In this section, Morrison continues to contend that we have misrepresented Crabb’s teachings. Morrison begins by making two points: He says: “In the first place, it is not true that Crabb’s theory is ‘Freudian-based.’”1 The second point Morrison makes is: “Crabb does not speak of his theory as though it were a scientifically established fact. Rather, he speaks of it as based on the Bible.”2

Morrison asserts that we have not established any proof or argument that Crabb’s theory is indeed Freudian-based. Obviously one does not have to follow Freud’s complete system to be Freudian-based. For instance, Adler, who departed from Freud, was still Freudian-based in his view of the unconscious and in his methodology of looking for clues to present behavior in one’s early childhood. Crabb has borrowed from both Freud and Adler and also from psychological theorists who also borrowed from Freud and Adler.

Let the reader determine whether we have adequately shown that Crabb is Freudian-based. To review some of what we wrote in Prophets of PsychoHeresy I, we will quote pages 149-151 from that book:

For Freudians, the unconscious mind provides the magic key that unlocks the true knowledge of the person. The notion of a magic key grows out of their opinion that the unconscious directs and motivates behavior. Hence, if you desire to understand people, you must deal first and foremost with the unconscious. Only in this way can one unravel the “tangled web” of bizarre and troubling behavior.

In Crabb’s opinion Christian counselors cannot hope to properly analyze and counsel people unless they also understand and analyze the unconscious.3 He clearly states that each of us has been programmed in the unconscious mind.4 He teaches that thoughts and evaluations made at the conscious level are powerfully influenced by the unconscious:

The sentences we consciously tell ourselves strongly influence how we feel and what we do. We now can see where these sentences originate. The content of the sentences we tell ourselves in our conscious minds draws upon the wrong assumptions held by our unconscious minds.5

While Crabb believes this to be true, there is no evidence to support his assumption that people’s wrong assumptions or sentences said to themselves originate in a Freudian-based unconscious.

Nevertheless, Crabb contends that conscious activity is constantly motivated by the content of the unconscious in a powerful and pervasive manner. He says:

Though we may not be consciously aware of what we are telling ourselves at every given moment, the words that fill our minds control much of what we do and feel. Much of our behavior is a direct product of what we are thinking unconsciously.6
Not only the motives but also the unique theme or style of our interactions remains unidentified. . . .

Therefore the sinfully wrong strategies by which we manipulate people with our well-being in mind are intentionally hidden from view. They take their place in the **unconscious**. (Emphasis added.)

Belief that unconscious thinking controls and determines behavior not only saturates his books; each case history that Crabb interprets inevitably reveals unconscious assumptions and beliefs controlling conscious activity. For example, he says:

> Consider what happens as a girl watches her mother cry because her daddy doesn’t come home at night. This unfortunate girl may learn the belief that men hurt women. She may then (unconsciously) set for herself the goal of never becoming emotionally vulnerable to a man. When she marries, her goal will motivate her to keep her distance, never to relax in her husband’s love, never to give herself freely to him.9

Psychologists cannot predict behavior. But when a person has problems later in life, a psychologist may try to find out what happened earlier and then apply his theories to explain what happened and why. If behavior cannot be predicted, as Freud readily admitted, such understanding is only guess-work.

Crabb believes that this woman’s conduct as a wife and mother is controlled by past events and unconscious beliefs motivating her from her unconscious. According to this system it is impossible for a person to change without discovering and confronting those so-called unconscious thought-patterns. He contends that “if no work is done beneath the water line, then work above the water line results in a disastrous externalism.”10 (Emphasis his.) Remember that “below the water line” represents the unconscious. Crabb goes on to say that the unconscious contents truly determine the way in which people live. He says:

> We must learn to deal with problems below the water line that typically remain unidentified but still have serious effects on how we live. . . . There are, I believe, processes going on within our personalities that determine the directions we move. . . .11 (Emphasis added.)

We repeat Morrison’s second point: “Crabb does not speak of his theory as though it were a scientifically established fact. Rather, he speaks of it as based on the Bible.”12

Morrison thinks that if Crabb has not directly appealed to the authority of science, he cannot speak of his Freudian-based theory of the unconscious as though it were a scientifically established fact. Crabb’s presentation of Freud’s iceberg metaphor of the mind is not presented from a position of tentative possibility, but rather from a position of authority. And since such a metaphor cannot be found in Scripture, the only possible lesser
authority would be science. While this kind of psychology does not qualify as a science, it operates as though it does. Therefore whenever anyone authoritatively presents Freud’s iceberg metaphor of the mind he is appealing to science, whether he calls it that or not.

Our reasoning is very simple. Nowhere has Crabb shown the presence of the Freudian unconscious in Scripture; it is purely and simply a conclusion of Freud’s cocaine-driven mind at the time. Since it is not found in Scripture (and we shall deal with this later), it was imposed on Scripture from Crabb’s Freudian base.

Morrison also contends that we do not understand Dr. Karl Popper. Contrariwise, we understand Popper very well. Morrison does not understand the point we are making. In the philosophy of science there is an issue referred to as the demarcation problem. The demarcation problem has to do with what is and what is not science. Where is the demarcation? The bottom line is that this type of theory (Freudian, Adlerian, etc), according to Popper and other distinguished individuals, is not scientific.

Morrison quotes Popper as saying, “Theories are . . . never empirically verifiable.” Morrison has once more changed the subject. Then he says that we use Popper to support our contention that “the existence and contents of the Freudian unconscious . . . have never been proven.” We did not use Popper to support that statement, but in the next paragraph of the same section we used Popper to emphasize the unscientific nature of such personality theories. Morrison has confused arguments and evidence because of their proximity on the page.

