

Laboratory diagnosis in Ontario and the need for reform relative to the profession of chiropractic.
JCCA 1997; 41(4):205-220.

The clinical laboratory in chiropractic practice: what tests to order and why?
JCCA 1997; 41(4):221-230.

Pertinent case studies illustrating the need for laboratory accessibility for Doctors of Chiropractic: a clinical conundrum.
JCCA 1997; 41(4):231-236.

To the Editor:

The JCCA/December '97 contains three interesting and timely papers by Drs. Gotlib, Injeyan and Crawford on the need for chiropractors to have direct access to laboratory test facilities. The paper by Gotlib et al. provides an interesting background to how chiropractors lost the right to order laboratory tests, even though laboratory diagnosis is not unique to one profession. This is followed by a succinct paper by Injeyan et al. on what clinical laboratory tests chiropractors should order as primary health care providers in an attempt to come to a timely and precise diagnosis for their patients, thereby providing the basis for appropriate care, which is clearly in the public interest. The paper by Crawford et al. highlights the importance of chiropractors having access to clinical laboratory tests to enable chiropractors to perform optimal delivery of services. It is noted that there is clearly a "double standard" within the health care community and the denied utilization of the diagnostic laboratory will, in many instances, delay otherwise appropriate and timely care.

I was fortunate enough to graduate from CMCC before 1972 when chiropractors were prohibited legislatively from ordering or performing laboratory tests. I have always made use of laboratory tests and, in certain jurisdictions, I have had to order these through co-operative medical practitioners. However, as stated in the paper by Crawford et al. the "practice of referring patients in need of laboratory diagnostic procedures to their respective family physician is neither cost-effective or expeditious". It seems that government agencies criticise the ever increasing health care costs in many, if not all countries, and yet are happy to enforce unnecessary visits to medical

practitioners by preventing chiropractors from ordering laboratory tests. However, I doubt that the prevailing situation will change unless submissions aimed at obtaining laboratory tests for chiropractors are supported by strong legal representation.

As Director of a hospital based spinal pain unit, it has become blatantly obvious to me that such a unit could not function effectively without access to clinical laboratory tests. Therefore, chiropractors who, after all, are primary contact practitioners working in the area of spinal pain syndromes and, who therefore see a large number of patients presenting with spinal pain, can only function efficiently if they have access to clinical laboratory facilities. The farce of preventing chiropractors from performing laboratory tests should, if governments are really interested in patient well-being, be amended forthwith to enable chiropractors who are charged with a statutory duty of performing a diagnosis in the course of providing health care services to an individual, to practise efficiently.

Without access to clinical laboratory tests, it would be impossible for this specialised spinal pain unit to function appropriately with regard to making an accurate diagnosis of a patient's presenting signs and symptoms. Therefore, how can chiropractors in private practice be expected to function at maximum efficiency when they are denied the right to order laboratory tests?

A further issue which should be addressed to complement diagnosis is that of chiropractors having direct access to CT, MRI and bone scanning facilities. This is another area where chiropractors and their patients are seriously disadvantaged by medical dominance over bureaucrats who run health care systems in various countries. Clearly, bias and discrimination are promoted over the well being of chiropractic patients.

LGF Giles, DC (C), MSc, PhD (WAust)
Director
National Unit for Multidisciplinary Studies of Spinal Pain
Townsville General Hospital
Townsville, Qld 4810
Australia

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

To the Editor:

I was NOT persuaded by Nansel and Slazak that the autonomic nervous system is necessarily unimportant in the body's function.

Certainly Sudek's reflex dystrophy is autonomic in origin and Barre Lieou syndrome involves several examples of autonomic mitigated dysfunction.

Does innate exist? I'm not a "big picture" chiropractor, but I find interesting studies that suggest prayer has remote healing properties and homeopathic remedies have better than placebo results. Meanwhile our institutions are currently conducting studies to scientifically define chiropractic's parameters.

Perhaps Dr. Morgan should wait for all the evidence before delivering a verdict.

Wayne L. Malott, BA, DC
Stratford, Ontario

To the Editor:

I read with much amusement the article in the most recent issue of the JCCA entitled "Innate intelligence: its origins and problems" by Lon Morgan.

BJ once wrote that the problem with chiropractors is their failure to recognize an innate intelligence which exists in all things. Case in point, Dr. Morgan.

Dr. Morgan writes that the scientific community does not admit to the existence of this "fifth force" as he describes it. Please allow me to quote for you from a book published in 1997.

So, if the flow of our molecules is not directed by the brain, and the brain is just another nodal point in the network, then we must ask - Where does the intelligence, the information that runs our bodymind, come from? We know that information has infinite capability to expand and increase, and that it is beyond time and place, matter and energy. Therefore, it cannot belong to the material world we apprehend with our senses, but must belong to its own realm, one that we can experience as emotion, the mind, the spirit-an inforealm! This term is the term I

prefer, because it has a scientific ring to it, but others mean the same thing when they say field of intelligence, innate intelligence, the wisdom of the body. Still others call it God.

It may surprise Dr. Morgan (who has obviously researched the topic of Innate thoroughly), that this was written by none other than Candace B. Pert, PhD, research Professor in the Department of Physiology and Biophysics at Georgetown University Medical Center in Washington, D.C., former Chief of Brain Biochemistry at the National Institute of Health, and the author of an absolute enormous number of scientific studies in the areas of mostly, but not exclusively, neuropeptides. Let's just say that this is a scientist of the highest caliber.

I could use up much more time and space poking holes in Dr. Morgan's insightful paper, but I'd prefer to quote BJ. From *The Glory of Going On, Volume XXXVII 1961*, he writes in regard to Innate and the major premise:

Properly understood, known, and applied, it would magnify manifold an understanding of the tremendous importance of the ONE CAUSE-ONE CURE principle; and, instead of its being designated an obnoxious term "CULT" which "MUST GO," it should be given our FIRST consideration at all times, always, constantly and consistently.

Enuf said.

