

To the Editor:

I am writing in response to the Letter to the Editor from Jason W. Busse which appears in the June '98 issue of the JCCA, Vol. 42, No. 2, on page 117.

Mr. Busse, a student at the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College, refers to an intern being "brought before the disciplinary board for distributing anti-vaccine literature to patients in the H.K. Lee Walk-in Clinic." Mr. Busse is mistaken, there has been no discipline hearing on this topic or any topic related to immunization.

I would appreciate if you could publish this letter to clarify any misunderstanding which may have been created.

Jean A. Moss, DC, MBA
President, CMCC

Innate intelligence: its origins and problems. JCCA 1998; 42(1):35-41.

To the Editor:

I read with interest, dismay, lament and skepticism the article "Innate Intelligence: its origins and problems" by Lon Morgan DC, DABCO; in JCCA 42(1):35-41 (1998).

Innate Intelligence is the chiropractic equivalent of qi (pronounced "chee") energy which is the main doctrine of Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM). TCM has been around for approximately 5,000 years, and is still not recognised by Western Medicine.

According to TCM, too much, too little or a blockage in the flow of qi can result in pathology. The chiropractic model of pathogenesis is too much or too little nerve energy.

D.D. Palmer was a magnetic healer and he used qi to heal his patients before he discovered chiropractic. His inductive idea of innate intelligence could have its origin from his magnetic thinking.

In order to gain acceptance by the scientific and medical communities, we must abandon the simplistic concept of innate intelligence. Innate intelligence is intangible, cannot be quantified or characterised. It is imaginary and is too profound a concept. It exists only in the heads of chiropractors. We can replace it with "the healing powers of the body".

At this period in the history of our profession, and as CMCC has now become part of York University, we must eliminate this non scientific principle of innate intelligence.

TCM is 5,000 years old, and only in the last five years, it has gained some guarded recognition. Chiropractic is only 103 years old, it will take another 4,897 years before it becomes accepted as mainstream medicine, if we continue to preach innate intelligence. It will be wise for us to stop propagating the concept of innate intelligence to the students in all chiropractic colleges throughout the world if we want chiropractic to have a good scientific basis, and be integrated into mainstream medicine in our lifetime.

John WC Loh, DC
Port Coquitlam, British Columbia

To the Editor:

I feel as if I've been kicked in the stomach. Never have I seen an article in the JCCA that has contained so many personal opinions and irrelevant material. I can only believe that the editors purposely printed it to incite a response from a normally placid membership.

In Dr. Morgan's article he calls me a folk practitioner, a fool and I'm absurd. According to him my practice is that of the occult, is mystical and religious. He implies that I am someone who is "*in the know*" which, I can only guess, means that I am the main reason that chiropractic has not progressed to *his* liking in the last 100 years. Somewhere along the line I was lobotomized and didn't know it. Maybe next time Dr. Morgan should keep his comments to relevant material and stay away from personal attacks on his colleagues.

I have read the article a number of times and have come to the conclusion that Dr. Morgan seems to have missed the boat about what Innate Intelligence is and how it relates to healing. He seems to believe that Innate Intelli-

gence is exclusive to chiropractors and that D.D. Palmer invented it. He is very misinformed.

Forces of nature

Dr. Morgan would have us believe that all things in life can be explained by the four forces recognized by science. Do these forces explain the clotting of blood or the creation of a thought? Do they explain the healing of a cancer patient or the knitting of a broken bone? How about two cells joining together and becoming a human being? Perhaps Dr. Morgan's definition of a "force" needs to be evaluated for a living being. Perhaps we shouldn't be talking about forces at all! Obviously there are many events that happen in life that cannot be explained through science, let alone these four forces.

Spiritualism, vitalism

Palmer's belief systems were certainly influenced by such things as spiritualism and vitalism but so too were many others. Health science of the day was anything but science by today's standards but it was the best they could do at the time, based on their limited knowledge. All health professions have grown significantly since that time, including chiropractic. However, it will be interesting to hear what they will be saying about us after another 100 years. Could it be that the medical procedures of today will be thought of as antiquated and barbarian? Perhaps by then we will all be working *with* the body's ability to heal itself rather than depending on intervention techniques that only go against the very essence of what the body is trying to do.

Theology

Dr. Morgan equates Innate Intelligence with a theology by giving us a history lesson of early religion and healing. While some would say, myself included, that Innate Intelligence is in fact "God within us", I'm sure that it could also be interpreted in secular terms. I find it interesting that, throughout the article, Dr. Morgan capitalizes Innate Intelligence. This literary technique is often reserved for references to God or some other Deity. Perhaps deep inside Dr. Morgan does have some belief in Innate Intelligence. Your religious beliefs are your own, but there must be some Power running this body of ours.

Confusing issues

While Dr. Morgan tries to make a case for science as the

only approach to chiropractic, he filled his article with many personal insights that have no scientific basis. He also confuses the issues by making comparisons that really have no connections. He presumes that because humans apparently have higher intelligence they must have more Innate Intelligence. How can he do that?

Conclusion

I agree with Dr. Morgan's objections to the claim that "Innate Intelligence is the fundamental identifying principle of chiropractic". In fact, Innate Intelligence, or whatever *he* would like to call it, is the fundamental identifying principle of life. Without some kind of life "force" there would be no life.

Larry McCarthy, DC
Etobicoke, Ontario

To the Editor:

I feel I must respond to Lon Morgan's article in the March 1998 issue of the JCCA, titled "Innate intelligence: its origins and problems." After giving us an interesting historical review of some of the developing thoughts and technologies of the day he proceeded to cut down any chiropractor and person who has any belief in Innate intelligence. In the first line of his article he mentions that "historians have come to appreciate that most great men are a product of the events and circumstances of their times." If this is true he must be a product of J. Donahue as most of his article was based upon highly opinionated articles that were written by Donahue over the last 10 or so years. I wish Dr. Morgan could have an original thought to add to our understanding of what it was he was trying to say in his article. His article was full of glaring inconsistencies and lapses of logic and I hope to point some of these out. I only hope you have the editorial space to print this letter so that his opinions about something very near and dear to the hearts of many chiropractors isn't seen as the only side of this very important subject.

