INTRODUCTION

In our speaking and writing over the years, we have never singled out a specific church in relationship to false teaching. However, in this case, the church leadership is publicly united and supportive of a false teaching and has approved a paper espousing it. The church leadership has specifically responded to our book *The Four Temperaments* through a paper written by Brian Myers, Associate Pastor at Spring Branch Community Church (SBCC) in Houston, Texas. The SBCC Administrative Board, which includes the senior pastor, Roger Raymer, approves and supports his paper. That means Myers’ paper has the official approval of the ruling and leading body of the church. It is our understanding that the false teaching we will address is not a small issue in the church, but is part of what it means to be a member of SBCC.

Our response to Brian Myers’ paper follows his sequence. Myers’ paper, dated November 15, 1992, has an Abstract, Introduction, Part I, II, and III, Conclusion, Notes, and Appendixes. However, for clarity, we start our paper with an Introduction followed by the Abstract. Also, our Notes are at the end. Our reply can be read part for part in concert with Myers’ paper.

We are sorry that Myers did not consider many of the crucial problems with typologies, such as the four temperaments and DiSC, or with personality inventories and tests, such as the Personal Profile System (PPS), important enough to address in his paper. The following is a list of some of those serious problems (page references are for *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*):

- The subjective nature of temperament and personality types and tests (120-121)
- Superficiality and error intrinsic to such typologies and tests (123-124)
- Misplaced assumptions regarding such typologies and tests (124-125)
- Generalities appearing as specifics (125-126)
- False assumptions about consistency (126)
- The Barnum effect (173-174)
- The illusion of efficacy that occurs in temperament typologies (176-178)
- Illusory correlation and illusory thinking (178-179)
- Self-fulfilling prophecy (179-180)
- Bondage and legalism of such psychological systems (188-191)

We have not dealt with all the errors and problems with Myers’ paper. In the future we may expand this paper and respond to problems with Myers’ paper that are not addressed in this present version. Also, at some future time we may choose to publish this paper for a broader readership than SBCC.

ABSTRACT

1. We demonstrate that Myers would no doubt not have written his paper had he spent more time in the library, had a better academic background in testing and measurement, known more about the history of psychology, had a better grasp of biblical doctrines, and, most of all, had not been so eager to support Ken Voges’ false teaching. We want to make it clear that we are not inferring, as Myers does of us, that he is being devious at least or lying
at worst. We are saying that Myers distorts both science and the Bible because of his devotion to Voges. There are numerous instances of that in his paper. It is so often true that human relationships eclipse sound judgment and sound biblical application. A good example of this is the case of the three faculty members who left Dallas Theological Seminary because of their change of theology. Human relationships were quite instrumental in the theological shift.

2. Myers argues that, although the four temperaments are obviously linked to astrology, they are only an innocent, added part of that occult system. Our position is that the four temperaments are not only linked to astrology, but that they are an integral, occult part of it. There are virtually thousands of archaic documents. Many individuals, such as Galen, borrowed from others. And, many individuals, such as Galen, were seemingly contradictory at times. Some ancient authors had schools in which students wrote under their mentor’s name.

We have looked through numerous books and translations and have read reports from various individuals who are experts, and we conclude that the four temperaments are an integral part of a total occult system called astrology. Can the four temperaments be dissociated from astrology? Sure they can. But, can they be dissociated from their occult roots? It is our conclusion, from much investigation, that they cannot for numerous reasons. The explanatory power of the four temperaments is similar to that of horoscopes and carries the same implications. The relationship of the temperaments to the horoscope is too good a fit; there are too many similarities. The bipolar nature of the four temperaments is just like that of horoscopes. Just as astrology is related to an external supposedly fixed system (the stars), the four temperaments are related to an internal supposedly fixed system (the genes). Finally, the four temperaments are presented as an integral part of astrology in The Dictionary of Astrology.¹

In a book titled Astrology: Do the Heavens Rule Our Destiny? the authors, John Ankerberg and John Weldon, include a chapter titled “Psychological Factors that Make Astrology ‘Work.’” They list eleven factors which we quote below—except that instead of the word astrology in each sentence, we use the words the four temperaments theory, and in a few instances we change other words to accommodate the meaning and grammatical structure. The reader could just as easily re-read the following and insert the words Personal Profile System or Biblical Personal Profiles.

(1) The four temperaments theory seems to work because clients want it to work.
(2) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it satisfies the human need for friendship, personal security, or dependence on others.
(3) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it can help justify wrong behavior.
(4) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it is made to appear as a science.
(5) The four temperaments theory seems to work because temperament analyzers make interpretations that are, or can be made, universally applicable.
(6) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it is applicable to almost every human situation in life.
(7) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it changes a person’s world view.
(8) The four temperaments theory “works” because it traps people.
(9) The four temperaments theory seems to work because temperament teachers always have “reasonable” explanations for failures.
(10) The four temperaments theory seems to work because of temperament analyzers’ attentiveness or seductiveness.