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

To the Editor:

Your article on *Innate Intelligence: its origins and problems* is a confusing and misleading attack on chiropractic philosophy. It underscores a pervasive insecurity issue that continues to plague chiropractors. Your article attempts to convincingly argue that the belief of innate intelligence was a thing of the past. You confuse modern day belief systems with scientific accountability. You state that the modern day scientific community cannot measure the 'Fifth Force,' a concept posing a problem in logic, credibility and creating professional isolation. Belief in innate intelligence is no longer a progressive and modern approach. You also state that chiropractors adher-

ing to this philosophy are creating a false sense of security, perpetuating ignorance and harm to the growth of our profession.

Well what is the progressive modern day belief system? One of the most popular and well read modern authors on healing, Dr. Deepak Chopra writes extensively about the 'fifth force.' How about the principles and insights on quantum physics being put forward by leading physicists. The modern day popular best seller 'Vibrational Medicine' by Dr. Richard Gerber which explores the subtle energies of the body and their implications in the healing process. How about the ideas of popular modern day physicians such as Dr. Bernie Siegel, Dr. Larry Dossey, Dr. Andrew Weil, who all write extensively about the 'fifth force.' Most recently, in 'Molecules of Emotion,' Dr. Candace Pert, a world respected and acclaimed neuroscientist emphatically states that as a result of ongoing research she is more than convinced that 'there is an intelligence which runs our body that is beyond our ability to measure, it is beyond time and place, matter and energy.'¹

In this modern day one cannot ignore the rise in popularity of Tai Chi, Qi Gong, meditation, reiki, therapeutic touch, ayurveda, acupuncture, shiatsu, yoga, all which incorporate the 'fifth force' in their philosophical doctrines.

How about the thousands upon thousands of chiropractors and the millions of people who will testify to the 'miracles' of chiropractic care. How about modern day changes in our approaches like network spinal analysis which has documented the presence and perpetuation of a self organizing wave after an adjustment. The wave is inexplicable yet a visible phenomena currently drawing the attention of biophysicists and biomathematicians. It is believed to be a self organizing phenomena characteristic of all living systems.

I ask you Dr. Lon Morgan, are these not a small example of modern day approaches and theories? Ninety five percent of modern day people believe in a force that organizes beyond what can be seen or measured. For many it is God, for others a part of God, spiritual forces, etherial forces, plasma, chi, prana, mana, electromagnetic fields, higher vibrational states, innate intelligence, love, etc. Are they all part of the same or are they distinct and different. Will we eventually quantify some of them or all of them, or are they beyond quantification? Aren't these

modern day questions that have never really left us?

Innate intelligence is the back bone of our philosophy. Why is it hard to say that if interference is removed from the nervous system the body's organizational force – innate intelligence is put to more optimal use? As chiropractors we should be proud to refer to innate intelligence. In addition, we should also be proud of our advancing scientific data base and improved techniques. Our science, art and philosophy should be well known and admired by everyone.

Your article can be misleading and confusing. It confuses modern day socially accepted views with modern day science. Science's inability to measure innate does not negate its presence. Science continually strives to study the universe, it seeks to explore the unknown, why should it reject innate?

The reality of your argument is not science's rejection of innate but of your rejection. Your article is merely a symptom of a deeper issue concerning identity within the chiropractic community. Our chiropractic struggle is not with innate intelligence but with status quo, more importantly, medical status quo which has forced our isolation. If we compete with medicine then we have to act and think like the medical community. Since medicine is void of a philosophy then we must let go of ours as the modern thing to do. In this context our philosophy becomes an embarrassment. It forces us into unhealthy self criticism, division and lack of professional unity.

Chiropractic is scientific, depending on scientific scrutiny and research for it to evolve. Chiropractic is not medicine, but this does not make it unscientific. As a profession we have been severely ostracized and rejected by medical propaganda. Chiropractic does, however, conform with the modern socialized popular philosophical belief systems. Perhaps your article should have more appropriately been titled '*In order to be valued as modern medical physicians, chiropractors should get rid of their philosophy*'.

I feel articles like yours leaves many of us with the impressions that we are a second class operation full of philosophical zealots. Many chiropractors are hard working and caring professionals with the upmost interest in advancing our services and uniqueness of care.

Your article addresses the 'fifth force' or innate intelligence as an unmeasurable force and should therefore be disregarded. There are two problems with this approach:

as research technology advances many unexplainable phenomena of the past have been explained, and, if we stop looking for it we will never find it.

In addition, chiropractic theories have evolved. Have you kept up with the writings of Dean Black, Ted Morter, and Donald Epstein. Have you kept up with the latest research? Are you familiar with the single largest study ever done in chiropractic by Dr Robert Blanks et al. which documents emotional and lifestyle changes associated with chiropractic adjustments that fall beyond physical and spinal biomechanical changes?²

Chiropractic has deep roots embedded in past theories and modern philosophical ones. As we continue to grow as a profession, advance our research and skills, our relationship with the 'fifth force' is going to gain us a leading edge reputation in wellness care, primary health care sought after by every man, woman and child. As chiropractors we should all look forward to becoming the leaders of this philosophical paradigm, a unifying paradigm we proudly embrace.

Anthony Posa, DC
Toronto, Ontario

References:

- 1 Pert C. *Molecules of emotion*. New York: Scribner, 1997.
- 2 Blanks RH, Schuster T, Dobson M. A retrospective assessment of network care using a survey of self-rated health, wellness and quality of life. *J Vertebral Subluxation Research* 1997; 1(4):15-30.

To the Editor:

Just where is our profession going? From the sponsorship of a medical show (which I'm glad to say was canceled), to the editor of this journal stating chiropractic is an "art, science and philosophy," to an article trying to scientifically refute the natural law of innate intelligence. An important point about Dr. Gotlib's statement, in the letters to the editor section of the same issue, is that "chiropractic as we have all studied," is art, science and philosophy. I thought that our forefathers studied and practiced chiropractic as a PHILOSOPHY, art and science. It is true that chiropractic today is studied as a "science" first, an art second and maybe you hear the name Palmer somewhere in your philosophy class. As a fairly recent graduate I can

tell you stories of our philosophy class. Our teacher spent hours trying to refute the ADIO process and actually went as far to state that the process was just the opposite. That disease was actually caused from the outside in. Our philosophy teacher was actually promoting the germ theory. It should be of no surprise that he resigned and went off to attend medical school.

