

The Philosophy of Healing
The Philosophical Constructs of
Biological Mechanism, Naïve, and Critical Vitalism
by Glenn M. Hultgren, D.C., I.C.A.C.C.I.
Copyright 2005

Abstract

The chiropractic profession has historically had a reputation for divergent ideologies as to its philosophical basis. Some have seen the need to alter the course laid down by the Palmers and to develop a more scientific paradigm, in line with established medical sciences. Others see this as an abdication of the basic tenets of our profession. Few have noticed that in this struggle for scientific acceptance and traditional philosophy, a segment of our profession is going in another direction and becoming more involved than ever in the metaphysical and esoteric practices. Much of this is being done in the name of science and with the knowledge and approval of some of our educators and research people.

Classical philosophy studies refer to many healing philosophies. I want to discuss three and how they relate to the chiropractic profession. These are the mechanistic or reductionistic approach and the vitalistic philosophies of critical and naïve vitalism. The chiropractic theory of mental impulse interference is severally compromised in the mechanistic and naïve vitalistic philosophies. Only critical vitalism is compatible with our traditional chiropractic philosophy.

It is my opinion that there is a sound philosophical basis for chiropractic that is ethical, scientific and defensible without surrendering our values to medical science or embracing the metaphysical and esoteric teachings. The course our profession needs to follow is that of Paul Edwards's definition of "critical vitalism" if we are to embrace our chiropractic theory of interference as a cause of dis-ease.

Section I

Our bodies are made up of two entities - the material and the immaterial - the animate and the inanimate. We know that the material, physical part of our bodies is that which we can touch, see and feel - that it is composed of the same elements as the earth upon which we stand. The Bible says we are dust. That is our physical make-up. But the immaterial, animate entity is something which we cannot see, touch or feel. However without it we could not live or exist. That immaterial nature — which we call innate, soul, or spirit, — is the entity which maintains health and life. When there is adequate communication between the immaterial entity and the physical entity there is health. However, interference in this communication system is the cause of dis-ease in our bodies.

The only difference between the body which is alive and that which has just died is the absence of this entity, — the life, the innate, the soul or spirit. After this entity leaves the body, it is not long before deterioration of the physical, material entity takes place and eventually that portion will return to the dust of the earth. Nothing that is done to improve the status of the physical entity at that time will bring a change in its condition once the immaterial entity has left.

We know that as this immaterial entity gives life to the physical body, it also maintains health and healing, thinking and reasoning, the will and emotions, feeling and planning. We also know that any method of healing must activate, arouse, aid, and remove the

interference in the communication system for the immaterial entity to have any hope of bringing healing to the physical. Therefore, it is this immaterial entity which has the power to heal the material/physical entity.

In his Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Paul Edwards calls this the philosophy of vitalism. Vitalism has been maligned by the more "scientific" members of our society. Vitalism is not empirical science - not subject to laboratory scientific proof. Edwards describes vitalism as "*primarily a metaphysical doctrine concerning the nature of living organisms ... it is that which distinguishes living from non-living things ... it is the presence in living systems of a substantial entity that imparts to the system power possessed by no inanimate body ... it holds, first, that in every living organism there is an entity that is not exhaustively composed of inanimate parts and, second, that the activities characteristic of living organisms are due, in some sense, to the activities of this entity.*"¹ Edwards calls this "critical vitalism."

By Edward's definition, critical vitalism recognizes that the body is dust (physico/chemical matter) which has been animated by an immaterial entity called soul, which produces life. This entity has been placed in matter by none other than the Creator Himself at the very beginning of creation and is passed on to succeeding generations through the process of procreation. This entity, which in Scripture is called soul or spirit, is responsible for all living processes: — for thinking, for memory, for self preservation, for reproduc-

tion and also for healing of physical and mental dysfunctions.