When he is speaking of vitalism in the early part of the article he mentions that after the centuries following Aristotle there was the emergence of the shaman who intervened in life processes using supernatural methods. He isn't even historically correct on this one as shamans in the

aboriginal cultures of our country and many others were around long before Aristotle walked the earth in the era of 300 B.C. He speaks of the shaman using supernatural forces. Supernatural is defined in Webster's dictionary as "unexplainable by natural law". I guess it depends on which paradigm your working from as to whether you consider what the shamans do as unexplainable by natural law. They certainly understand it quite well and have been passing down the knowledge of how to repeat the things they do for many thousands of years. Since science is defined in Webster's dictionary as "a branch of knowledge or study dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged and showing the operation of general laws", I would say that what these people do could be called a branch of science. Probably not the type of science that Dr. Morgan is used to but never the less science. The knowledge they have acquired about the process of healing in the human body and in nature in general is quite impressive. I have had the privilege of working with several of these people over the years and they are quite learned people and hand picked to do the work of the shaman. The body of facts they take their knowledge from is their observations of nature and the cycle of life that they see around them. Their ability to use a "sixth sense" or form of intuition to do everything from find food and water, when none seems present to the senses, to predict natural disasters and communicate across huge distances is well documented in both their culture and ours. Perhaps this isn't something Dr. Morgan can measure yet but that does not mean that it does not exist. It is easily observed and empirically validated through observation. In my belief system this shows the operation of a general law of organization that exists as much in the macrocosm, as seen in the orbital patterns of the planets in the solar system, to the microcosm and the beauty of the organization of the atom.

Later in his article Dr. Morgan makes the bold statement that "the scientific community does not admit to the existence of this fifth force (chi, ki, innate intelligence etc.) by whatever name." I wonder which aspects of the scientific community he was referring to. Certainly not the 50,000 or so members of the Institute for Noetic Sciences who research and spend millions of dollars per year researching this vital force of life that animates and perpetuates the physical world. Certainly he wasn't speaking of Dr. Deepak Chopra or Dr. Andrew Weil who have written

several books on or around this topic. Certainly he wasn't speaking to those aspects of his own profession who are interested in studying something more than low back pain and who represent creative thinkers who are willing to think outside of the common regurgitated understandings of the day. He certainly wasn't including Dr. Albert Einstein who defined matter as empty space with patterns of energy running through it driven by a divine intelligence. No I am quite sure that Dr. Morgan only thought about it from his own limited view of science and the mechanistic thinkers who happen to agree with him.

Dr. Morgan makes several other bold yet erroneous statements in his section Innate intelligence: a problem in healing. He mentions that severed limbs can be reattached and that by bastardizing Palmer's philosophy he felt that this shouldn't be able to happen. All living tissue needs nerve supply to sustain and coordinate the biological processes that happen within it. What does he think will happen to these same limbs if they are not attached back on to someone. They will die of course. Just because the tissue isn't rotting in 10 minutes doesn't mean that it isn't dead. Certainly if you define life as the ability of the cell to maintain itself in active organization in the organism so that they can respond in an appropriate manner to the stresses and challenges of life I feel we would be hard pressed to say that these severed limbs are alive for very long after they are severed.

Dr. Morgan obviously hasn't been keeping up with his journal reading either as it is well established now that there is both direct and indirect communication to the white blood cells of the body through the nerve system. Dr. Candace Pert found neuropeptide receptors on monocytes in the blood stream back in the 80's. Which blood cells was he referring to? The red blood cells that are produced in the bone marrow and are in contact with the nerve system either directly or through the neuro-endocrine system? I think he should go back and do some more homework.

He also quotes from Nansel and Slazak who say that there isn't any scientific or clinical evidence to suggest that autonomic dysfunction from spinal dysfunction of any form causes any end stage organ pathology. I have not read this article but I wonder if the work of Dr. Akio Sato of Japan is quoted or the work of Dr. Irvin Korr who would dispute this fact with their research. From a clinical standpoint perhaps he should entertain some of the work they

are doing at the University of Western Ontario where they are studying the alarming increase in blood pressure that goes along with spinal cord injuries. Where increases of over 300 mm. Hg. are routinely seen. Where the cause seems to be these “bald little neuron(s)” (sic) that don’t function properly as a result of the spinal cord or nerve root damage. Perhaps Dr. Morgan would like to come and spend a few days in my clinic where we see patients with all sorts of visceral conditions that have responded to chiropractic care. Where we see how our scientifically applied correction of the subluxations allows the body to heal dysfunctional bronchial passages where asthma has been present for years. Where we have seen G.I. dysfunction of 20 years change in a matter of months so that meds are no longer needed. Where we see heart arrhythmias settle down and blood pressure drop over 30 points systolic and stay that way on 6 month follow up. Where we see little children with epileptic seizures stop having them. Where we see a little boy who was told he would be blind by the time he was 8 years old absolutely amaze the doctors at the University of Ottawa with his retinal regeneration. He should talk to this little boy’s mother who is ecstatic because these same doctors told her that her little boy probably wouldn’t even need glasses in 6 months.