Like Dr. Gotlib stated, chiropractic taught and for the most part practiced today is art, science and philosophy. To put it bluntly, chiropractic today is medicine. Dr. Strauss, in the Pivot Review, makes this point rather clearly. He uses the chiropractor in Spain, who was arrested for practicing medicine without a license, as an example. The Spanish courts and an appeals court agreed that she "talks like a medical doctor, acts like a medical doctor, treats medical conditions as does a medical doctor (except for technique) and in every way appears to be practicing medicine." If we can't convince two courts that we are different, there is something seriously wrong. Where did chiropractic change from detecting and correcting subluxations to diagnosing and treating specific conditions? The diagnosis and treatment of a condition is fundamentally the practice of medicine. Dr. Morgan's article talks about a problem in finding innate intelligence. Unfortunately, science does not have an answer for everything. For Dr. Morgan to state that because innate intelligence is not one of the four physical forces, it does not exist, is preposterous. You cannot state that because something cannot be measured by physical science means that it is a non entity. I ask Dr. Morgan his views on God or Jesus Christ? I do not know of any scientific test that can put God in a bottle. I would like Dr. Morgan to tell the 2 billion or so people that praise God, that "he" is not real. Dr. Morgan is a "science guy," even though his paper is the epitome of pseudo-science. He states that "other science disciplines, from genetics to microbiology to psychology, have added tremendously to our understanding of mankind." It is this great understanding, through science, that has led to remarkable cures for cancer, AIDS, and that menace the common cold. Sure we can isolate the gene that causes breast cancer. Sure you can have a prophylactic bilateral radical mastectomy (even though the "scientists" can't predict which people with the gene will develop cancer). And sure you can still get breast cancer. How has science helped? What has the billions of dollars spent on the discovery of the breast cancer gene done?

Nothing!! Breast cancer will continue to be on the rise until you can determine the cause of the problem and correct it. The defective gene is not the cause. Something had to happen in that person's body to allow the gene to mutate. Natural laws are based upon the species ability to respond to changes in their environment. Every single species in the world has either adapted to change or has died trying. Humankind (and not mankind as Dr. Morgan stated) has thrived and prospered through many difficult times and it will continue to do so. However, even science can predict that your environment has a great deal to do with your bodies ability or inability to prevent or produce disease. Breast cancer is far greater in North America than in the orient. But, when Orientals move to North America and start to live like "us" their rates tend to normalize and they get just as much breast cancer as us. Why? Did their genetic make up completely change when they got off the plane? It is no secret that North Americans live very unhealthy lives. We eat poorly, exercise poorly and live on a very dirty continent. Maybe this has something to do with it? We have pushed the limits of the natural laws and the natural laws are fighting back. Nature will always win.

In conclusion, I wholeheartedly encourage the use of science in chiropractic. That being said, should we not use science to determine what is happening in the body before and after an adjustment? Should we not use WBC counts, CD4 counts, nerve conduction tests etc., anything that might help to explain what a subluxation causes and how the adjustment helps to correct it. Science should not be used to show how spinal manipulative therapy is used to treat a specific condition i.e., back pain or headaches, because this is medicine and not chiropractic. As a separate issue, I am tired of the lack of CHIROPRACTIC articles written by CHIROPRACTORS in this journal that I am helping to fund. At best, Dr. Morgan's pseudo-scientific article should be placed in the letters to the editor section. I wonder that if I submitted an article to the contrary of Dr. Morgan's, would it get published? In the future, I expect to see some subluxation based research in this journal, or I will make a request to have my name taken off of the mailing list. I will also request that the portion of the funds from my dues, that goes towards funding the journal, be returned to me.

Paul H. Dixon DC
Hamilton, Ontario

To the Editor:

I would like to express my deepest thanks to Dr. Lon Morgan for his two recent articles: [1] Pertussis immunization: an update (JCCA, 41(2)), and [2] Innate intelligence: It's origins and problems (JCCA, 42(1)). Having been a student at CMCC for the past three years I can assure you that both of these topics are subjects of intense controversy, both in the student body and faculty. As recently as last year an intern was brought before the disciplinary board for distributing anti-vaccine literature to patients in the H.K. Lee walk-in clinic. Furthermore, the number of self-proclaimed experts in the field of vaccination who have arisen after a few seminars and a class in microbiology has amazed me. I have completed a B.Sc. in microbiology, and an M.Sc. in molecular and medical genetics, with my graduate work focussing on vaccine development, and I certainly **do not** consider myself to be an expert in the field of vaccination. I do however share the concern of Dr. Morgan that as primary health care providers our opinions will undoubtedly contribute to decisions regarding our patient's children. With this in mind, it is essential that we present our patients with information based on the most recent evidence. One of the most significant contributors to the controversy surrounding vaccination is the dearth of questionable information obtained from non peer-reviewed books, newspaper articles, pamphlets, etc. There seems to be an underlying assumption among a significant number of chiropractors (and chiropractic students) that once information has been published, it is inherently equated with truth. It is my hope that with the publication of well researched and referenced articles on vaccination, such as Dr. Morgan's, chiropractors and soon-to-be chiropractors will look up these references, and take steps to educate themselves instead of merely repeating someone else's views.

Dr. Morgan also raises the issue that some chiropractors hold fast to their anti-vaccination views despite current evidence to the contrary. He ascribes this as intolerance to anything associated with medicine. I would add to this statement in that I believe that some chiropractors oppose vaccination because they feel that it threatens to modify D.D. Palmer's monocausal theory in which people get well when the 'innate' power of their body is released by spinal adjusting. This leads into Dr. Morgan's

second article in which he addresses the concept of innate intelligence. If any other topic has been able to generate the magnitude of emotional debate among chiropractors that innate intelligence has, I am unaware of it. I have seen dozens of students enter CMCC completely unaware of the concept of innate intelligence, and within one or two years become convinced that it must form the basis for their lives and practices. Certainly it is important to know the origins of one's profession; however, I must echo Dr. Morgan's beliefs in that if strict adherence to those founding beliefs comes at the cost of dismissal of the best and most current evidence, then the cost of such beliefs comes at too high a price. This is especially true now, as research into manipulative therapy is being conducted on an international level. This has resulted in a staggering magnitude of information with a direct relation to chiropractic, and to summarily dismiss it, would in my opinion, inherently decrease the quality of care to one's patients. I hope that in keeping with Dr. Morgan's article on innate intelligence, future articles which address philosophy cause practitioners and students alike to re-assess the cost of any exclusionary belief system. The theory of innate intelligence, or any monocausal theory for that matter, should be evaluated not only in terms of cost vs. benefit for the individual practitioner, but also for the profession that they represent, and most importantly, for the patients whom they treat and influence.

