

HISTORY OF CHIROPRACTIC

Chiropractic traces its origin back to ancient times In Greece, Rome, Egypt, China and India. Healers had become experts in spinal anatomy and bio- mechanics, and were aware of the adverse effects of spinal misalignment. They knew how to perform joint manipulation and restore alignment to a twisted “frame” in order to alleviate a wide range of ailments.

Hippocrates wrote numerous books on healing, and mentioned the importance of Manipulation and "On Setting joints by Leverage". He said “look well to the spine, for many diseases have their origin in the dislocations of the vertebral column”. Indians, Chinese, Polish, Hungarians, Arabs and Mexicans, all knew the benefit of joint manipulation.

One of these early pioneers was Daniel David Palmer the founder of Chiropractic. The word comes from the words “Cheir” and “Praktikos” which means HAND and EFFICIENT. Chiropractic is an old / new health profession, old in its inception, new in its popularity. The profession was founded in September 18th 1895 in Davenport, Iowa, USA, when D.D. Palmer placed his hands upon an irregular protrusion “ misalignment” of the neck of Harvey Lillard who had at that time hearing loss , and with a forceful thrust reduced this irregularity. As a result Mr. Lillard claimed “I hear the wagons on the street” something he could not do prior to receiving this manipulative treatment.

Palmer took a keen and profound interest in the spine. Timing was superb. Interest in the nervous system was at that time was quite high in the scientific circles, and the discovery of X-rays helped palmer at that time too.

He opened the first chiropractic school where 15 students enrolled, 5 of the students were MDs.

My definition of Chiropractic - The art and science of diagnosis and treatment of somatic physiological dysfunction resulting from improper neural function, using manual manipulation (“the adjustment”) as its primary treatment method in order to facilitate resumption of proper alignment of joint components and neural function.

Defintion of Subluxation (ACA)

A subluxation is a complex of functional and/or structural and/or pathological articular changes that compromise neural integrity and may influence organ system function and general health. A subluxation is evaluated, diagnosed, and managed through the use of chiropractic procedures based on the best available rational and empirical evidence.

Theories of Disease

Claude Bernard vs. Louis Pasteur

“BIOLOGICAL TERRAIN VS GERM THEORY”

The germ - or microbial - theory of disease was popularized by Louis Pasteur (1822-1895), the inventor of pasteurization. This theory says that there are fixed, external germs (or microbes) which invade the body and cause a variety of separate, definable diseases. In order to get well, you need to identify and then

kill whatever germ made you sick. The tools generally employed are drugs, surgery, radiation and chemotherapy. Prevention includes the use of vaccines as well as drugs, which - theoretically at least - work by keeping germs at bay.

At about the time that Pasteur was promoting his “monomorphic” germ theory, a contemporary by the name of Claude Bernard (1813-1878) was developing the theory that the body’s ability to heal was dependent on its general condition or internal environment. Thus disease occurred only when the terrain or internal environment of the body became favorable to germs.

Louis Pasteur-Louis Pasteur

Born: 27-Dec-1822

Birthplace: Dole, Jura, France

Died: 28-Sep-1895

Pasteur argued with physiologist Claude Bernard. (see below)

Pasteur’s deathbed statement occurred only ten days after the nominal date of the formation of Chiropractic. He died 9-28-1895, Chiropractic began 9-18-1895.



Claude Bernard was a 19th century French physiologist and contemporary of French chemist Louis Pasteur

Claude Bernard

Claude Bernard, the Father of Physiology, and Louis Pasteur argued throughout their lives as to what really was the cause of disease, the soil or the seed. Pasteur insisted it was the seed (germ) while Bernard claimed it was the soil (the body).

On Pasteur's death bed, it is said that he admitted that Bernard was right; he said, " it is the soil, not the seed."

(From Wikipedia)

Claude Bernard ([July 12, 1813](#) - [February 10, 1878](#)) was a [French physiologist](#). He was called by [I. Bernard Cohen](#) of [Harvard University](#), "one of the greatest of all men of science" in his Foreword to the Dover edition (1957) of Bernard's classic on scientific method, *An Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine* (originally published in 1865). He is considered as the "Father of [Physiology](#)".

Claude Bernard's aim, as he stated in his own words, was to establish [scientific method](#) in medicine. He dismissed many previous misconceptions, took nothing for granted and was relying on experimentation. Unlike his contemporaries he insisted that all living creatures were also bound by the same laws as inanimate matter.