Dr. Morgan makes the same erroneous conclusion that many junior vitalists make when he assumes that the innate intelligence is somehow in the nerves themselves. When in fact if he read all of the writings of the Palmers and Stephenson he would find that they ultimately believed that this organizational intelligence uses the nerve system to communicate and coordinate the function of the organism as a whole. The intelligence is within the very workings of the individual cells themselves. I personally have never seen, smelled, tasted, touched or heard this organizational intelligence but I have seen its effects. I see it’s effects every day as it allows my body to be a self-healing, self regulating and self maintaining mechanism, almost irregardless of the environmental challenges that I throw at it.

He later mentions that the concept of Innate intelligence “lacks any ability to predict what health events will, or will not occur, to what extent, in which patients, and under what realistic time frame.” I disagree. Knowing that health and healing are natural and intrinsic processes in the body and are under the control of Innate intelligence, allows to predict that any disease state created by the body has the

potential to heal itself. To what extent they will heal and how fast is definitely something that is an individual thing and is based upon many parameters. However some common sense and good clinical decision making with the patients informed help will allow you to decide when and if the patient may need assistance in conjunction with continued chiropractic care. What other concept or benchmark in health care can be any more or even as predictable as that?

I think the true essence of Dr. Morgan’s article comes out in the end where he makes the bold statement that “the concept of Innate discourages thoughtful analysis, serious scholarship and research.” Nothing could be further from the truth. I know many subluxation based chiropractors who study on a regular basis, use the latest scientific protocols (such as sEMG and DTG scans) to document the need for chiropractic care, and who are deeply involved in research that goes beyond low back pain. His blatant arrogance in thinking that he has all of the answers for the chiropractic profession and the world in general through his model of reality makes me think he needs to get more often. It is this narrow minded look at the nature of reality that is holding back our great profession. The entire world is searching for answers to the questions they are asking about their health care and their lives and they are not getting them in the mechanistic reductionistic sciences. They know there is more to life than the physical plane and they are looking for someone to guide them on their journey of self exploration and deeper understanding. That is why the Eisenberg studies showed what they showed with more people visiting so called “alternative” health care providers than regular allopathic doctors to the tune of 138 million more visits in 1994 alone.

He speaks of the need for professional development and societal acceptance and how he feels that the concept of innate intelligence is holding us back in these two areas. I’m not sure what aspects of society he is referring to here but since the chiropractic profession was the largest group seen in the alternative providers column of the Eisenberg studies I would say that a large segment of society already has accepted us! If he is referring to acceptance by the allopathic medical paradigm I hope we never get it. I would like to stay distinct and distant from a model of health care that dispenses pharmaceuticals like they were lollipops such that recent research at the University of Toronto showed that the prescription of pharmaceuticals is

the sixth leading cause of death in North America.

Finally as Dr. Morgan closes his article he throws out the famous mechanistic line that “it is clearly religious in nature and must be considered harmful to normal scientific activity.” Well again I thought I would share a little of Webster’s dictionary with Dr. Morgan. Religion is defined as “a specific fundamental set of beliefs and practises, generally agreed upon by a number of persons or sects.” I would say that Dr. Morgan’s beliefs and practises (assuming that he has anyone agree with him) would therefore qualify as a religion. Shame on you Dr. Morgan for criticizing something that you are as well.

As a close to his article he speaks of the great things that would happen for our profession if we would just drop the innate intelligence stuff. He claims that among other things it would enhance credibility with government entities and third party payors and expand our patient base. I completely disagree. Without our philosophy of vitalism and the intrinsic abilities of the body to heal itself we are just an overpriced physiotherapy department that would fast become redundant. With more and more M.D.’s, physiotherapists, massage therapists and yes the lay public as well, learning to manipulate, our profession would be lost in the maze of health care providers and become defunct in 25 years. How do I know this? There are chiropractors going bankrupt all over North America. It has been my experience that these usually aren’t the philosophically sound vitalistic chiropractors but usually the ones who try to duplicate the services of the physiotherapists. When are we going to learn that it is our philosophy and understanding of the vitalistic nature of life that sets us apart and allows us to provide a critical and necessary service to our communities? Apparently for people like Dr. Morgan it won’t be in this lifetime!!

Tom Preston, DC
North Bay, Ontario

Note to reader: The letters from Dr. Loh, Dr. McCarthy and Dr. Preston were received after the June issue went to press.

To the Editor:

I find several problems within the article by Lon Morgan, DC, DABCO published in the Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association in March of 1998. Not only is Dr. Morgan ignoring the philosophy on which Chiropractic is based, but he is also ignoring the science that supports the Chiropractic Philosophy.

Dr. Morgan should consider what Chiropractic would be without Innate Intelligence guiding our Philosophy and Science. Chiropractic would be limited to neuromusculoskeletal diagnosis and pain management. How could this be beneficial to the Art, Science, and Philosophy that is Chiropractic? And talk about limiting and isolating the practice of Chiropractic? This would be the way to do it! We could all become third rate medical doctors specializing in headaches and back pain. Chiropractic should be isolated, but only from the treatment of conditions and disease. We all know that Chiropractic is not a treatment of anything, but is necessary to restore Nervous System function and restore health.

If we concentrate on correcting subluxations and educating people to the detrimental effects of subluxation, instead of treating people for musculoskeletal symptoms and playing around with modalities, then maybe we could see more than 10% of the general population.

Palmer did not believe that he could influence innate. He believed that there was interference that could take place with innate and that that interference could be removed. If innate impedes Chiropractic as a “legitimate health science,” then how can medicine be a “legitimate health science” if only 15% of medical methods are scientifically sound.

Innate intelligence is derived from occult practices of another era. Another era being since the dawn of time. Apparently every society has believed in Innate Intelligence, no matter what they called it. Lon Morgan, DC, DABCO appears to be the odd man out.

Dr. Morgan also apparently thinks that Life Force is not necessary for life and health. So what then separates a living organism from a brick? Obviously nothing, according to Dr. Morgan. To him Life Force doesn’t exist because it cannot be “empirically refuted.”