Jason W Busse, BSc, MSc
Toronto, Ontario

To the Editor:

I would like to address the serious concerns that I have over Dr. Morgan's article in the JCCA March 1998 issue. Dr. Morgan is advocating a mechanistic, reductionist model for chiropractic demanding proof by the standards of RCT's before theory is accepted. By neglecting the vitalistic roots of chiropractic we deny ourselves the experience of observation and the reality of natural laws some of which we cannot yet measure. Two truths in nature that I know to be true are that the nervous system is the most important system in the body and the body is a self-healing organism. This is the basis for what chiropractic is. I take personal offence to Dr. Morgan's categorical assumption

that one is either "chiropractically lobotomized" or a "medical fool" and wonder which category he falls into. If this is the type of civil war being waged within our profession at least we can keep it out of indexed journals. In the future I will stick to chiropractic literature like the Journal of Vertebral Subluxation Research.

Lori Yarrow, DC
Nelson, B.C.

To the Editor:

For those Newtonian D.C.s like Dr. Morgan who worship the god of science, we have two of the most profound discoveries of the century to verify innate intelligence. Electromagnetic fields were discovered by Faraday and Maxwell and Einstein gave us the formula $E = MC^2$. Both discoveries support the fact that you cannot organize matter without intelligence. Dr. Morgan conveniently left out these two events in his attempt to undermine D.D. Palmer. Regardless of how Palmer came to understand innate intelligence, Einstein, Faraday and Maxwell and Ferme, etc. confirmed the presence of innate intelligence in all matter, but D.D. Palmer was twenty five years ahead of them all.

RC Whitney-Douglas, DC
Guelph, Ontario

To the Editor:

I am writing in response to Dr. Morgan's article titled "Innate Intelligence: It's Origins and Problems". As with Dr. Morgan's article on Whooping Cough vaccination that appeared in another JCCA this article definitely shows the division within the Chiropractic profession not only in the interpretation of but also in philosophy.

Chiropractic was discovered in 1895 on the premise of innate intelligence, vertebral subluxation, and the adjustment. This is not to be taken lightly for without this distinction in Chiropractic the profession is no different from other health professions that manipulate. Is not one of the fears expressed by Chiropractors and our profession's political organizations that other health professions

are manipulating and invading Chiropractic's area of so called expertise? The philosophy of Innate intelligence is vitally important in Chiropractic. I hold to the Chiropractic philosophy and Innate intelligence, it serves me and people who seek my help well.

I do believe that an understanding of Innate Intelligence is a major reason for division in Chiropractic. Fortunately for Chiropractic these types of articles by Dr. Morgan help to create discussion on these divisive subjects and help to strengthen and purify the Chiropractic profession.

I do see a day when Chiropractic will be divided professionally not only in our eyes but also in the public's eye as well. It is important for people who seek my help to understand that there are different types of Chiropractors and that Chiropractic provided by Dr. Mark Mitchell is different from the services supplied by Dr. Morgan.

MC Mitchell, BSc, DC
Chiropractic Awareness Council Member
Cambridge, Ontario

To the Editor:

I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to Dr. Lon Morgan for his recent paper because of its timeliness, its pertinence and the substantial and significant impact it will have on the continuing development and evolution of the chiropractic profession.

Undoubtedly, this article required an extensive amount of research and literature review as well as an unselfish devotion of personal time in order to complete it in its comprehensiveness.

Undoubtedly, there will be some criticism from vocal fundamentalists which will challenge the editor as well as the author of this article rather than challenge the concepts. Hopefully enough criticisms of the article will deal with the content and not reflect the immaturity of an attack on the editor or the author.

Specifically there are several quotes contained within the article which are very appealing: 1. The quotation of J. Donahue: "Explaining an unknown (life) with an unknowable (innate) is absurd", and 2. the statement "it remains untestable and unverifiable and has an unacceptably high penalty/benefit ratio for the chiropractic profession", and 3. "it is clearly religious in nature and must be

considered harmful to normal scientific activity" (Dr. Morgan) are very pertinent, succinct and honest.

Clearly it is time that the chiropractic profession discard philosophical concepts that it parades as science and that chiropractic modifies antiquated, philosophical concepts to be consistent with today's scientific knowledge.

Finally it is of paramount importance that the scientific and quiet majority of chiropractors become more vocal in their condemnation of antiquated principles and assist in the evolution of the chiropractic profession into the 21st century for if they fail to express their condemnation of unscientific practices, they give tacit endorsement to the status quo.

In closing I would like to express my sincere thanks for the unselfish dedication of both the author and the editor in bringing issues of this significance to the forefront of our profession so that they can be dealt with in an open, honest and scientific manner.

W Reg Nicholson, MSc, DC
Midland, Ontario

To the Editor:

It was with great interest that I approached the article "Innate Intelligence: Its origins and problems," by Lon Morgan. I had hoped for an intelligent and objective disputation of this concept so central to the philosophy and thus *raison d'être* of our profession. I was not prepared for the intellectual chicanery presented. An opinion dressed in puffery. Certainly not worthy of presentation in our journal, peer reviewed and prestigious. There was a notable absence of objectivity, the sources quoted were largely prejudiced and thus lacking credibility. There was no presentation of the concept of innate intelligence and any quotes were indirect and thus distilled.

The principle of scientific investigation is unimpeachable. Unfortunately as so often happens in other areas principles are easily corrupted by those with differing agendas. It would appear that Lon Morgan D.C. would like us to believe that this was a scientific review and thus worthy of our attention. It would also appear that he would like to see us as technicians of back pain. For this we would not require a university or equivalent education. Certainly there can be no rational justification for a profes-

sion of 'back-crackers'. Orthopracors of the world unite – you have a leader!

By publishing an article of this calibre within the body of our journal, masquerading as a review article you denigrate the whole publication. By all means have some stimulating and provocative opinions, such as mine might be, but publish them as such and distance the Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association from them. This is not the first time that you have debased the Journal by publishing opinions by this author. I regret that my funds are being used for this disservice to the profession.