Claude Bernard's first important work was on the functions of the [pancreas](#) gland, the juice of which he proved to be of great significance in the process of digestion; this achievement won him the prize for experimental physiology from the [French Academy of Sciences](#). A second investigation - perhaps his most famous was on the glycogenic function of the [liver](#); in the course of this he was led to the conclusion, which throws light on the causation of [diabetes mellitus](#), that the liver, in addition to secreting bile, is the seat of an internal secretion, by which it prepares sugar at the expense of the elements of the blood passing through it. A third research resulted in the discovery of the vaso-motor system. While engaged, about 1851, in examining the effects produced in the temperature of various parts of the body by section of the nerve or nerves belonging to them, he noticed that division of the cervical sympathetic gave rise to more active circulation and more forcible pulsation of the arteries in certain parts of the head, and a few months afterwards he observed that electrical excitation of the upper portion of the divided nerve had the contrary effect. In this way he established the existence of vaso-motor nerves, both vaso-dilator and vaso-constrictor.

[\[edit\]](#) Homeostasis

[Homeostasis](#) is the key process with which Bernard is associated. He wrote, "La fixité du milieu intérieur est la condition d'une vie libre et indépendante." ("*Constance of the internal environment is the condition for a free and independent life.*") This is still the underlying principle of homeostasis today.

The study of the physiological action of poisons was also a favourite one with him, his attention being devoted in particular to [curare](#) and [carbon monoxide](#) gas.

Bernard practiced [vivisection](#) to the disgust of his wife and his daughter. He firmly believed that the advancement of medicine and the relief of human suffering justified the suffering of animals but his wife was not convinced, the couple were officially separated in 1869 and his wife went on to actively campaign against the practice of vivisection.

[\[edit\]](#) *Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine*

In his major discourse on scientific method, *An Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine* (1865), Claude Bernard describes what makes a scientific theory good and what

makes a scientist important, a true discoverer. Unlike many scientific writers of his time, Bernard writes about his own experiments and thoughts, and uses the first person.^[1]

Known and Unknown. What makes a scientist important, he states, is how well he or she has penetrated into the unknown. In areas of science where the facts are known to everyone, all scientists are more or less equal—we cannot know who is great. But in the area of science that is still obscure and unknown the great are recognized: “They are marked by ideas which light up phenomena hitherto obscure and carry science forward”.^[2]

Authority vs. Observation. It is through the experimental method that science is carried forward—not through uncritically accepting the authority of academic or scholastic sources. In the experimental method, observable reality is our only authority. Bernard writes with scientific fervor:

”When we meet a fact which contradicts a prevailing theory, we must accept the fact and abandon the theory, even when the theory is supported by great names and generally accepted”^[3]

Induction and Deduction. Experimental science is a constant interchange between theory and fact, induction and deduction. Induction, reasoning from the particular to the general, and deduction, or reasoning from the general to the particular, are never truly separate. A general theory and our theoretical deductions from it must be tested with specific experiments designed to confirm or deny their truth; while these particular experiments may lead us to formulate new theories.

Cause and Effect. The scientist tries to determine the relation of cause and effect. This is true for all sciences: the goal is to connect a “natural phenomenon” with its “immediate cause.” We formulate hypotheses elucidating, as we see it, the relation of cause and effect for particular phenomena. We test the hypotheses. And when an hypothesis is proved, it is a scientific theory. “Before that we have only groping and empiricism”^[4]

Verification and Disproof. Bernard explains what makes a theory good or bad scientifically:

“Theories are only verified hypotheses, verified by more or less numerous facts. Those verified by the most facts are the best, but even then they are never final, never to be absolutely believed.”^[5]

When have we verified that we have found a cause? Bernard states:

Indeed, proof that a given condition always precedes or accompanies a phenomenon does not warrant concluding with certainty that a given condition is the immediate cause of that phenomenon. It must still be established that when this condition is removed, the phenomenon will no longer appear....^[6]

We must always try to disprove our own theories. “We can solidly settle our ideas only by trying to destroy our own conclusions by counter-experiments” (p. 56). What is observably true is the only authority. If through experiment, you contradict your own conclusions—you must accept the contradiction—but only on one condition: that the contradiction is PROVED.