The critical vitalist must accept the fact that the Creator works within His model, through His created order, by His anatomical circuitry, using the plan which He established when He created and organized the body for its proper function and self preservation. The anatomical circuitry utilized by the immaterial entity to communicate with the material entity is the nervous system. When this system is functioning properly without interference, the physical body will function most efficiently. When there is no interference in the communication system, the immaterial entity will bring about healing to the physical. We know that the best physician is the one who does the least to interfere with the patient's innate ability to heal himself. When deterioration in the physical body is beyond the ability of the immaterial nature to heal, the end result is the separation of the soul/innate/animate nature from the body and death occurs.

Critical vitalism is not to be confused with "naïve vitalism" which, as a philosophy, is far more common in today's world of New Age Healing. Edwards describes naïve vitalism as "life is regarded as a material substance, usually a fluid body ... life is flatly identified with a material fluid, the breathe or the blood .. the doctrine of spirits, as occurs in Galen and his successors, is an example of this sort of vitalism. The process of etherealizing the life culminates in the view that it is a fluid but one that is assigned no properties other than its power of animating an organism." ²

In the philosophy of naïve vitalism we find that the essence of life is given to some real or imagined anatomical or biological part which controls all bodily functions. Life is a fluid or an energy in naïve vitalism. Today's holistic healers are claiming to balance life energies,^{3 4} unblock the flow of life's impingements,⁵ stimulate meridians,⁶ read auras,^{7 8} ingest life energy from nature,^{9 10 11} call upon spirits,¹² and use methods which have little or no empirical value, methods which do not utilize the created anatomical circuitry or system physiology of the physical body and many times depend on occult energies and psychic forces for healing.^{13 14 15} They do not rely on anatomical circuitry or physical interference to cause disease and therefore do not try to locate interference in the nervous system. Life, innate, and soul are material entities for the naïve vitalist which can be coerced into doing the bidding of the healer. Never-the-less those healers may be effective because of the spirit of the healer who is doing the work on the faith of the recipient.

In further contrast to the vitalistic philosophy is the medical scientific model which is one of "reductionistic" or "mechanistic philosophy." Webster defines this as "the attempt to explain all biological processes by the same explanations (as by physical laws) that the chemists and physicists use to interpret inani-

mate matter; it is a procedure which reduces complex data or phenomena to simple terms." ¹⁶ Paul Edwards defines mechanism in biology as a "philosophical theory about the nature of biological systems ... mechanism is sometimes said to be the theory that living organisms and all of their living parts are machines ... stated less formally, mechanism is the view that every biological event is a pattern of non-biological occurrences." ¹⁷ Edwards asks the rhetorical question, "What distinguishes living from non-living things?" He answers for the mechanist, "A complex pattern of organization in which each element of the pattern is itself a non-living entity." ¹⁸

In its revulsion to the metaphysical, this philosophy is more acceptable to the scientific mind and it effectively removes the spirit/soul/innate from the world of empirical science. This may be acceptable as far as the non-biological sciences are concerned, but is the medical scientist, the mechanist, ready to call "life" a material substance? In the examination of cellular matter we cannot find life under a microscope. Life cannot be created in a laboratory. No combination of ingredients will ever duplicate the function of a thinking, cognitive, living, reproducing organism without the vitalistic nature. The immaterial nature cannot be created from various known or unknown physical parts in a laboratory. The mechanistic philosophy just does not have the answers necessary to satisfy the thinking person.

Aristotle was one of the first proponents of critical vitalism particularly in his works, *On The Soul* and *On the Generation of Animals*. ¹⁹ However, during the Renaissance period, men such as Francis Bacon of England and Rene Descartes of France, denounced vitalism and promoted mechanism for the logical, thinking, scientific, mind. Darwin and Freud followed their example in the nineteenth century.

In chiropractic we have serious danger of falling from our critical vitalistic base into the trap of either naïve vitalism or mechanistic philosophy. Neither extreme can satisfy and explain why we do what we do as well as a solid understanding of critical vitalism. Nor will either extreme examine and locate interference in the communication between the soul/innate and the physical body.