At its most simplistic level surely no one would argue against the premise that all functions of the body are controlled intelligently, an intelligence that is dedicated to the survival of the physical matter of the body and the species? Perhaps this is inborn/innate intelligence, or are we to believe that it is from without that we are controlled?

Dr. Morgan would have more credibility if he were to provide a reasoned critique of e.g. "The triune of life" by Reggie Gold or of some of the other thinkers of the profession; some of whom come to mind – Drs. Kent, Gentempo, Barge, Santo, Holder, Sigafosse, Strauss, Stephenson and Williams to name but a few. Even a first hand, original critique of the greatest of them all, Dr. B.J. Palmer, would be stimulating.

Roger H. Mayall, MA, DC
Hamilton, Ontario

To the Editor:

As a 1996 graduate of C.M.C.C. I, like most recent graduates, knew as much about chiropractic history and philosophy as that which I was willing and able to learn on my own. Thankfully, due to the almost heroic effort of recent individual students at C.M.C.C. there is a renewed appreciation for our professions' past and future. This recognition of our uniqueness in a redundant and ineffective health care environment is priceless to all of us; especially the new graduate, who represents the future.

Your recent publication of two articles (ironically by the same individual), while representing freedom of speech and perhaps that 20% of chiropractors that the C.C.A. labels "conservative" can, in my eyes, only be seen as part of an agenda or irresponsible journalism. In light of

having (past tense!) consistently read the JCCA and in the absence of any recent articles permitting free speech for the equal 20% representing "conservative" chiropractic, what is one to conclude? I suppose I could assume that such biased and conceptually flawed writings like that of Dr. Lon Morgan's and their subsequent publishing in our National Association's journal is meant to rally and unite us in frustration!

That is how this chiropractor will turn a negative into a positive – my Innate Intelligence says!

David Phelps, DC
Burlington, Ontario

To the Editor:

I would like to thank Dr. Morgan for the extremely well written article about innate intelligence that was printed in the March issue of the JCCA. I feel the points that were discussed were valid, and I think that every chiropractor or chiropractic student would benefit by reading this article.

I am currently studying to be a chiropractor, and I have always thought of myself as a critical thinker. Dr. Morgan's article defined my thoughts to a tee. I don't question that D.D. Palmer was a great man and I am grateful that he founded this profession. However, I do question some of his theories and I can not accept everything he said on blind faith. A lot has changed since 1895 and I think we owe it to our patients to change with the times.

I did have one problem with this article. I did not write it first!

Luke Boudreau, BSc
Chiropractic Intern
President of the Student
Canadian Chiropractic Association 97-98
Toronto, Ontario

To the Editor:

After flipping through the June issue of *Men's Health*, (sorry, I know it's not *Scientific American*) a high-lighted box stated "seventy-nine percent of doctors believe that God or some higher power sometimes intervenes to cure an illness." I'm sure they were referring to Medical Doctors, Scientific Medical Doctors. Imagine being schooled in Science and yet saying "a higher power intervenes."

Dr Morgan stated that Chiropractic's dilemma is that it can not satisfactorily demonstrate to the scientific community that Innate Intelligence even exists. And I guess the dilemma of Science is that it can not satisfactorily disprove to the Chiropractic community that Innate Intelligence exists.

I find it odd that many in the Chiropractic profession seek science and higher third party pay coverage, while medicine is moving to a model that recognizes the limits of science, but includes what Chiropractors call Innate Intelligence.

If it comes down to deciding whether Innate should be retained, let the nay sayers call themselves whatever they want, as long as it's not a Chiropractor.

David McLachlan DC
Toronto, Ontario

To the Editor:

I must congratulate Dr. Morgan for his treatise of the issue of innate. No doubt this essay will be met by a diverse reaction and opinion amongst members of the profession. The issue of innate is as Dr. Morgan illustrates, one which really can't be solved and is probably a moot point anyway. Most patients present to a Chiropractor because of pain, and the bulk of this is low back or neck pain. The underlying mechanisms responsible for these sorts of pain continue to be the subject of inquiry and research. However, the reader will have difficulty finding any published, peer reviewed data finding that a patient's ailment resulted from a deficiency or excess of "innate". Degenerative disease affecting the intervertebral disc and motion segment, joint mobility problems, muscular deconditioning, strength and flexibility deficiencies are however very prominent findings which can often be confirmed with some objectivity.

Logical investigation into the cause of suffering on the part of back pain sufferers calls for lines of inquiry which cross professional boundaries and lie within the common language of science. There is no justification for perpetuating the use of a term which really has no meaning and represents the attempt of some to "hang on" to terminology of the past. Good science is not interested in who is right or who is wrong, simply which hypothesis can explain the problem the best. The latest Chiropractic Report (May 1998 Vol. 12 No. 3) specifically addresses the issue of profession specific terms and the need to discuss issues in a clear acceptable manner understandable between professions. The use of the term "innate" defies inter-professional communication.

Is there some sort of homeostatic mechanism which is "put right" in some cases by manipulating the joints of the spine? Is there a positive feedback cycle of pain and muscle activity which may perpetuate a "dysfunctional" spinal motion segment? Very probably; a recent paper by Marshall KW, and Tatton WG (*Neuro-Orthopaedics* 1997; 21:47-62) makes for good reading concerning muscle spindles, convergence, central excitation, positive feedback and the suggestion that "at least some reflexive modulation of muscle activity is mediated by the gamma motor system". There was no reference to innate in this elegant paper which furthers the model of aberrant afferent input and reflexive motor activity. Quite simply, concerning the beneficial effects often experienced as a result of Chiropractic treatment, a better mouse trap is being developed, and it's not the explanation offered 100 years ago of "innate". We now know that folic acid is effective at treating homocysteine related hypercholesterolemia and resultant atherosclerosis ... but these answers didn't come from stubbornly hanging on to ancient philosophy.