Determinism and Averages. In the study of disease, “the real and effective cause of a disease must be constant and determined, that is, unique; anything else would be a denial of science in medicine.” In fact, a “very frequent application of mathematics to biology [is] the use of averages”—that is, statistics—which may give only “apparent accuracy.” Sometimes averages do not give the kind of information needed to save lives. For example:

A great surgeon performs operations for stone by a single method; later he makes a statistical summary of deaths and recoveries, and he concludes from these statistics that the mortality law for this operation is two out of five. Well, I say that this ratio means literally nothing scientifically and gives us no certainty in performing the next operation; for we do not know whether the next case will be among the recoveries or the deaths. What really should be done, instead of gathering facts empirically, is to study them more accurately, each in its special determinism....to discover in them the cause of mortal accidents so as to master the cause and avoid the accidents.^[7]

Although the application of mathematics to every aspect of science is its ultimate goal, biology is still too complex and poorly understood. Therefore, for now the goal of medical science should be to discover all the new facts possible. Qualitative analysis must always precede quantitative analysis.

Truth vs. Falsification. The “philosophic spirit,” writes Bernard, is always active in its desire for truth. It stimulates a “kind of thirst for the unknown” which ennobles and enlivens science—where, as experimenters, we need “only to stand face to face with nature”^[8] The minds that are great “are never self-satisfied, but still continue to strive”^[9] Among the great minds he names [Priestly](#) and [Blaise Pascal](#).

Meanwhile, there are those whose “minds are bound and cramped”^[10] They oppose discovering the unknown (which “is generally an unforeseen relation not included in theory”) because they do not want to discover anything that might disprove their own theories. Bernard calls them “despisers of their fellows” and says “the dominant idea of these despisers of their fellows is to find others’ theories faulty and try to contradict them”^[11] They are deceptive, for in their experiments they report only results that make their theories seem correct and suppress results that support their rivals. In this way, they “falsify science and the facts”:

They make poor observations, because they choose among the results of their experiments only what suits their object, neglecting whatever is unrelated to it and carefully setting aside everything which might tend toward the idea they wish to combat.^[12]

FATHER OF PHARMACOLOGY -

Paracelsus-Paracelsus ([11 November](#) or [17 December 1493](#) in [Einsiedeln, Switzerland](#) - [24 September 1541](#)) was an [alchemist](#), [physician](#), [astrologer](#), and general [occultist](#). Born Phillip von Hohenheim, he later took up the name Philippus Theophrastus Aureolus Bombastus von Hohenheim, and still later took the title Paracelsus, meaning “equal to or greater than [Celsus](#)”, a Roman encyclopedist from the first century known for his tract on medicine.^[1]

Paracelsus was born and raised in [Switzerland](#), of a [Swabian](#) (Wilhelm Bombast von [Hohenheim](#)) chemist and physician father and a [Swiss](#) mother. As a youth he worked in nearby mines as an analyst. At the age of 16 he started studying medicine at the [University of Basel](#), later moving to Vienna. He gained his [doctorate](#) degree from the [University of Ferrara](#).^[2]

Paracelsus pioneered the use of chemicals and minerals in [medicine](#). He used the name “zink” for the element [zinc](#) in about 1526, based on the sharp pointed appearance of its crystals after smelting and the old German word “zinke” for pointed. He used experimentation in learning about the [human body](#). His hermetical views were that sickness and [health](#) in the body relied on the harmony of man, the [microcosm](#), and [Nature](#), the [macrocosm](#).

He took an approach different from those before him, using this analogy not in the manner of soul-purification but in the manner that humans must have certain balances of minerals in their bodies, and that certain illnesses of the body had chemical remedies that could cure them. (Debus & Multhauf, p.6-12)

He summarized his own views: "Many have said of Alchemy, that it is for the making of [gold](#) and [silver](#). For me such is not the aim, but to consider only what virtue and power may lie in medicines." (Edwardes, p.47) (also in: [Holmyard, Eric John](#). *Alchemy*. p. 170)

Paracelsus gained a reputation for being arrogant, and soon garnered the anger of other physicians in Europe. He held the chair of medicine at the [University of Basel](#) for less than a year; while there his colleagues became angered by allegations that he had publicly burned traditional medical books. He was forced from the city after having legal trouble over a physician's fee he sued to collect.

He then wandered Europe, Africa and Asia Minor, in the pursuit of hidden knowledge. He revised old manuscripts and wrote new ones, but had trouble finding publishers. In 1536, his [Die grosse Wundartzney](#) (The Great Surgery Book) was published and enabled him to regain fame.