Section II

To better understand the philosophical difference between the chiropractic profession and the medical profession we need to understand the differences between critical vitalism and biological mechanism. We need to ask ourselves the question: "Is man, strictly speaking, only a complex combination of atoms, molecules, chemicals, chromosomes, genes, and proteins? Or does man possess an immaterial nature, as well as his physical nature? Is life simply the product of a right combination of ingredients, or is there something else

to life that cannot be held, seen, weighed, dissected, or even located under a microscope in the body?"

The philosophy of biological mechanism teaches that separate systems of the body are composed of infinite numbers of components (cells), which affect other systems, but which function by their own action as determined by their environment. Edwards says: *"Every biological event is the result of a non-biological happening..."*²⁰ *"Biological phenomena might be reduced to the physio/chemical response."*²¹ This of course removes the immaterial from the material — the soul, spirit, innate — from the body. This, in summary, is the philosophy of medicine and biological sciences.

In practice, the mechanist must determine which part of the machine is not functioning up to par and then design his own remedy for the malfunction. The problem they are looking for is the organ, tissue or limb itself and not in its control or loss of control through interference in communication with the immaterial entity. The symptoms will tell the story and if the symptoms are changed, the machine should work as it is designed to work. The success of the treatment is dependant upon the proper diagnosis of symptoms by the mechanist. The response of the patient is predictable and controlled. The fact that changing the flaw (symptoms) in one area of the machine causes a chain reaction with a multitude of other symptoms is often considered within the realm of acceptable care. If anything, they can deal with that with other drugs or treatments. The only important factor at the time is to change the original set of symptoms. This is determined by the mechanist and his wisdom supercedes that of the patient's inborn soul/innate. There is little if any thought given to loss of the patient's own innate control over the body because of interference in the communication system. The mechanistic physician takes on the role of the soul/innate of the patient and he prescribes the treatment, decides the course of healing, and is responsible for the success or failure of the plan. What one patient may accept and utilize satisfactorily, the next patient may give a totally different response. The mechanist has no explanation as to why one patient will respond one way and the other one will respond in a totally different way.

In a recent issue of Science, the weekly Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the rhetorical question is asked:

"If human neural stem cells were implanted into the brains of other primates, what might this do to the mind of the recipient? Could we change the capacities of the engrafted animal in a way that leads us to re-examine its moral status? ... Many of the most plausible and widely accepted candidates for determining moral status involve mental capacities such as the ability to feel pleasure and pain, language, rationality, and richness of relationships. To the extent that

*a non-human primate attains those capacities, that creature must be held in correspondingly high moral standing."*²²

Do they mean by that the non-human primate would have a human nature? The question for us is: *"Can the immaterial nature of the person be implanted in another animal simply by transplanting a few cells."* *"Could it be transplanted if an entire brain were transplanted?"* *"How much of the human would be necessary to be transplanted in order for the immaterial nature to give cognitive ability to the non-human primate?"* *"Would we then have to change our moral treatment of that non-human primate?"* These questions are now being addressed in the mechanistic research laboratories of the world where they have no concept of the immaterial nature and how it imparts life and health to the body. Each immaterial nature is unique to each individual, and transplanting it into another individual, human or other wise, is just not possible. Even identical twins, conjoined twins, and clones have separate innates!

This series of questions, although rhetorical, exemplifies the vast difference between the biological mechanistic philosophy and our critical vitalistic philosophy. They think that the entire nature of the individual can be removed from one individual by taking a few cells from the brain and transplanting them into another organism. In our critical vitalism, we know that the nature of the individual, that immaterial nature, is present in every cell of the body. If it is removed from one individual, that individual is dead and that nature cannot be transplanted into another individual or organism!