For attempting to understand Life Force, Dr. Wilhelm Reich was “eventually convicted for his activities and sent to jail where he died.” Is that the fate that Dr. Morgan

wishes D.D. Palmer and B.J. Palmer would have had. Is Dr. Morgan saying that Chiropractors who teach their patients what innate is and understand that the body is a self-healing organism should go to jail and die there? I wonder if he would be willing to go to jail to stand up for the profession called Chiropractic like so many early Chiropractors did?

It sounds as though Dr. Morgan is attacking Palmer for having personal involvement with spiritualism and vitalism and also using them to develop the philosophy of Chiropractic. There are very few people in the world who have ever had a truly original idea. There is nothing wrong with learning about other ways of viewing the world and using them to develop a philosophy that is different.

“According to Palmer, Innate runs the body’s physiological functions with a perfect knowledge of how to do so.” Is Dr. Morgan disputing that the body can run itself, or is he saying that our bodies need some kind of guidance to get our normal physiological processes working, like maybe a scientific study that shows how the body works. Apparently, the body cannot possibly work correctly unless first we can scientifically describe all of its functions.

“Innate thus serves as a guide to keep us from suffering the perceived fate of the Osteopaths,” Dr. Morgan states. You know that Osteopaths had problems in the beginning of their profession, until of course medicine (medical doctors) decided that they could control what the osteopaths were doing. Try to find an osteopath who manipulates first then treats with drugs and surgery if manipulation fails. I would venture to say that there aren’t many. If we continue down the road that Lon Morgan wants to pave, we are destined to become third rate medical doctors specializing in back pain and headaches. This is the price of acceptance by the medical community.

It is true that the concept of Innate Intelligence separates us from medicine, but we are a very separate and distinct profession that no one else can duplicate. Our philosophy is that 1. the body is a self-healing organism, 2. that the Master control of the body is the Nervous System, 3. that interference of Innate through the interference of the Nervous System results in Dis-ease. and 4. that Chiropractic eliminates that interference.

The philosophy of medicine is that your body is the best it can be at any given time. If something goes wrong, get rid of the result with drugs or surgery, and do not address the cause. I would definitely say that Chiropractic is a very

distinct, unique, and conservative approach to health and all aspects of life, whereas medicine is a radical approach to disease and death.

Those Chiropractors who get the “Big Idea” are the ones who understand health the most, those who don’t operate under the medical paradigm and do not limit their scope of practice to musculoskeletal diagnosis and pain management. Isn’t operating under this paradigm limiting patient base more than saying anyone with a vertebral subluxation should be under Chiropractic care?

Dr. Morgan seems to think that if Innate exists we should be able to capture it, bottle it up and be able to give it to people. I don’t know of any Chiropractor who says Innate Intelligence is capturable or adjustable or useable. I do know Chiropractors who do say Innate Intelligence is everywhere and that interference to the matter over which Innate Intelligence expresses itself can be removed through a specific Chiropractic Adjustment. No one claims to be able to “bottle” Innate Intelligence or “use” it for anything. Just like no one claims to be able to capture life and be able to return it to the dead and bring them back to life.

“Palmer held that death was the absence of Innate Intelligence. We might ask ‘What happens then to living matter when removed from the presence of Innate Intelligence?’” Dr. Morgan says that “every day blood is donated, bone marrow and organs are transplanted, and severed limbs reattached. Under Palmer’s philosophy, these tissues should be ‘dead’ after being separated from their source of Innate and no longer useable.” Doesn’t donated blood have to be treated chemically to keep it from clotting? Don’t white blood cells communicate with the Nervous System through neurotransmitters?

All organs eventually die after removal from the body, but when they are transplanted, another person’s body can then control that organ or tissue. That person’s Innate Intelligence is working with the Law of Limitations of Matter. The body will do its best with what it has to work with. Sure a liver will not go on working if it has no nerve supply or blood supply, etc. But when transplanted, the body’s intelligence takes over that organ to work in the best interest of that person.

As far as “innateless” tissue repairing itself, I would venture to say that those tissues do have a nerve supply because peripheral nerves can grow and reattach to tissues that have been cut off from their nerve supply. Even if this

weren't true it still supports the idea of Innate Intelligence being everywhere in the body and not just flowing through the Nervous System.

Nansel and Slazak claim that "there just isn't any scientific evidence at all to support the view that autonomic nerves have the capability, much less the propensity, for inducing frank tissue pathology in any of their innervated organs" and "nor for that matter is there the slightest bit of clinical evidence of which we are aware that patients with broken necks or broken backs, or patients with entire hips or shoulders blown apart by shotgun blasts, or even patients with mechanical neck or low back dysfunction subsequently go on to develop higher incidence of any segmentally or regionally related internal organ disease." Apparently Nansel and Slazak have never heard of Dr. Henry Windsor, M.D. and have never read the Windsor studies, obviously they haven't done their homework.

What is "highest level of potential Innate Intelligence" supposed to mean? If a creature is living, then Innate Intelligence always operates at 100%. When there is interference, Innate Intelligence is operating at 100%, only now the Law of Limitations of Matter applies and distorts the flow of Innate Intelligence. As far as regeneration of limbs, that is like saying, "hey, why can't a salamander speak English?" They just don't have the physical and/or mental capacity to do so. We do not have the genetic capability to regenerate limbs.

According to Dr. Morgan, we need science to quantify and qualify everything. If this is so, then all religious beliefs should be abandoned because we have no scientific explanations. Besides, most of medicine works on the premise that "it works, it doesn't matter how because we have no scientific explanation for it."

If Innate Intelligence fails to provide "logical consistency or conceptual coherence" then you should also dispute the existence of Life. Science cannot create Life. Science cannot quantify nor qualify Life. That is all there is to it. If you must dispute Innate Intelligence, you must also dispute Life on all levels and the existence of God. There is not one scientist in the world that can create a life form with the mere matter it takes to express the intelligence that is life. There is something missing and we refer to it as force. Force unites Intelligence and Matter.