He died in 1541 in Salzburg, and was buried according to his wishes in the cemetery at the church of St Sebastian in Salzburg. His remains are now located in a tomb in the porch of the church.

After his death, the movement of [Paracelsianism](#) was seized upon by many wishing to subvert the traditional [Galenic](#) physick- and thus did his therapies become more widely known and used.

His [motto](#) was "alterius non sit qui suus esse potest" which means "let no man that can belong to himself be of another"

[[edit](#)] Contributions to toxicology



Monument to Paracelsus in Beratzhausen, [Bavaria](#)

Paracelsus, sometimes called the father of [toxicology](#), wrote:

German: *Alle Ding' sind Gift und nichts ohn' Gift; allein die Dosis macht, dass ein Ding kein Gift ist.*

"All things are poison and nothing is without poison, only the dose permits something not to be poisonous."

That is to say, substances often considered toxic can be benign or beneficial in small doses, and conversely an ordinarily benign substance like water can be deadly if over-consumed.^[3]

He wrote the major work *On the Miners' Sickness and Other Diseases of Miners* documenting the occupational hazards of metalworking including treatment and prevention strategies. He also wrote a book on the human body contradicting Galens ideas.

Galen put forward the theory that illness was caused by an imbalance of the four humours: blood, phlegm, black bile and yellow bile. He recommended specific diets to help in the "cleansing of the putrefied juices" and often purging and bloodletting would be used. This theory was accepted until challenged by Paracelsus who believed that illness was the result of the body being attacked by outside agents.

HEROIC MEDICINE is a term for aggressive medical practices or methods of treatment, and usually refers to those which were later superseded by scientific advances.

It is not known who first used the pejorative term "heroic medicine"; but it is most likely that it was first used by US or British scholars of the history of medicine in the early years of the twentieth century.

Heroic medicine, in which the patient, rather than the physician (or the therapy) was *heroic*, flourished between the 1780s and 1850s. [Benjamin Rush](#) (1745-1813), who signed the American Declaration of Independence, and is considered to be one of the "fathers" of American medicine, and who had trained in medicine at Edinburgh University (1766-1768), was a strong advocate of "heroic medicine"^[1].

During the Age of Heroic Medicine (1780-1850), educated professional physicians aggressively practiced "heroic medicine," including [bloodletting](#) (venesection), intestinal purging ([calomel](#)), vomiting (tartar [emetic](#)), profuse sweating ([diaphoretics](#)) and blistering. Physicians originally treated diseases like [syphilis](#) with [salves](#) made from [mercury](#). These medical treatments were well-intentioned, and often well-accepted by the medical community, but were actually harmful to the patient.

The death of [George Washington](#), on [December 14, 1799](#), may have partially resulted from shock from blood-letting.

ATTEMPTS BY THE AMA TO DESTROY CHIROPRACTIC LED TO THE WILK V. AMA case

Wilk v. American Medical Association, [895 F.2d 352 \(7th Cir. 1990\)](#), was a federal [antitrust](#) suit brought against the [American Medical Association](#) (AMA) and 10 co-defendants by [chiropractor](#) Chester A. Wilk, DC, and four co-plaintiffs.

BACKGROUND

Until 1983, the AMA held that it was unethical for [medical doctors](#) to associate with an "unscientific practitioner," and labeled chiropractic "an unscientific cult."^[3]

Before 1980, Principle 3 of the AMA Principles of [medical ethics](#) stated: "A physician should practice a method of healing founded on a scientific basis; and he should not voluntarily professionally associate with anyone who violates this principle." Also, up until [1974](#), the AMA had a Committee on [quackery](#) that openly challenged what it considered to be many unscientific forms of healing. Wilk has said this committee was established specifically to undermine chiropractic.

In 1976, Chester Wilk and three other chiropractors sued the AMA, several nationwide healthcare associations, and several physicians for violations of sections 1 and 2 of the [Sherman Antitrust Act](#). The plaintiffs lost at the first trial in 1981, then obtained a new trial on appeal in 1983 because of improper [jury instructions](#) and admission of irrelevant and prejudicial evidence (*Wilk v. American Medical Ass'n*, 735 F.2d 217, 7th Cir. 1983).