Although the mechanistic philosophy is primarily that of the medical physician and the biological scientist, far too many chiropractors are practicing the same way. They treat diseases or symptoms and fail to adjust and correct subluxations removing interference in the communication system. They seek remedies to change the patient's symptoms instead of finding the cause of the problem, correcting the interference and letting the patient's innate response heal the problem. They fail to recognize the presence of the immaterial nature and its control over the physical body.

Section III

If the chiropractor has a problem going too far to the left into the field of biological mechanism he also has an even deeper problem with the slippery slope on the extreme right in naïve vitalism. Naïve vitalism has been a thorn in our side since the days of D.D. Palmer. In his first book he talks about his "new theology enunciated by me,"²³ In his second book, D.D. says, *"the practice of chiropractic includes a moral obligation and a religious duty,"*²⁴... *"it is an educational, scientific and religious system,"*²⁵ ... *"Chiropractic religion, chiropractic religion, the religion of chiroprac-*

tic and the religious duty of a chiropractor are one and the same."²⁶ It was the desire of D.D. Palmer to follow the example of Christian Science and establish chiropractic as a religion and therefore by-pass state licensing laws. He stated: "In accordance with this aim and end, the Constitution of the United States and the statutes persona of California confer upon me and all persons of chiropractic faith, the inalienable right to practice our religion without restraint or hindrance."²⁷

D. D.'s son, B. J. Palmer, did not go along with his father on this concept and he fought for licensure in every State in the Union as a separate and distinct science, art and practice of healing. B.J. also was adamant in his opposition to making chiropractic a religion. In his book, *Conflicts Clarify*, 1951, he quotes a lengthy exchange of letters and arguments between himself and George Shears, D.C. Dr. Shears started the G-P-C (*God Pays the Chiropractor*) concept in the 1940's. Dr. Shears used this program to subvert the licensing requirements of various States. In his program he called adjustments "innate adjustments, without us doing anything physical to the spine." He used the "laying on of hands," and prayer for healing and allowed the patients to pay whatever they thought the service was worth. Dr. Shears stated in one of his letters, "it is not the force which innate used to make the adjustment but the energy provided as our effort at giving the adjustment caused an energy field to be created from which innate could draw for her needs. I decided to find out if innate could make the adjustment without us doing anything physical to the spine or the body."²⁸ Dr. Shears was member of the I.C.A. Board of Control, and therefore one of B.J.'s closest allies in the profession. However, when he tried to persuade B.J. to promote G-P-C as the answer to medical opposition and licensing problems, as well as to claim a right to practice chiropractic as a freedom of religion, B.J. was adamant in his opposition

Although B.J. Palmer did not follow the philosophy of his father, D.D. Palmer, and fought to establish chiropractic as a science and not a religion, some of his concepts would lead us to believe that naïve vitalism was a part of his thinking in later life. He gave the title innate intelligence to the immaterial nature and referred to it as "a finite portion of universal intelligence (God)"²⁹ He personified this nature and referred to it as "she" and "her."³⁰ This personification led to deification of the immaterial nature in his *Conflicts Clarify*, 1951,³¹ and thus identified this philosophy as naïve vitalism according to the definition of Paul Edwards.

After B.J.'s wife, Mable, died in 1949, B.J. produced several books and he reversed his thinking of his earlier years, taking on many of the pantheistic religious views of his father. His *Bigness of the Fellow Within* reflects his religious, spiritualistic, thinking as

he, more than ever before, expressed a naïve vitalistic concept for chiropractic. In his posthumously published *The Great Divide*, he speaks of the divine divinity within. When I asked his nephew, Dr. W. Heath Quigley, about B.J.'s change he stated: "I may be wrong, but I have always felt that B.J.'s elevation of innate to a divine level came when his personal life was altered. He had never advised nor believed in prayer but as he grew older he wrote and spoke increasingly of 'communicating with innate,' that is, he personified innate."³² This type of communication is called communication with a spirit guide which is a common New Age practice