The question of innate and the question of what Chiropractor's actually treat seems to have a precedent in another field of health care. ... Optometry. Ophthalmologists test for and diagnose visual disease, write prescriptions for refractive correction and opticians fit the glasses. Why then, is there a field such as Optometry (part of a University by the way) which seems to fit somewhere in between the disciplines of Ophthalmology and the Optician? Could it be that this sort of "sub-specialty" fits nicely in this niche? Optometrists speak the language of science, and have fulfilled a place deserved of their particular "sub-specialty". Is Chiropractic not a **specialized branch** of the

healing arts particularly adept at the non-surgical management of spinal pain disorders, using a highly skilled treatment modality (such as spinal manipulation when necessary and prudent) in addition to exercise and adjunctive therapies? There is a broadly developing expertise in the research area of Chiropractic which is only now beginning to pay dividends in the published literature. The stubborn insistence of using an antiquated theorem such as the philosophy of "innate" in order to substantiate a treatment regime and keep the body "free of subluxations" is to ignore a mounting body of scientific evidence concerning pain and the effective treatment thereof.

Chiropractic treatment must stand up to rigorous scrutiny or it does not deserve to have any place in health care. When criticized, DCs are quick to trot out the science of manipulation, its efficacy, effectiveness and relative safety. Yet some practitioners and an alarming number of students continue to embrace the unscientific principle of "innate".

Physiotherapy treatment is often paid for by third party payers virtually sight unseen with few questions asked and this profession continues to receive a flood of referrals from traditional medicine and the public. Physiotherapists and Athletic therapists are now taking weekend courses in manipulation and are using this modality of treatment increasingly because of its scientific proof. Some Athletic and Physio-therapists are now attending private colleges in Montreal in order to receive certification as "Osteopaths". There are claims of visceral manipulation and all manner of scientifically unsubstantiated modes of treatment being made: however, this does not seem to pose a problem. Why, despite the volumes of credible literature to support Chiropractic treatment of back pain is this mode of therapy continually relegated to the third world of health care? Is the situation fair, cost effective or just? Probably not, however this trend does reflect interprofessional communication and common sense language ... something which often cannot be said about the Chiropractic profession.

It's time we (all of us) let practice management take a back seat to sound evidence based practice ... or before long, there won't be one.

W. Mark Erwin BA, DC
Clinician, King's Health Centre
MSc candidate, programme in Neuroscience,
Institute of Medical Science, University of Toronto

To the Editor:

I have read with great interest the above mentioned article. Thank you to Dr. L. Morgan for having the spine (apparently well manipulated) and the audacity to come forward to confute the concept of Innate. The amplitude of this subject and excellent presentation of this in-depth analysis leave no place for criticism.

Absolute metamorphic remodeling in view of Innate Intelligence is occurring within this profession and will unquestionably continue to disease our profession well into the next century. Today more than ever it behooves every practitioner to seriously analyze, dissect and revisit Innate.

While Innate Intelligence remains a metaphysical enigma it concomitantly creates a widespread tragic schism dividing our profession. Now is the time to rethink the concept of Innate. Innate is derived from occult practices and as Dr. Morgan points out, it carries a high penalty in divisiveness and lack of logical coherence. I for my part do not want to be associated with the New Age Movement of religious practices and be labeled "a contingency of chiropractors that believe that Innate intelligence runs through and is connected to universal intelligence etc."¹ I cannot buttress the Innate concept and fill out respective MVA insurance forms, deal with insurers and state that Innate, a form of mysticism will heal an acceleration / deceleration injury in a required time period.

I will not propagate healing methods which have no genuine basis in reality, nor common sense and which openly defy well established principles of the basic sciences and in some cases tamper with dangerous realms of the occult.

I am concerned about the future of this profession. Spinal research has provided us with the documentation that has supported the efforts of provincial and national lobbyists, lawyers and has assisted in major breakthroughs for our profession in the removal of obstacles that at times seemed to threaten this profession. I firmly believe such actions as these are directly linked to high calibre quality spinal research that has been done in the past that supports the benefits of manual spinal manipulation.

The public is paying attention. They are taking control of their own health care needs and they are choosing spinal manipulation in greater numbers. The momentum has begun and we cannot allow it to be dampened by the archaic concept of Innate Intelligence.

In conclusion I have ejected Innate. Let the theologians deal with this concept!

Klaus Lutzer
BA, DC, DAAPM
Kitchener, Ontario

Reference

- 1 Reisser Paul C, *New Age Medicine*, 1987 Inter Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois. p. 19-22, p. 80.

To the Editor in reply:

I wish to thank those doctors who wrote opposing the recent article in JCCA on the subject of Innate Intelligence.¹ A thank you also to Drs. Nicholson, Lutzer, Erwin and Luke Boudreau, and Jason Busse, for their comments.

To those who are in disagreement with the content of that article I wish to emphasize that no disrespect was intended towards D.D. Palmer. The article sought to examine the origins and current implementations of Palmer's ideas. His views reflected a common 19th century folk milieu that sought supernatural answers for everything: where to dig a well, when to plant a crop, how to treat an ailment.

While most of us would consider using phases of the moon to determine crop planting as quaintly naive, this really is no different from Palmer's early beliefs as a Magnetic Healer. Both sprang from a common source of folk legends. It is worth remembering that Palmer treated his patients' ailments, apparently successfully, for a good many years doing nothing more than holding his 'magnetic' fingers directly over an afflicted organ. Palmer's emphasis on the spine, and the supposed effects of the sympathetic nervous system, didn't come into the equation until many years later.

I would like to respond to certain specific points raised in the letters to the editor.

Dr. Malott claimed that Sudeck's reflex dystrophy (aka reflex sympathetic dystrophy-RSD) and Barre-Lieou syndrome represent examples of autonomic mitigated dysfunction. While autonomic dysfunction was originally suspected in these conditions, this assumption is being increasingly questioned. Dr. Malott is referred to Pittman's study on Complex Regional Pain Syndrome which questioned a sympathetic association.²

In an accompanying article Ochoa notes: "The concept of reflex sympathetic dystrophy would not have persisted through much of our century were it not for its legitimization by an apparent diagnostic test, namely the sympathetic block. Such 'blocks' are regarded as positive if the patient reports subjective improvement. However, when this test is controlled for the placebo effect, it appears to be no more than a placebo effect." Increasingly, RSD is being seen as a "pseudoneurologic illness."³

Barre-Lieou syndrome is an extremely rare entity in the current literature. It seems to be a cluster of symptoms;

dizziness, ringing in the ears, etc., without overt pathology. Whether even these symptoms are of sympathetic origin is frankly uncertain.

