

Part 9 - Early Schools of Chiropractic – “Naturopathy”

As emphasized in prior articles, section 16 of the 1922 California Chiropractic Act requires the act to be interpreted so as to **not “discriminate against any particular school of chiropractic, or any other treatment”**. In the last article we looked briefly at the history of Dr. John Howard, the founder of National Chiropractic College, and his concept of “physiological therapeutics” as a “school of chiropractic” thought that must be protected under section 16. Let’s turn to “naturopathy”, per se.

The term “naturopathy” has an interesting history. The word was copyrighted by Dr. John Scheel, a “water curist”, and his wife Sophie Scheel, a homeopath. The Scheels sold their copyright to Dr. Benedict Lust who popularized the term to cover what others called “nature cure”, “natural therapeutics” (Henry Lindlahr, MD) or “physiological therapeutics”. (See, e.g. Kirchfeld F, Boyle W. *Nature Doctors*. Portland, Medicina Biologica, 1994, pp. 185-250.)

Dr. Lust wrote in 1921 that although the word “naturopathy” was somewhat of a misnomer (natural disease) he had found the term useful to distinguish this form of practice from allopathy; especially when challenged by the “autocracy, coercion, imposition, intolerance, and persecution of the New York Medical Society in particular, and the American Medical Association in general.” (*Nature Doctors*, p. 191.) Sounds familiar!

It is critical to the present situation in California to recognize that

“The first chiropractic school in California was started in June, 1904, at 1314 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland, and on January 24th, 1905, it was incorporated by Dr. H.D. Reynard, Maude L. Reynard, Dr. W.F. Booth, Dr. E.L. Lichty and Dr. Ruby A Lichty. Later this school was broadened to include naturopathy in its curriculum, and at this time it enlisted Dr. Carl Schultz and his wife of Los Angeles. The seven people mentioned formed a naturopathic board (the **Naturopathic Association of California** – N.A.C.) with Dr. Schultz as president. They then besought the legislature of 1907 to pass a bill legalizing the naturopathic board with the power to issue licenses to naturopathic doctors.” (Keating J, Phillips RB. *A History of L.A.C.C.*, 2001, p. 2.)

The 1907 bill did not pass, but in 1909 the California Legislature amended the 1907 Medical Practice Act to allow, on a one time basis, the (61) persons previously certified by the N.A.C. to become licensed. One of the 61 persons so licensed was Charles Cale who, along with his wife Linnie Cale, founded LACC in 1911.

The referenced Dr. Carl Schultz emigrated from Germany to the USA in the mid-1890s and moved to California in 1900. He brought with him Germany’s heritage in what was at that time often referred to simply as “nature cure”. However, he later adopted Lust’s term (“naturopathy”) for his form of practice.

Dr. Schultz played an important role in the development of the chiropractic profession in California from 1900 to 1935. In addition to cooperating with chiropractors to form the N.A.C., his

contribution included providing internships for LACC students at his Naturopathic Institute and Sanitarium in Los Angeles. (See, Smith B.A. Carl Schultz, M.D., D.O., D.C. 1843-1935. *Chiropractic History* 2001, 21(2): 77-100 for further details.)

But what was included within the concept of naturopathy as used by these early practitioners? A presently useful definition of naturopathy is that from the 1952 *Oosterveen* case to the effect

“That Naturopathy is a mode of healing that attempts to **restore and maintain** health by the use of light, air, water, clay, heat, rest, diet, herbs, electricity, massage, Swedish movements, suggestive therapeutics, chiropractic, magnetism, physical and mental culture, and does not advocate the use of drugs and medicines but does advocate the use of 'dietary supplements which said dietary supplements include all substances found in nature, including those substances found in herbs, the earth and animal tissues, whether raw or refined....” (Emphasis added.)

In the *Oosterveen* case, the medical board, the BCE and the California Attorney General’s Office each agreed that chiropractors (as authorized by the BCE) were entitled to practice naturopathic methods of healing. The *Tain* plaintiffs asserted that the BCE presently has the right (and duty) to define new standards for practice within this tradition; especially if and when presented with a suitable elective curriculum for that purpose. As noted in Part 6, the *Tain* court simply ignored the *Oosterveen* case.

Having identified the naturopathic (physiological, natural therapeutics) materia medica one is then faced with the more daunting task of defining how, when and under what patient circumstances these “materials” should be used. Several sources of direction for this task are available, but I will presently touch upon only two.

According to the authors of the previously mentioned *Nature Doctors*, Henry Lindlahr, MD is credited with being the founder of “Scientific Naturopathy” in the U.S.A. Dr. Lindlahr was born in Germany but moved to the United States and made his fortune on land speculation and as a businessman and banker in Montana. He was diagnosed as having diabetes at the age of 35 (1897) and returned to Germany where he successfully underwent the “nature cure”. This changed the course of his life and by 1904 he had acquired his MD degree and was practicing what he called “natural therapeutics” in Illinois.

Dr. Henry Lindlahr, in affiliation with Dr. John Howard, founded the Lindlahr College of Naturopathy in 1918 in Chicago. This school was absorbed by N.C.C. in 1926. Dr. Victor Lindlahr, the son of Dr. Henry Lindlahr, taught his father’s system of natural therapeutics as part of the naturopathic program offered by LACC during the 1930s and 40s.

Dr. Lindlahr’s contribution to **the theory of natural therapeutics** can be found in volume 1 of a two-treatise work on this subject. Obviously, it would be inappropriate to attempt to detail his position here, but one point is essential: Dr. Lindlahr set the stage for the development of his theory by stating that “There are two principal methods of treating disease. One is the combative, the other is the preventive.... The preventive method does not wait until disease has fully developed and gained ascendancy in the body, but concentrates its best endeavors on preventing... the development of disease.” (Lindlahr H., *Philosophy of Natural Therapeutics*. Chicago, Lindlahr Press, 1922, 4th Ed., p. 1.)

Obviously, any present use of the referenced materia medica must incorporate all relevant data developed since 1922. But, **prevention and early intervention** must remain key concepts. Within that context, the Germanic tradition repeatedly referred to here and Part 8 has advanced into a paradigm which, among other things, utilizes the “Living Matrix” concepts addressed in my Third Series of articles in this publication. This paradigm is presently referred to as “**functional medicine**” and is consistent with the early work of Drs. Howard, Schultz, Lindlahr et. al. This concept of functional medicine would be of invaluable assistance to any organization seeking to have the BCE recognize its right to offer an elective curriculum in keeping with the “schools of chiropractic” referred to in this article and in Part 8. We will turn to the “reflex therapeutics” school of chiropractic thought next time.

*You may contact David Prescott through the **Prescott Group** (888)989-0855 or seek additional information at **www.prescott-law.com***

LACC and SCHULTZ

HOMEOPATHY and LINDLAHR

ELECTROTHERAPEUTICS and 1917 MATERIA MEDICA