At the present time we have a number of naïve vitalistic practices in our profession. Some are calling on spirits³³ to diagnose problems and to determine proper forms of treatment and remedies. Some are diagnosing problems over the telephone using a surrogate in the office or diagnosing babies lying on the mother's stomach and testing the mother as a surrogate.³⁴ Some are into energy balancing.^{35 36 37} Many are waving the patient's arms up, down, front, and back testing for diseases of internal origin.^{38 39} Some are putting bottles of pills on the back of the patient and asking the patient's spirit to give a short leg or long leg to tell if the product is right.⁴⁰ Still others are sticking pins and needles into the ear to cure diseases of internal origin.⁴¹ Some are looking for spots on the iris of the eye for the diagnosis of diseases of internal origin⁴² and others are looking for painful places on the plantar surface of the hands and feet for spots that they believe correspond to internal organs.^{43 44} Some have direct communication with the spirit world with many bizarre results.⁴⁵ These and many more practices do not rely on the created anatomical circuitry or physiological function of the body. They do rely on energy fields, spirit guides, occult religions, and false premises without any objective value.

Section IV

As our profession moves farther and farther from their critical vitalistic base, we hear more about homeostasis, recuperative powers, natural healing power, and immune response and less and less about vitalistic interference. Are these not the effect — the results of the active working immaterial nature, the soul/innate? What is meant when they say the "body healed itself?" The physical body has no ability to heal itself in spontaneous healing. If it did the corpse in the mortuary would get up and walk away. But the healing power is gone when the soul/innate leaves the body. Is homeostasis the basis of it all, the source from which all healing emanates? Or what is it that controls homeostasis? Strang says, "It is this marvelous, innate (inborn) purposeful nature which is the predominant, practical reality behind the mechanisms of homeostasis."⁴⁶

Dorland defines homeostasis as “a tendency to uniformity or stability in the normal body states of the organism.”⁴⁷ Webster says it is “a relatively stable state of equilibrium or a tendency toward such a state between the different but interdependent elements or groups of elements of an organism or group.”⁴⁸ Neither of these definitions gives any hint as to what, if anything, controls homeostasis. Janse says, “normal integrated neurological conduct results in pathology, disintegration of homeostasis and eventually the intrusion of disease.” Strang says “homeostasis enables the body to stay alive in an ever changing environment. The nervous system is the prime controller of homeostasis.”⁴⁹

I may be able to agree with both Strang and Janse up to a point but there still is something controlling the nervous system as it regulates and controls the entire body, which it cannot and does not create by itself. If the above hypothesis were true, how do we explain diseases of the nervous system such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson’s Disease and poliomyelitis? These diseases also are a breakdown interference with homeostasis and these diseases affect the nervous system which, they say, is supposed to control homeostasis. This of course cannot happen unless something else remains in control of the nervous system. Thus we must return to the immaterial nature and the concept of critical vitalism. It is the immaterial nature - the soul/innate - which is the controller of homeostasis.

Section V

The issue of vitalism and its lack of scientific empiricism, is used to devalue and discredit the chiropractor who holds to this philosophy. According to scientific empiricism, any theory must be observable, verifiable, reproducible, irrefutable and unfalsifiable before it can be accepted as empirical science. Obviously the theory of critical vitalism cannot do this and therefore it cannot be accepted as empirical science.

Does that mean that chiropractic and its vitalistic philosophy are a cult, a religious concept? Does this mean that any other theory which cannot be observable, verifiable, reproducible, irrefutable and unfalsifiable is likewise a cult or a religious concept? If you are a follower of the mechanistic reductionistic empiricism philosophy, that is exactly what you think. However, evolution and natural selection, which is so staunchly supported by the mechanistic philosophies, cannot be considered empirical either as it is not observable, reproducible, irrefutable, or unfalsifiable.⁵⁰ Scientific debate, even though coming from divergent viewpoints, must be rooted in fact and be rational to the thinking man. Is this not a phenomena — the immaterial nature — which is so obvious, which is unfalsifiable — one which must be accepted in all philosophical constructs? Paul Edwards sums it up by stating, “In short, vitalism is irrefutable.”⁵¹