I am also familiar with the studies of Sato,⁴ Gillette,⁵ Budgell,⁶ on the autonomic system. These studies all demonstrate spinovisceral reflexes, which are normal physiology. However, none of these studies demonstrate that spinovisceral autonomic reflexes produce pathology, something quite different.

Dr. Whitney cited a quote from Candice Pert claiming a supposed "inforealm" that is "beyond time and place, matter and energy." Ms. Pert uses these buzzwords, not because she can credibly establish them as being valid, but only because, as Ms. Pert herself admits, "it has a scientific ring to it."

Dr. Whitney claims Ms. Pert is "the author of an absolute enormous number of scientific studies." What is more accurate is that Ms. Pert was a member of research teams producing papers, especially on neuropeptides, during the 1980s. Ms. Pert never solely authored a single published study, including the initial one on neuropeptides.⁷ Ms. Pert does not appear to have been involved in research since about 1990, preferring lately to work the lecture circuit promoting her book.⁸ I would remind Dr. Whitney that Ms. Pert, while an able scientist, worked in collaboration with numerous other scientists. Further, none of the studies Ms. Pert participated in examined the role or existence of anything analogous to Innate Intelligence or 'inforealms'. The 1990s have seen countless additional studies on neuropeptides and psychoneuroimmunology by other researchers. Not a single one of these studies have identified any so-called "inforealm." Ms. Pert is entitled to her private religious views, but she has published no credible evidence supporting them.

Chiropractic fascination with Ms. Pert's book is probably explainable by her endorsement of the Network and Upledger fringe modes of chiropractic. (p. 275)

Dr. Posa also referred to the lay-press writings of Deepak Chopra. Chopra has group-authored a couple of articles on the potential benefits of Transcendental Meditation and Ayurveda.^{9,10} Those studies did not establish the existence of Innate Intelligence. The clinical relaxation benefits of TM, and other meditative techniques, are quite explainable with contemporary science. In 1994, *Forbes* magazine referred to Chopra as "the latest in a line of gurus who have prospered by blending pop science, pop

psychology, and pop Hinduism." A more detailed critical review of Chopra's activities is available on the Internet.¹¹

Chiropractors claim to be trained in the health sciences, yet it is curious how quickly we turn to the dubious paperback press for our basic health information. In our collective credulity we rely on unqualified purveyors of populist pulp. One of the most egregious examples being Gary Zukov ("Dancing Wu Li Masters") who, despite a complete lack of science training or experience whatsoever, makes a wide range of health claims supposedly associated with quantum mechanics. Credulous chiropractors are big customers.

Dr. Dixon claimed the Innate article represented pseudoscience, but he failed to document a single example that would support that conclusion. The fact that he disagrees with the article does not invalidate it. Dr. Dixon further inferred that because something cannot be measured doesn't mean it doesn't exist. I agree. It is, after all, very difficult to prove a negative.

The point Dr. Dixon misses is: if there is *-no-* evidence for the existence of something (Innate) then how can you say for certain it *-does-* exist? How can chiropractic base an entire profession on something for which there is zero evidence? To rely on patient testimonials as supposed evidence for the existence of Innate is the ultimate chiropractic cop-out.

Dr. Mayall's letter on the Innate article could best be summed up as "he didn't like it." If Dr. Mayall disagrees with the article then he is under some obligation to provide cogent counter-arguments and coherent evidence that would support an alternate conclusion. Dr. Mayall's letter, however, was devoid of both argument and evidence. He could do nothing more than point to other purveyors of Innate theology. His response was ultimately nothing but circular huffery.

Dr. Whitney-Douglas made the remarkable and unreferenced claim that Einstein, Faraday (sic), etc., "confirmed the presence of innate intelligence in all matter," and that "you cannot organize matter without intelligence." With all due respect, I suggest Dr. Whitney-Douglas has seriously confused his forces. Science recognizes four natural categories depending on the force they carry and the particles they interact with. They are gravity, electromagnetism, and the weak and strong nuclear forces. No where, at any time, did any of the scientists alluded to above make any claims or discoveries con-

firming the existence of an additional fifth force, i.e., Innate Intelligence. Nor did any of them ever, at any time, ever confuse Innate Intelligence as being one of these four fundamental forces. Astrophysicists are pretty much in agreement that all matter originated in the "Big Bang" without intelligence being a measurable cofactor. As a start, I would refer Dr. Whitney-Douglas to any of the writings of Stephen Hawking, probably the most brilliant theoretical physicist of our time.¹²

Dr. Yarrow felt that unless we rely on vitalism "we deny ourselves the experience of observation." I disagree in that initial observations are the very heart of the scientific process. All scientific discoveries begin with systematic observations, which are then confirmed by experimentation.

Dr. Yarrow further claimed that "the nervous system is the most important system in the body." It's difficult to say which system is the most important in that we would die with the loss of any of them. However, current research is pointing to the remarkable power of the hormonal system, especially the HPA axis, as being a prime mediator of body function. A study will be appearing soon in JMPT on the topic of Psychoneuroimmunology exploring this concept further.

Dr. Mitchell noted that "other health professions are manipulating and invading Chiropractic's area of so called expertise." I fully agree – and the invasion is occurring without reliance on the artificial contrivance of so-called Innate Intelligence. This should be a wake-up call to chiropractic: all the benefits of our adjustive care can be easily delivered by others, just as well, maybe cheaper, with equal results. Moreover, others can deliver this care without the crutch of Innate Intelligence.

It has been three years now since the landmark paper by Nansel and Szlazak challenging the role of the autonomic system in true visceral disease was published.¹³ Nansel and Szlazak demonstrated that even massive interruption of Innate (autonomic) fails to produce identifiable pathology. After three years of opportunity chiropractic Innatists have utterly and completely failed to produce a single coherent or credible rebuttal. Again, even metaphysical views, like Innate, are meant to have some kind of rational, verifiable basis. Where is it?