I think what Innate has added to our knowledge base is that we know very little about what goes on in the bodies of living organisms but yet they go on living without the

interference of the educated mind or scientific proof.

Life is unknown. We cannot create Life in a test tube, so how can we explain Life in terms of the known. Life is unexplainable so why try to explain it. We have no way of testing scientifically the concept of Life.

No, the benefits of Chiropractic need not be explained by Innate, I understand that scientific research can explain what an adjustment allows the body to accomplish, but how can Life and healing occur without an Intelligence beyond our educated minds, an Intelligence that can control every process in the body.

I feel that people who wish to abandon the concept of Innate should be able to. But isn't that denying everything Chiropractic was founded on? If we give up our Philosophy, then our Principles are not far behind. I would rather practice with the Chiropractic Philosophy in mind than be a third rate medical doctor specializing in back pain and headaches.

The only things that limit the Chiropractic profession to treating 10% of the general population is the failure of Doctors of Chiropractic to educate patients to the fatal effects of subluxations, and limiting their scope of practice to musculoskeletal diagnosis and pain management. If we can educate the world about subluxations and True, Principled Chiropractic, then there are no limits for this profession.

Troy J. Jordan
Chiropractic student CCC-KC
On Purpose Organization member

To the Editor:

It is with some apprehension that I respond to some recent correspondence in the Journal, specifically to Dr. Morgan.

First I would like to point out to Dr. Morgan, that in this country scientists such as Dr. Candice Pert are quite deserving of the title "Dr." not Ms. I find it somewhat disturbing that this is the second female scientist to whom Dr. Morgan has referred to erroneously as "Ms." The other case in point was Dr. Vera Schiebner. I really don't believe that these are oversights on the part of Dr. Morgan, just a sign of disdain for scientists who may hold beliefs, which may counter, to his own.

Secondly, I would like to point out a very large over-

sight regarding Dr. Morgan's rebuttal to my letter. Dr. Candice Pert has in fact been the lead author on several papers published in very prestigious scientific journals. I would encourage Morgan to check the "*Journal of Immunology*", 1985; *Science*, March 1973; *Proceeding of the National Academy of Science*, 1984; *Science*, 1984, to name a very few. Much of what she published she was named a second author merely because of the fact that she was a graduate student. It hardly matters whether or not she was first or second author anyway. Who cares! ***It should also be noted that she was unfairly passed over for inclusion for the Nobel Prize in 1978 for research on which she was in fact the lead author!***

I suggest that you get your facts straight Dr. Morgan. By the way, how many scientific journals have given you the time of day other than this journal? I did an extensive search on Medline. It appears that you must have been the second author an awful lot.

It is views like those of Dr. Morgan, Nicholson, Lutzer, Erwin, Mr. Boudreau and Mr. Busse that ensure that this profession will never be united. I strongly suggest that these people and others like them in the profession voluntarily give up their licenses and call themselves something else. The Chiropractic profession was founded on very specific principles. These principles are here to stay whether you like it or not. Call me an "innatist", a "subluxationist" a "fundamentalist" Bring on the CHIROPRACTIC INQUISITION!

I sleep well at night knowing that there is a Universal Intelligence that organizes the universe and that that Universal Intelligence is expressed in me as Innate Intelligence. Fortunately, that same Innate Intelligence is in you Dr. Morgan and all your hangers-on. Scary to think that you and I are all *one* isn't it!

Michelle E. Whitney, DC
Chair of the Chiropractic Awareness Council
Guelph, Ontario

To the Editor:

When I first read Dr. Morgan's article, "Innate Intelligence: Its Origins and Problems", I was impressed by the quality of the arguments, his references, and his courage in stating what has had to be said now for many years.

On reviewing the letters to the editor in the next volume and noting the disparaging comments made by some of my colleagues concerning the article, I decided that I should revisit the original treatise with a more critical eye.

On second reading, I am impressed with the quality of his arguments, his references, and his courage in stating what has had to be said now for many years.

V. Gary Dyck, BSc, DC
Barrie, Ontario

To the Editor:

I was very pleased that your journal took the time, the effort and had the courage to publish Lon Morgan's article, "Innate Intelligence: Its Origins and Problems," (JCCA 1998; 42(1):35-41). I would like to humbly comment on Dr. Morgan's expressed opinions and add a few of my own.

Firstly, I'm in complete agreement with Dr. Morgan's observations on this dogmatic stumbling block our profession should attempt to overcome. It was refreshing to read a clear chronology of the concepts which gelled during the 19th century into the shaky conclusion that there exists an ethereal *Innate Intelligence*, as defined by our profession and which is based in *Vitalism*. I can also understand the consternation of those who wouldn't want to see this doctrine questioned too closely, for if the concept of Innate Intelligence is in error, so then may be the concept of *Vertebral Subluxation* – at least the hypothesis that is generally professed by the profession! The chiropractic tree has many nests among its' branches, and shaking that tree will undoubtedly make some eggs fall with a resounding thud!

Among those brilliant thinkers cited in Dr. Morgan's article, Aristotle of Stagira (384-322 B.C.E.) ranks quite highly. I believe very few would question the integrity of this man and his investigations into just about everything in nature. One of the core concepts which many have forgotten, and which was integral to Greek thought, was the concept of *physis*.

Physis, which can be defined loosely as "*nature*", but more clearly understood as "*fundamental existence*", was the bridge which linked the *psyche* (soul) with the *soma* (body). In other words, the activity of the soul upon the

body was manifested through the characteristic nature of that body. Physis was also considered a “constant”, and in opposition to the concept of “nomos” which meant “custom”, “convention”, “changeable”, or “law”. Examples of “nomos” would be written laws, morality or customs which are subject to change or revision. Basically, the constancy of physis was taken to mean that life forms are subject to natural laws which don’t change, though the organism itself can change over time, and this in itself was a “constant” which could not be avoided – sort of like Ben Franklin’s “death and taxes”!