The issue then for the Doctor of Chiropractic is which philosophy should we accept? We have shown the difference between the mechanistic philosophy, the critical and naïve vitalism and have presented our case for critical vitalism. We cannot accept the mechanistic philosophy of the medical scientist as many of our profession who are seeking medical acceptance have done. However, neither can we accept the religious dogma of the Palmers or the cultistic naïve vitalism of the New Age holistic healers of our day. We must re-establish our position with that which Paul Edwards terms, **Critical Vitalism!** It is irrefutable!!!

Section VI

With the preceding as a basis for our understanding, let us look at what happens when there is interference between the immaterial and the material, between the animate and the inanimate, between the soul/innate and the body. We have established the concept that the body without the innate is nothing but chemicals. The material without the immaterial has no purpose or function. The inanimate without the animate is unable to think, move, respond, reproduce, relate, grow, communicate, digest food, produce heat, maintain health, overcome disease and injury, and carry on daily functions necessary for human life. It has no cognitive ability. Without the immaterial there is no life - the body, the material, the inanimate is dead.

However, there are hundreds of situations whereby the control of the animate over the inanimate is present but not in full command. There is interference blocking that control. This interference may come in several ways. First, there may be interference of the mental basis, whereby the mind is not in touch with reality. This can result in mental diseases such as schizophrenia, paranoia, bi-polar disorder, Alzheimer’s and other diseases which are of the mind. These conditions affect the body but may be caused by emotional or mental interference without a physical cause or they may be caused by chemical poisoning or injury. (*The New Age Healer relates all healing power to the mind.*⁵² *They call it mind/body connection. But the mind is not innate. The mind, intellect, temperament, emotion, will, etc. are all qualities of the innate/soul and are subject to the control of the same. Diseases of the mind are symptoms of loss of communication between the immaterial - soul/innate — and the physical entities.*)

Second, there are interferences in the spiritual realm whereby forces from the dark side of the spirit world can take over the body and cause tremendous damage to the body and also cause the body to self-destruct. Whether we want to admit it or not, I believe the modern day terrorist is a product of this type of spiritual interference.

However, most of the interferences which we see in everyday life are physical, causing the animate to

lose a measure of control over the inanimate body. The causes of these interferences may be chemical, mechanical, or genetic. In the area of the chemical we have environmental (*polluted air, food, and water*), and poisons (*snake and insect bites, heavy metals, and drugs*). The genetic causes of interference in the physiological control of the material by the immaterial are born within and often passed from one generation to another, such as Huntington's Disease and sickle cell anemia, or a flaw in the embryonic development such as cystic fibrosis, muscular dystrophy, and Down's Syndrome. These are by and large outside the scope of chiropractic practice.

The mechanical causes would usually have a traumatic origin and cause an interference in the communication between the animate with the inanimate. This is an area which we as chiropractors are most familiar. A trauma may cause a subluxation and this results in an interference on the nervous system between the brain and the tissue, organ or limb of the body. The most common location for such interference is within the nervous system, in the spine between the occiput and the coccyx. However, lest we overlook the entire subject of interference, we must admit that injuries to the brain and peripheral nerves also causes interference between the controlling entity and the body. Finding where that interference is, is the duty of the chiropractor. If it is in the spinal column, we have a duty and obligation to examine the spine carefully, thoroughly and specifically and then to try to remove the interference and restore normal function and communication to the nervous system if at all possible. As Dr. Clarence Gonstead used to say: *"Find it, fix it, and leave it alone."* In other words let innate do the healing.

