Should the chiropractic profession distance itself from theological speculation as part of its ideology?

### Acknowledgments

I wish to extend personal thanks to Joseph Donahue D.C., Joseph Keating, Ph.D., Ruth Mirtz-Miller, Ph.D., and Benjamin Mirtz, M. Div., for their assistance in the review process of this manuscript. The content of opinion contained in this paper is solely my own.

### REFERENCES

1. Stephenson PW. Chiropractic textbook. Davenport, IA: Palmer School of Chiropractic, 1926
2. Donahue JH. Palmer's principle of tone: our metaphysical basis. *J Chiropr Humanities* 1993;3:56-61
3. von Loewenich W. Luther's Theology of the Cross. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976
4. Tillich P. Systematic theology, volume. 1. Chicago, IL: Chicago Press, 1951.

5. Webster's New College Dictionary II. New York, NY: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1995

6. Lawrence D. Can chiropractic be a philosophical discipline? *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession* 1991;1:25-27

7. Donahue JH. The trouble with innate and the trouble that causes. *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession* 1992;2:21-25

8. Strauss JB. Chiropractic philosophy, 3rd edition. Levitown, PA: Foundation for the Advancement of Chiropractic, 1994

9. Rondberg TA. Chiropractic first. *Chiropr J*; Phoenix, AZ. 1996

10. Keating JC. The evolution of Palmer's metaphors and hypothesis. *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession* 1992;2:9-20

11. Good CJ. Traditional chiropractic philosophy: irrelevant or irreplaceable? *J Chiropr Humanities* 1996;6:50-54

12. Palmer DD. The chiropractic adjustor. Portland, Or: Portland Printing House, 1909.

13. Wardwell WI. Chiropractic “philosophy”. *J Chiropractic Humanities* 1993;3:3-8
14. Palmer DD. Textbook of the art, science, and philosophy of chiropractic. Portland, Or; Portland Printing House, 1910
15. Palmer BJ. The bigness of the fellow within. Davenport, IA: Palmer School of Chiropractic, 1949
16. Luther M. Wiemar edition of Luther’s Works, Volume 3. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing, 1957, p. 124, 33
17. McGrath AE. Luther’s Theology of the Cross. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1985
- 18.. Luther M. Luther’s Works, Volume 33. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 290
19. The DICT Development Group: Online Dictionary Query: 1998
20. Little CH. Lutheran confessional theology. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing, 1943
21. Luther M. Luther’s Works, American edition, Volume 25. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 154
22. Luther M. Wiemar Edition of Luther’s Works, Volume 5. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 418.,34ff
23. Hunzinger AW. Lutherstudien, no. 1. Luther’s Neuplatonismus in der Psalmenvorlesung von. 1513-1516. Liepzig, 1906
24. Luther M. Wiemar Edition of Luther’s Works, Volume 18. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 625
25. Luther M. Luther’s Large Catechism, Book of Concord. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1955
26. Luther M. Luther’s Works, Volume 16. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 54
27. Luther M. Wiemar Edition of Luther’s Works, Volume 19. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 207, 3
28. Luther M, Wiemar Edition of Luther’s Works, Volume 5. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, Vol. V, p. 545, 10ff
29. Luther M. Luther’s Works, Volume 38. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 249
30. Peet KP, Peet NR. Tell our chiropractic story. *Chiopr Pediatrics* 1994;1:1-2
31. Bachop W. The warfare of science with philosophy in contemporary chiropractic, *Philosophical Constructs for the Chiropractic Profession* 1991;1:33-36
32. Luther M. Luther’s Works, Volume 10. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 435
33. Luther M. Luther’s Works, Volume 4. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 321
34. Luther M. Luther’s Works, Volume 44. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1957, p. 38
35. Winter EF. Erasmus-Luther: Discourse on free will. New York, MY: Ungar Publishing, 1961