Aristotle himself divided the philosophers of his day into two groups – the *physiologi* and the *theologi*. The *physiologi* were natural philosophers while the *theologi* believed the gods were causal in all activity in the universe. When one considers that Aristotle separated these two fields just under 2,400 years ago so as not to confuse matters of natural governance of living systems, one must wonder why D.D. Palmer unified them again in the 19th century to meagerly attempt to clarify what was unexplainable in his time! I believe that this type of reasoning – giving a patent response like “*Innate Intelligence*” as the “*cause-all*” of physiologic responses – effectively stifles further investigation into the nature of physical reactions in living systems.

If one takes a careful look at the word “Physis”, one will see it as the root word for *physics*, *physical*, and *physician*. It is clear that the Greeks understood that the inherent characteristics of any organism were to be found in and determined by the natural environment and were subject to its laws. Also, Aristotle, whose lectures were recorded in about 150 volumes dealing with *Physics*, *Metaphysics* and the *Nature of the Heavens and the Earth*, clearly differentiated the laws governing our planet from those governing the cosmos. From my understanding, there was no thought of a *Universal Intelligence* which expressed itself through the body as *Innate Intelligence*, being a subset thereof, in Aristotle’s time – at least among the *physiologi*, of which he was a major component!

Returning to Dr. Morgan’s concerns; are we to continue espousing the belief that living things possess an intangible “vital force” that energizes them in a nonphysical and nonchemical way? Can this concept be debunked in the scientific advances of our day which were nonexistent in Palmer’s time?

Frankly, I have never met a research biologist that gives

any credence to *Vitalism* as a plausible explanation for cellular or organic activity and I think I’d be hard pressed to find one! In fact, if one considers organisms which have no nervous system, the concept of “*Innate Intelligence flowing along the nerves*” leaves something to think about, not to mention the incongruence in considering the concept of “*subluxation*” as being causal in disease in the invertebrate animals!

As for *Vitalism* being a questionable concept, I propose we take a glance at a relatively new field of research into a biological phenomenon called “*Apoptosis*” for a clue, though many other fields may be considered with a similar outcome.

Apoptosis is a greek term meaning, “*dead leaves falling from a tree*”. The term was coined back in 1972 by Kerr, Wyllie and Currie to describe a type of “*cell suicide*” which was characteristically different, morphologically, from necrosis. This is also known today as “programmed cell death”. One of the glaring discoveries in this field is the recognition that all cells are in continual *biochemical* communication with their neighbors. Put in a very elemental way, when cells are irreparably damaged, they communicate their desire to commit suicide to their neighbors, via biochemical signals, and await a response. In optimal genetic situations, the cell is given permission to disorganize in a manner that will not illicit an inflammatory response; in others, when there is a defect in the genetic line, the biochemical “*green light*” is not produced and the cell continues to replicate in an uncontrollable manner. From embryological development through to normal culling of damaged cells in the maintenance of health, apoptosis has revolutionized our understanding of the mechanisms of health and disease. The phenomena of programmed cell death reported by the cell biologists are reproducible, verifiable and very revealing as to the mechanisms of disease and don’t rely upon any ethereal, vitalistic machination to be understood!

What if we do cast off this cultural baggage of the 19th century and accept a non ethereal premise in attempting to explain the mechanisms of health and disease? Well, I believe the concept of *Innate Intelligence* can easily be discarded and replaced with the simple concept of the old *physiologi* – that is, that there is a *fundamental nature* of living organisms to adapt, survive, heal itself, etc. The major difference is that we, as a profession, can *investigate* that *fundamental nature* whereas *Innate Intelligence* must

be dogmatically *accepted* as truth! To my mind, ridding ourselves of this concept will have absolutely no effect upon our clinical activity, in the short term, nor will it invalidate the observable effects of “adjustment” of the human spine! It may even be the first step toward expanding the scope and responsibilities we are presently obliged to conform to by legislation!

I would take Dr. Morgan’s issue one step further and call upon the various Chiropractic Associations and Boards to hold a revision of this very important issue and follow the consensus of professional opinion. After all, 2,400 years ago, even Aristotle separated physiology from theology. Today, the reasons are even more compelling!

I emphatically thank Dr. Morgan for so eloquently placing this issue before our profession and the JCCA for having the courage to print it. Dogma is a difficult egg to crack, but I’m hopeful that Dr. Morgan’s article will have provided the first chip. The time is long overdue for this profession to embrace the concepts and the advances of scientific endeavor that are revolutionizing other fields in an exponential manner!

Thomas V. Giordano, DC
Lecce, Italy

To the Editor in reply:

Response to Dr. McCarthy:

I thank Dr. McCarthy for his letter commenting on the recent article in JCCA on Innate Intelligence.¹

I assure Dr. McCarthy no criticism was directed at him or other individuals, but only at certain concepts and ideas. The Innate article did describe, and Dr. McCarthy exemplified, the hostility and division within chiropractic resulting from the doctrine of Innate Intelligence.

I very much appreciate Dr. McCarthy’s candor that, for him, Innate Intelligence is “God within us.” He undoubtedly speaks for other chiropractors who regard their profession from a religious perspective.

Is chiropractic a science or a religion?