This is not to say that restoring normal function and communication along the nerve pathways does not bring aid, comfort and relief to conditions with other types of interference. Who is to say that the Down's syndrome child does not benefit from spinal care? Or for the patient who is high on drugs, legal or illegal, prescription or street drugs? But how much faster will they respond to our care when their bodies are free of all poisons and toxic substances. But on the other extreme, who of us is to say that the best spinal adjustment is going to restore normalcy to the Huntington patient, or the Down's patient or the snake bitten?

We know that the human body is composed of two entities - the material and the immaterial, the animate and the inanimate, the soul/innate, and the physical body. Dis-ease is caused when the two entities are not communicating and death is caused when the inanimate can no longer respond to the animate. When the soul/innate leaves the body because of inability to communicate, heal, or perform living function, death occurs.

Section VII

With modern technology, it is now possible to keep a body *"living"* long after normal signs of life are gone. Life support systems have become very high tech. Who is to say when death occurs? Today that question is becoming a most difficult question. Several pregnant women have suffered catastrophic injuries and been kept *"alive"* until their baby was viable and after it was removed by Caesarian section, the woman is allowed to *"die."* She was said to be *"brain dead"* following her accident. But even then she can be kept on life support systems until the baby in the womb grows and develops to a size that it can live independent of its mother. Was the mother *"alive"* or *"dead?"* What is *"brain death?"* The common definition is a flat line on the electroencephalograph attached to the forebrain. But even then the hindbrain may still be functioning and is it not the hypothalamus and the hindbrain that control most of life's functions? Although we may not know if the mother's innate/immaterial nature was present or not, that of the baby's was active and very much alive and mother's body just acted as an incubator.

If the trauma patient is young and in reasonable good health when the critical injury occurs, it is usual and common to ask that the patient's organs be salvaged for transplant into another patient. When should those organs be removed? If they wait for all signs of life to disappear, many of the organs are no longer usable. If they take the organs, the heart specifically, before death occurs, is that not a form of euthanasia? When does the soul/innate leave the body? Do we want to wait until that occurs to harvest organs for transplant purposes? How do we know when it is no longer possible for the immaterial nature to communicate with the physical body?

In the notorious case of Terri Schiavo, the patient had suffered a brain injury and was left in a comatose state for fifteen years. She was unable to communicate verbally but was not on any life support system other than a feeding tube. Was she alive or dead? Was her soul/innate still present in her body? It is obvious that the animate was present but it is also obvious that it was unable to restore normal function to her body after fifteen years. Of course we do not know if a chiropractic examination and adjustment to her spine would have removed interference and restored normal function or not. Never-the-less the feeding tube was removed and without food or water for two weeks, the patient died.

Biotechnology today has given credence to our philosophy of chiropractic. Science can now tell us that there is an immaterial entity within our physical bodies. They are very much aware of that entity and its function. Our differences come in our understanding of its role in health, and the consequences of interference to its expression in the body causing disease and death.