I propose chiropractic's addiction to the dogma of Innate Intelligence is explainable under the "Tenacity of Systems of Opinion and the Harmony of Illusions" concept

presented in the noted 1935 work by Ludwik Fleck.¹⁴

The denial phenomenon Fleck describes avoids challenges to prevailing belief with an active reaction whereby:

- (1) A contradiction to the prevailing belief system is deemed unthinkable.
- (2) What does not fit into the belief system is ignored.
- (3) If it is noticed it is kept secret, or
- (4) Great effort is made to explain away the contradiction.
- (5) Despite valid contradictory views, believers see and describe only that which supports previously held views¹⁴

Fleck's concept of *Illusion Tenacity* precisely describes chiropractic's addiction to Innate Intelligence.

Many of the letters opposing the Innate article typified two characteristics common in chiropractic: reliance on logical fallacies and "pop science."

The general logical fallacies in the letters to the editor included:

Argumentum Ad Hominem: if you don't like the message then attack the messenger.

Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam: the claim that an argument is true because it hasn't been disproven, i.e., "we can't prove Innate does not exist, therefore it must exist."

Argumentum Ad Antiquitatem: claiming something is true because it's been around for a long time, i.e., "B.J. said it, I believe it, Enuf said!"

Argumentum Ad Numeram: if more people believe an idea it must be correct, i.e., "Chopra is selling more books, thus he must be right."

Argumentum Ad Verecundiam: authorities are appealed to on matters outside their field, i.e., "Ms. Pert studied neuropeptides, thus she must be an expert on non-existent 'inforealms.'"

A fascination with pop science is not unique to chiropractic, but we are heavy participants. Fleck described the phenomenon in 1935 as "science for nonexperts."¹⁴ Pop science is typified by popular presentation which omits detail and conflicting evidence, and which provides artificial simplification. With pop science books to sell, authors like Pert and Zukov are unrestrained by peer review or accountability. Carl Sagan described pop science as "providing easy answers, dodging skeptical scrutiny, casually pressing our awe buttons and cheapening the

experience, making us routine and comfortable practitioners as well as victims of credulity."¹⁵

The theology of Innatism owes its very existence to chiropractic's collective addiction to logical fallacies and pop science.

Chiropractic's unquestioning acceptance of Innate Intelligence results in a near total loss of critical thinking ability and a reluctance to question chiropractic's theological status quo.

This is not a suggestion to throw out all that is chiropractic. We have much to offer that is credible. As Mootz points out, our approach is: noninvasive, patient-centered and hands-on, it recognizes the dynamics of lifestyle, it focuses on early intervention, and we really believe the adage of "first do no harm."¹⁶ But we can do it all without Innate!

In conclusion, I have great respect for all my chiropractic colleagues, whether I agree with their individual "philosophy" or not. To those who feel threatened by my words, or who feel inclined to cancel subscriptions because they aren't reading what they want to read, I would ask that you remember: a true scientist welcomes the challenge and the opportunity to discard outworn notions. Only closed-minded dogmatists are threatened by a call to re-examine closely held beliefs.

Lon Morgan, DC, DABCO
Nampa, ID

References

- 1 Morgan L. Innate intelligence: its origins and problems. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 1998; 42:35-41.
- 2 Pittman D, Belgrade M. Complex regional pain syndrome. *Amer Fam Phys* 1997 Dec; 56:2265-85.
- 3 Ochoa J. Reflex Sympathetic Dystrophy: Fact and Fiction. *Amer Fam Phys* 1997; 56:2184-5.
- 4 Sato A. Somatovisceral reflexes. *JMPT* 1995; 18:597-602.
- 5 Gillette R. A speculative argument for the coactivation of diverse somatic receptor populations by forceful chiropractic adjustments. *Man Med* 1987; 3:1-14.
- 6 Bugdell B, Hotta H, Sato A. Spinovisceral reflexes evoked by noxious and innocuous stimulation of the lumbar spine. *JNMS* 1995; 3:122-31.
- 7 Pert C, et al., Neuropeptides and their receptors: a psychosomatic network. *J Immunol* 1985; 135(2 Suppl):.
- 8 Pert C. Molecules of emotion. 1997, New York: Scribner. 368.
- 9 Sharma H, Triguna B, Chopra D. Maharishi Ayur-Veda: modern insights into ancient medicine. *JAMA* 1991; 265:2633-4.
- 10 Glaser J, Brind J, Vogelmann J, et al. Elevated serum dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate levels in practitioners of the Transcendental Meditation and TM-Sidhi programs. *J Behav Med* 1992; 15:327-41.
- 11 Internet, <http://www.quackwatch.com/04ConsumerEducation/chopra.html>.
- 12 Hawking S. A Brief History of Time. 1996, New York: Bantam Books. 248.
- 13 Nansel D, Szlczak 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; 18:379-397.
- 14 Fleck L. Genesis and development of a scientific fact. 1979, Chicago: Univ of Chicago Press. 202.
- 15 Sagan C. The demon-haunted world. 1997, New York: Ballantine Books. 457.
- 16 Cherkin D, Phillips R, Mootz R. Chiropractic in the United States: training, practice, and research., 1998, AHCPR: Seattle.

The integration of surface electromyography in the clinical decision making process: a case report. JCCA 1998; 42(1):21-34.

To the Editor:

Congratulations on your recent article, "The integration of surface electromyography in the clinical decision making process: a case report", appearing in the Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association, 1998; 42(1):21-34.

It is commendable and most appropriate that you continue to provide the profession with needed evidence on the clinical usefulness of surface electromyography. It is especially important, that articles like yours appear in a peer-reviewed journal, to support the review process undergoing of the Clinical Guidelines for Chiropractic Practice in Canada. I wholeheartedly thank you for your efforts.

Zoltan T Szaraz, DC, FIACA, FCCRS(C)
Chairman, Standards of Practice/
Guidelines Committee of the CCA

To the Editor in reply:

I thank you for your kind comments in respect to the aforementioned case report.

There is considerable work left to be completed to address the concerns as delineated in the Practice Guidelines (JCCA 1994; 38(1) supplement), before there can be any change in the procedural rating of either scanning (static) or dynamic (fixed electrodes) S.E.M.G. Some of those concerns have previously been addressed in the Journal (JCCA 1996; 40(4): 203-213) by addressing minimum technical specifications, the existence of a quality assurance program, some patient preparation protocols as well as the establishment of a training program through the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College in Toronto.

Again I would like to thank you for your assistance, guidance, and encouragement in the ongoing developments of surface electromyography.

W Reg Nicholson, MSc, DC
Midland, Ontario

**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**