A part of chiropractic certainly exhibits the superficial trappings of a religion. It has:

- Founding Prophets: the Palmer’s
- Holy Scriptures: any Palmer writings

- A Supreme Being: Universal Intelligence
- God within us: Innate Intelligence
- Satan: the Subluxation
- A Mecca: Davenport, IA
- Services to attend: motivational seminars
- Living Apostles: seminar speakers preaching Innate
- A Gospel to preach: the dogma of Innate
- Saints: all true-believing Innatists
- Sinners & Heretics: anyone who questions the doctrines of Innate

However, another part of chiropractic is scientific in that it is:

- performing systematic observations of health phenomena
- formulating and testing hypotheses
- conducting controlled experimentation
- publishing findings in peer-reviewed journals where critical review is welcome

A scientist is willing to self-examine and change beliefs in the face of compelling new evidence. The religionist rejects new information and compulsively defends archaic beliefs. The scientist welcomes new information and shifts to accommodate it. The religionist is vulnerable to the ‘kicked in the stomach’ feeling when conflicting information is presented.

I respect Dr. McCarthy’s honest, conscious choice of the Innate religious perspective, and I commend him for not pretending that his choice is scientifically credible. There are chiropractors that practice the religious mode under the pretense of being scientific. That is intellectual dishonesty.

Response to Dr. Preston:

While Dr. Preston’s letter was more diatribe than dialogue, it nonetheless illustrated numerous issues of common chiropractic confusion. His references to Einstein, Chopra, and Pert were addressed previously.²

Dr. Preston fails to differentiate his energies or define his science. He considers the antics of a shaman to be equivalent to chi, which he thinks is the same as ‘divine intelligence’. Yet, this mythical bio-energy has repeatedly been shown to exist only in the fertile imagination of the true believer. After all is said and done “there seems to be little evidence that supports the existence of chi.”³ The

only real chi is the chi of chicanery.

Dr. Preston further confuses popularity with validity. This is the age of alien abductions, 'X-Files' movies, Psychic Friends Networks, Astrology, Crystal Channeling, and other New Age fadisms. Alternative health fads are booming and include Biological Immunity Analysis, Biosonic Repatterning, Colorpuncture, Dimensional Clearing, Directed Esotonic Toning, Esogetics, Harper Shamanic counseling, Ho'oponopono, and psychic surgeries, to name only a few.⁴

To this could be added Concept and Network chiropractic, plus the rest of the chiropractic alphabet soup of NET, BEST, SOT, AK, etc. All claim to treat via Innate, and all have utterly failed independent, objective examination.⁵

Under Dr. Preston's logical fallacy of *Argumentum Ad Numeram* (the popularity of a fad somehow validates it) all of the above practices are legitimate simply because people are using them.

Dr. Preston claims miraculous 'cures' in his clinic. He also admits to never having read the landmark paper by Nansel and Slazak on visceral disease simulation.⁶ He should have. Nansel's important study addresses the chiropractic misconceptions expressed by Dr. Preston.

Nansel notes:

"... we have grown increasingly weary of dealing with those in the chiropractic profession who persist in their use of the case study as a means of convincing patients and chiropractic students of the "effectiveness" of the "chiropractic adjustment" for just about anything from psoriasis to colon cancer. Simply put, the first tenet of the scientific method dictates that in the face of any positive outcome, the *most* that can be concluded is that the therapy in question did not *totally prevent* the patient's recovery ..."⁷

Dr. Preston may have uncritically accepted dubious seminar information. At many chiropractic seminars the speaker, the *guru-du-jour*, makes claims and then alludes to supposedly supporting references.

Most doctors don't obtain those references and independently evaluate their relevance and accuracy. The doctors return from seminars under the blissful delusion their beliefs have been 'validated.'

Thus, Dr. Preston refers to the Institute of Noetic Science, and works by Sato and Korr. These sources are often cited at chiropractic seminars. A review of those sources reveals:

- After 25 years of existence, the "Institute of Noetic Science" has never published a single study in any accepted peer-reviewed journal.
- Sato studied somatovisceral reflexes and stated: "Given the complexity and multiplicity of mechanisms ... attempts to extrapolate to clinical situations should probably be eschewed."^{8,9} Nowhere does Sato confirm Innate, and nowhere does he show that reflexes produce pathology. Chiropractors need to understand that somatovisceral reflexes are *normal* physiology, and there is NO evidence that they produce pathology.
- Korr also does not mention the concept of Innate. Korr, an osteopath, postulated a hypothesis in the 1970's that spinal lesions might cause sympathetically induced circulatory ischemia and subsequent pathology.^{10,11} Unfortunately, Korr had very little in the way of evidence to support his hypothesis. Since then Korr's theories "have not held up at all under the weight of current scientific evidence."⁶ In the two decades since no evidence has emerged to support Korr's notions, but much has been found that refutes it. The sympathetic system is not even capable of creating significant ischemia in any of the tissues it innervates.⁶ Korr looked to examples of stomach ulcers and reflex sympathetic dystrophy (RSD) to support his ideas.¹¹ As noted earlier, RSD is no longer believed to even be a sympathetic condition.² Gastric ulcers are now recognized as caused largely by the bacterium *heliobacter pyloris*. The only people today who still cling to Korr's outdated notions are desperate chiropractic innatists. The osteopaths themselves do not give any credence today to Korr's ideas.

Dr. Preston has been sent a packet of his own references. He can see for himself that his own references do not support his beliefs.

Response to Dr. Michelle Whitney:

I was disappointed that Dr. Whitney's response completely avoided the central issue, i.e., where are the credible journal references to support the supposed 'info-realms' (and Innate) she insisted Ms. Pert had found? Since she obviously has no such evidence Dr. Whitney dwelt instead on irrelevant side issues.