- ¹Edwards, Paul, *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, New York, Macmillan Publishers, 1967; Vol. VII, p.254
- ² ibid
- ³ Delores Krieger, *The Therapeutic Touch*, Prentice Hall, 1979
- ⁴ Mary Coddington, *In Search of the Healing Energy*, Destiny Books, 1978
- ⁵ Richard Gordon, *Your Healing Hands: The Polarity Experience*, 1978, Unity Press
- ⁶ "Acupuncture Today," Huntington Beach, CA 92615, Jan, 2000
- ⁷ *An Anthology, The Human Aura*, Berkeley Corporation, 1974
- ⁸ Sepharial, *Manual of Occultism*, New Castle Publishing, 1979; Psychometry, p. 310
- ⁹ Weldon & Levitt, *Psychic Healing*, Moody Press, 1982, p 207
- ¹⁰ George Ulett, *Beyond Yin & Yang*, Warren H. Green, Inc. 1992, p 3
- ¹¹ R. A. Huebner, *Occult Healing, Present Truth Publishers*, Morganville, NJ, 1983, p. 18-20
- ¹² Michael Harner, *The Way of the Shaman*, Bantam Books, 1986
- ¹³ Johanna Michaelsen, *The Beautiful Side of Evil*, Harvest House, 1982 p. 92, 93.
- ¹⁴ Glenn M. Hultgren, *Against All Odds ... BUT GOD!* Page 177
- ¹⁵ Weldon & Levitt, *Psychic Healing*, Moody Press, "Edgar Cayce and Psychic Diagnosis" p.65
- ¹⁶ *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, 9th Edition, p. 737
- ¹⁷ Paul Edwards, *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. IV p 250-251
- ¹⁸ ibid
- ¹⁹ ibid, Vol VII, p 254.
- ²⁰ Paul Edwards, *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. IV p 251
- ²¹ ibid, Vol. IV p 252
- ²² Science, Vol. 309, July 15, 2005, p 385
- ²³ D.D. Palmer, *The Science, Art, and Philosophy of Chiropractic* 1910; p 446
- ²⁴ D.D. Palmer, *The Chiropractor*, 1914, p2
- ²⁵ ibid, p4
- ²⁶ ibid. p6
- ²⁷ ibid. p12
- ²⁸ B.J. Palmer, *Conflicts Clarify*, 1951, p.70-113
- ²⁹ R.W. Stephenson, *The Chiropractic Textbook*, 1927, p 236, 237
- ³⁰ ibid, p 17, 19
- ³¹ B.J. Palmer, *Conflicts Clarify*, 1951. p 72, 106, 107
- ³² personal correspondence
- ³³ Sunday Advocate, Baton Rouge, LA 03/28/93; Picture of Dr. Randall Hirsack at Psychic Fair, p 2B
- ³⁴ The American Chiropractor, May/June 1994, "Surrogate Chiropractic," p. 20
- ³⁵ Network Chiropractic: East/West Journal, Dec. 1989, p. 26 "Alignment for growth seminar"
- ³⁶ Network Chiropractic: Yoga Journal, Sept./Oct. 1990, pp. 23-25. "Psychic Effects."
- ³⁷ Biomagnetic, Chiropractic & Nutrition, *The Digest of Chiropractic Economics*, May/June 1977, p 96
- ³⁸ Walter H. Schmidt, ICAK-USA, News Update, August 1988, "Muscle Testing Equals Functional Neurology" p.12
- ³⁹ John J. Triano, *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*, Dec. 1982, pp. 179-182 "Muscle Strength Testing as a Diagnostic Screen for Supplemental Nutrition Therapy: A Blind Study."
- ⁴⁰ Dick Versendaal & Fred Ulan, *The American Chiropractor*, March/April 1998, "Contact Reflex Analysis & Applied Clinical Nutrition" pp. 18-32
- ⁴¹ David Walther, D.C., Systems, D.C., Pueblo, CO 1976, "Auricular Therapy"
- ⁴² Bernard Jensen, D.C. *The American Chiropractor*, Nov./Dec. 1980, pp. 23-25; "How The Chiropractor Can Use Iridology"
- ⁴³ David Walther, D.C., Systems, D.C. Pueblo, CO, 1976, "Foot Reflexes"
- ⁴⁴ ibid, "Palmar Hand Stress Receptors"
- ⁴⁵ Network Chiropractic, *Yoga Journal*, Dec. 1989, p 28; "Beyond Bones"
- ⁴⁶ Virgil Strang, *Palmer College of Chiropractic, Essential Principles of Chiropractic*, 1984, p.166
- ⁴⁷ Dorland, *Medical Dictionary*, 1951 p.686
- ⁴⁸ *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, p. 577
- ⁴⁹ Strang, p. 52
- ⁵⁰ John Chaikowsky, "Geology vs. Physics," *Geotimes*, Vol. 50 p.6, April 2005
- ⁵¹ Edwards, Vol. VII, p254.
- ⁵² Bruce Lipton, *The Biology of Belief, Mountain of Love/Elite Books*, p. 128ff