(11) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it is increasingly a psychology.²

We recommend Ankerberg and Weldon’s book. Read the explanation for each of the listed items above. They’re very revealing.

3. Myers mentions that the men involved in the four temperaments were “the first rate scientists of their day.”³ It is also true that “the first rate scientists of their day” were involved in astrology. Any cursory examination of “the first rate scientists of their day” would establish that fact. Also, any superficial search of the literature would demonstrate that many of “the first rate scientists of their day” were involved in occultism, superstition, metaphysics, and much pseudoscience.

4. Myers would have the reader believe that the four temperaments were derived scientifically. Astrologers use Myers’ same reasoning to justify their use of astrology. When reading Myers’ paper, readers only need put in the word astrology in place of the four temperaments to understand an astrologer’s defense of his system.

5. Myers says, “But the Bobgans selectively present their evidence in a way that borders on dishonest scholarship.”⁴ If there is dishonest scholarship it will certainly be seen by the reader as he reads both papers. Myers makes several inferences in the direction of “dishonest scholarship” to which we respond. Let the reader discern whether there is dishonest scholarship and, if so, which party is guilty. We do not accuse Myers of dishonest scholarship. However, he does twist the facts to fit his preconceived support of Voges.

6. Myers says, “There is tremendous support for typologies like the temperaments in the academic community, and especially for the Personal Profile System used by Ken Voges.”⁵ We prove that statement to be totally false. It would be accurate to say (and we demonstrate this) that there is almost no support for the four temperaments in the academic community, and especially for the Personal Profile System used by Voges.

7. Myers does not understand the issues involved in natural versus special revelation. While we do not wish to get into this topic here, we do wish to point out that the four temperaments always have been and are part of the metaphysical universe, not the physical universe. This error on Myers’ part is quite serious and has implications for supporting other occult activities. There is a gigantic difference between finding helpful information in the natural world (e.g., through physics) and attempting to find truth in the supernatural world (e.g., through astrology).

8. At one point in his paper, Myers suggests that a written critique by Pastor Tommy Ice is “either true or slanderous.”⁶ When you read that in the context of what Myers says, you know he is suggesting slander. As we indicate later, Ice is evaluating what Voges has written, but not Voges himself. Myers fails to understand this distinction. Along with other gaps in his knowledge, Myers apparently does not know that slander has to do with what is spoken; whereas libel has to do with what is written. He means libel, but says, “slander,” apparently because he does not know the difference. This is a common weakness in his paper.

9. Myers has twisted what we have written, used spurious logic, and made false and even libelous-sounding accusations. As we indicate later, Myers has inferred that we are devious at least and lying at worst. We show Myers’ errors and refute his inferred libelous remarks. We would like to make it clear to Myers that we accept and even appreciate substantiated criticisms. However, when he suggests dishonest scholarship and infers that
we are being devious at least and lying at worst, we believe he has impugned our motives and actions. We demonstrate in our reply that Myers has given us plenty of opportunity to respond likewise.

10. Two main logical fallacies used by Myers in his paper are the straw man and the red herring. We describe them in this paper. We encourage the readers to see the straw men as they are erected by Myers and to “smell” the red herrings as they are spawned by him.

11. Myers has misread, misquoted, and misrepresented us as well as having misrepresented the academic literature and the Bible. Myers gives evidence of reading only part of our book and maybe spending one afternoon in a library before coming to his conclusions. As we shall demonstrate, the issue of the relationship between the four temperaments and astrology is complex, involving thousands of documents requiring much time in research—time apparently not spent by Myers. Along the way, we indicate Myers’ poor academics and poor thinking that lead to erroneous conclusions. Myers even goes so far as to quote one of us saying things we never said.

12. Myers’ paper is poorly written, as well as poorly researched. We are sorry to use the “sic” notation so frequently. However his misspellings, grammatical mistakes, and other errors often require such notation. If Myers plans to continue researching and writing, we suggest he obtain academic help for his research and editorial help for his writing.

13. In supporting the use of the four temperaments and the DiSC, which throughout his paper he refers to as the “DISC,” Myers argues in favor of adding a psychological supplement to biblical sanctification. What does this say about the sufficiency of Christ concerning sanctification and daily Christian living? Our concern about the four temperaments is not limited to the occult roots. We are concerned with psychological theories and practices that deal with the very nature of man, how he should live, and how he changes. Because such theories deal with the nonphysical aspects of the person, they intrude upon the very essence of biblical doctrines of man, including his fallen condition, salvation, sanctification, and relationship of love and obedience to God. Psychological theories offer a variety of alternative explanations about the human condition, but they are merely pseudoscience and speculation.

14. We have requested a debate to be held at Spring Branch Community Church between Ken Voges and Martin Bobgan. If Voges is unwilling to debate, then we request a debate between Brian Myers and Martin Bobgan. We hope there will be an affirmative response. There is a lack of common courtesy on the part of SBCC for not having responded by now.

6*Ibid.*, p. 15
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