[[edit](#)] The second trial

In the second trial case the AMA had the burden of proof, needing to establish the validity of the boycott. The court recognized a "patient care defense," but imposed a difficult burden. The defendants had to show their concern could not have been adequately satisfied in a manner less restrictive of competition. So *Wilk* and later cases greatly limit the use of "quality of care" defense in boycott cases.

Just before the second trial, the plaintiffs suddenly dropped their demand for damages and sought only an [injunction](#). Therefore, the resulting trial in May and June of 1987 was a [bench trial](#) in which Judge Susan Getzendanner personally heard the evidence and made factual findings.

[[edit](#)] Judge's findings in the second trial

On September 25, 1987, Getzendanner issued her opinion that the AMA had violated Section 1, but not 2, of the Sherman Act, and that it had engaged in an unlawful conspiracy in [restraint of trade](#) "to contain and eliminate the chiropractic profession." (*Wilk v. American Medical Ass'n*, 671 F. Supp. 1465, N.D. Ill. 1987). She issued a permanent injunction against the AMA under Section 16 of the [Clayton Act](#) to prevent such future behavior. However, she exonerated the two other remaining defendants, the Joint Council on Accreditation of Hospitals and the [American College of Physicians](#), and dismissed them from the case. Dr. Getzendanner said this:

“ The plaintiffs, however, point out that the anecdotal evidence in the record favors chiropractors. The patients who testified were helped by chiropractors and not by medical physicians. Dr. Per Freitag, a medical physician who associates with chiropractors, has observed that patients in one hospital who receive chiropractic treatment are released sooner than patients in another hospital in which he is on staff which does not allow chiropractors. Dr. John McMillan Mennell, M.D. testified in favor of chiropractic. Even the defendants' economic witness, Mr. Lynk, assumed that chiropractors outperformed medical physicians in the treatment of certain conditions and he believed that was a reasonable assumption.

The defendants have offered some evidence as to the unscientific nature of chiropractic. The study of how the five original named plaintiffs diagnosed and actually treated patients with common symptoms was particularly impressive. This study demonstrated that the plaintiffs do not use common methods in treating common symptoms and that the treatment of patients appears to be undertaken on an ad hoc rather than on a scientific basis. And there was evidence of the use of cranial adjustments to cure cerebral palsy

and other equally alarming practices by some chiropractors.

I do not minimize the negative evidence. But most of the defense witnesses, surprisingly, appeared to be testifying for the plaintiffs. Taking into account all of the evidence, I conclude only that the AMA has failed to meet its burden on the issue of whether its concern for the scientific method in support of the boycott of the entire chiropractic profession was objectively reasonable throughout the entire period of the boycott. This finding is not and should not be construed as a judicial endorsement of chiropractic.

The next element of the patient care defense is whether the AMA's concern about scientific method has been the dominant motivating factor in the defendants' promulgation of Principle 3 in the conduct undertaken and intended to implement Principle 3. The AMA has carried its burden on this issue. While there is some evidence that the Committee on Quackery and the AMA were motivated by economic concerns – there are too many references in the record to chiropractors as competitors to ignore – I am persuaded that the dominant factor was patient care and the AMA's subjective belief that chiropractic was not in the best interests of patients.”

Following a decade of litigation, a federal appellate court judge upheld a ruling by U.S. District Court Judge Susan Getzendanner that the AMA had engaged in a "lengthy, systematic, successful and unlawful boycott" designed to restrict cooperation between MDs and chiropractors in order to eliminate the profession of chiropractic as a competitor in the U.S. health care system.”.

On Nov. 26, 1990, the Supreme Court rejected the AMA's appeal in the Wilk vs. AMA case without comment. This marked the end of the long-running antitrust case filed against the American Medical Association (AMA) by four chiropractors in 1976.

The Supreme Court's opinion upholds a U.S. Appeals Court decision that found the AMA guilty of trying to destroy the chiropractic profession.

For years, the AMA's ethics code prohibited medical doctors from referring patients to chiropractors or from cooperating with chiropractors in any way. The AMA also ran an unsuccessful legislative campaign to have chiropractic outlawed or denied Medicaid reimbursement.

In February, 1990, the Seventh Circuit Court upheld an earlier ruling by the U.S. District Court in Chicago, Ill., and ordered the AMA to revise its ethical rules to permit cooperation with chiropractors and to publicize the new rules.

However, the AMA appealed the decision to the country's highest court. The association said it had not violated antitrust laws.