Dr. Whitney expressed concern over not using the honorific 'Dr.' when referring to the works of Pert and Scheibner. Many style guides (e.g., Washington Post, Associated Press)¹² now recommend omitting such titles un-

less the person referred to has a doctorate in the healing arts. This is especially true when the author is writing on topics outside their area of training, as in the case of Ms. Scheibner, a paleontologist, writing on the health topic of immunization. Thus, individuals with a PhD, or LL.D., are generally not referred to as 'Dr.', except perhaps in publications within their own field. This is customary practice, not disrespect. This further prevents individuals from using the 'Dr.' appellation in an artificial attempt to gain credibility they otherwise do not deserve, especially when they have books to sell. Case in point: Ms. Scheibner and Ms. Pert.

Dr. Whitney first claimed that Ms. Pert was "the author" of numerous studies, then got confused as to Ms. Pert's role as lead or co-author. Whether Ms. Pert was lead or co-author on a study is immaterial, she still published virtually everything in collaboration with other scientists. Dr. Whitney's own sparse references bear this out, for example *Science*, 1984. This study on small cell carcinoma was lead authored by Ruff, with Pert as co-author.¹³ Thus, Dr. Whitney is in the awkward position of having her own "references" refute her own claims. Dr. Whitney is still without a single credible reference to support her position.

Dr. Whitney favors a pogrom to "ethnically cleanse" chiropractic of the politically and theologically incorrect. While her morbid fear of ideas that threaten the status quo is understandable, such intolerance is demeaning to a profession still struggling to find its place in the world.

Response to Troy Jordan, Student

It is difficult to find a coherent point in Mr. Jordan's rambling response, but his letter does serve to illustrate the mindset of at least some students making their way through chiropractic college. He prejudices the study by Nansel and Slazak⁶ without having studied it. His statements are uniformly and completely devoid of any supporting evidence or reference. His position seems to be little more than random regurgitation of tired clichés.

I must echo Dr. Loh's observation that "... we must abandon the simplistic concept of innate intelligence." The concept of Innate is too inane to be accorded credibility in a rational world.

I thank Dr. Giordano for his eloquent and important comments.

There is an inverse relationship between familiarity

with the scientific journals and belief in Innate theosophies. As many of the letters to the editor illustrate – those poorly read in the scientific journals are more apt to accept poorly founded concepts like Innate. Not one of the doctors who wrote opposing the Innate article could provide even one credible journal reference supporting their views.

As doctors mature to the professionalism of the scientific literature, they come to recognize the scientific poverty, and intellectual dishonesty, of the Innate theology dispensed through our schools, seminars, and trade publications.

Whatever else Innate is, it is a label for our ignorance. It is a fallacy of the worst order to presume to explain something (life) by merely naming something (Innate). Naming our ignorance is a poor substitute for scientific explanation.¹⁴

The selling of Innate through seminars, books, tapes, and videos, is a multi-million dollar chiropractic industry. The purveyors of these materials have discovered they can make more money peddling nonsense to their fellow chiropractors than they can treating patients. Religion (spizzerinctum) sells, science is boring.

Chiropractic has the potential of becoming an outstanding health science, but the dogma of Innate retards it to a dismal religion. I have hope that chiropractors will mature in scientific accountability, and will discard the pseudoscientific pretenses of Innate in favor of intellectual honesty.

D.D. Palmer once observed that chiropractic could be practiced without Innate Intelligence being a part of it.¹⁵ Perhaps we should follow D.D.'s suggestion.

Lon Morgan, DC, DABCO
Nampa, ID

References

- 1 Morgan L. Innate intelligence: its origins and problems. *JCCA* 1998; 42(1):35–41.
- 2 Morgan L. Innate Intelligence: its origins and problems [letter]. *JCCA* 1998; 42(2):123–126.
- 3 Huston P. China, chi, and chicanery. Examining traditional Chinese medicine and chi theory. *Skeptical Inquirer* 1995; 19:38–42.
- 4 Raso J. Mystical medical alternativism. *Skeptical Inquirer* 1995; 19:33–37.

- 5 Hultgran G., Jeffers J. Shamanism, a Religious Paradigm: Its Intrusion into the Practice of Chiropractic. JMPT 1994; 17:404–410.
- 6 Nansel D., Slazak M. Somatic dysfunction and the phenomenon of visceral disease simulation: A probable explanation for the apparent effectiveness of somatic therapy in patients presumed to be suffering from true visceral disease. JMPT 1995; 18:379–391.
- 7 Nansel D., Slazak M. Somatic Dysfunction and the Phenomenon of Visceral Disease Simulation: [Letter]. JMPT 1997 April; 20:218–224.
- 8 Sato A. Somatovisceral reflexes. JMPT 1995; 18:597–602.
- 9 Sato A. The reflex effects of spinal somatic nerve stimulation on visceral function. JMPT 1992; 15:57–61.
- 10 Korr I. Sustained sympathicotonia as a factor in disease. The neurobiologic mechanisms in manipulative therapy 1978; 229–268.
- 11 Korr I. The spinal cord as organizer of disease processes; III. Hyperactivity of sympathetic innervation as a common factor in disease. J Am Osteopath Assoc 1979; 79:232–237.
- 12 Associated Press Style Guide. 1998, New York: AP.
- 13 Ruff M, Pert C. Small cell carcinoma of the lung: macrophage-specific antigens suggest hemopoietic stem cell origin. Science 1984; 225:1034–1036.
- 14 Keating J. Metaphysics, rationality and science [Letter]. JMPT 1994; 17:411.
- 15 Palmer D. The chiropractor's adjustor. 1910, Portland: Printing House Co. 691.

**CHIROPRACTIC FOUNDATION
FOR SPINAL RESEARCH**

The C.F.S.R. is a registered Charitable foundation dedicated to quality Chiropractic research. We appreciate your continued support.

Please send your

Tax Deductible Donation

TODAY:

Donations

and/or

Requests for Grant Applications

may be forwarded to:

**The Chiropractic Foundation
for Spinal Research**

**Winnipeg General P.O. Box 638
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 2K3**