Apparently Morrison does not like Popper’s demarcation line. But Morrison fails to establish an alternate demarcation line that would include this type of psychology. It seems that Morrison wants his readers to believe that the Freudian, Adlerian, etc. theories are science. If that is his point, he has promoted it by fiat rather than fact. And he is no doubt unaware of the implications of such a conclusion. Wherever the demarcation line is drawn, one must live with the consequences of it. We doubt that Morrison would be willing to live with the consequences of a demarcation line moved to include Freudian/Adlerian psychology as science.

In a section titled “A Valuable Lesson Believers Can Learn from Unbelievers,” Morrison says some very amazing things and comes to a very irrelevant conclusion. Morrison contends that “Popper’s philosophy is adamantly anti-biblical.” He further says:

. . . the Bobgans are not wrong to make discerning use of Popper, just as Crabb is not wrong to make discerning, biblically-informed use of Freud. Morrison concludes:

Their own example shows that the Bobgans have no grounds for finding fault with Crabb for his willingness to read and learn from secular sources.

In this section, Morrison demonstrates his lack of appreciation for types of knowledge (philosophical versus psychological) and is guilty of a logical fallacy. Popper provides a system by which one can examine the demarcation problem just mentioned. Because Popper is setting up standards by which one can place a discipline or activity on one side of the line or the other is completely extraneous to whether he is a Christian or an atheist. What he is doing does not impinge on the exclusive domain of Scripture.

Freud, on the other hand, has devised a system whereby he purports to know who man is and how he changes. These are the very things that Scripture reveals about man.
According to Freud, man is the result of his early psychosexual stages of development and particularly the result of resolving his Oedipus Complex. According to Freud, man is psychically determined. That is why Freudianism is known as psychic determinism.

Determining what is and is not science and who man is and how he changes are two different fields entirely. In his work on the demarcation between science and pseudoscience, Popper has not proposed a psychological system for understanding and changing man, and nothing Popper has written about the demarcation problem would even be used to understand the nature of man or how to help him change.

Morrison fails to see this transparent, but obvious difference. In the process, he makes a logical error known as “false analogy.” One logic book says it this way:

To recognize the fallacy of false analogy, look for an argument that draws a conclusion about one thing, event, or practice on the basis of its analogy or resemblance to others. The fallacy occurs when the analogy or resemblance is not sufficient to warrant the conclusion, as when, for example, the resemblance is not relevant to the possession of the inferred feature or there are relevant dissimilarities.\textsuperscript{17}

The analogy of the Popperian demarcation and the Freudian sex theory is a false one. Therefore the conclusion that “the Bobgans are not wrong to make discerning use of Popper, just as Crabb is not wrong to make discerning, biblically-informed use of Freud” is irrelevant.

Even in the broad area of psychology, there is a vast difference between objective observation of discreet behaviors that may be recorded accurately, which do not impinge upon the exclusive realm of Scripture, and those psychological theories and therapies which purport to understand man, why he does what he does and how he must change. For instance, we would have no problem with psychological studies having to do with perception in reading or with investigations comparing methods of instructing children in reading, unless those methods included practices not allowed by Scripture. We are continually amazed to hear that people think we are opposed to all areas of psychology, since we carefully state our position in every book. Thus, we desire to remind Morrison, as well as our readers, that our concern is with that part of psychology which purports to understand the nature of man, how he is to live, and how he changes. We are opposed to the use of psychotherapy and its underlying psychologies. That area of psychology intrudes on the exclusive domain of Scripture.

Thus Morrison shifts the target from that part of psychology which intrudes on the exclusive domain of Scripture by implying that if we can quote Popper, Crabb should be able to use the insights of Freud, Adler, etc. And this is what most of those who wish to defend this type of psychology do. They shift the target from the area of our concern to a totally different area of psychology or medicine. That is because they cannot refute what we are saying about the religious, nonscientific nature of psychological counseling and personality theories.

In this section Morrison uses various quotes from Dr. Cornelius Van Til to demonstrate that Van Til subscribed to a Freudian unconscious. We accept that Van Til probably did. However, the major difference between Van Til and Crabb is that for Van Til it was a minor deviation from his major writings. The Freudian unconscious is not the rosetta stone of his teachings as it is for Crabb. As we often say, if you remove the Freudian...
and Adlerian ideas from Crabb’s system, it no longer exists. Removing the references to the Freudian unconscious from Van Til would purify his apologetics.

Though Morrison badly misuses logic, he does seem to support the use of it. One writer on Van Til says, “Professor Van Til’s attitude toward logic is somewhat different from the Westminster Confession’s attitude. Nearly every reference to logic in his books is a disparaging reference. He continually criticizes, belittles, and deprecates logic, not the misuse of logic, but logic itself.” To use Morrison’s logic, we should do away with the use of logic because Van Til disparaged its use. Make sense? We think not.

Following his discussion of Van Til, Morrison says:

There is no need, therefore, to view with horror (as the Bobgans do) everything that comes from the pen of a non-Christian psychologist, and to expect that nothing true will be found there.

This statement is false. We have never made such a statement. Furthermore this statement does not even follow from what precedes it. What precedes it is the relationship all men, believers or not, have to the tangible, visible world God has created. To conclude therefore that “a non-Christian psychologist” has like access to the intangible, invisible world of the mind is a false conclusion and a failed analogy.

Morrison also reveals that he did not even read all of the book he is attempting to critique. Not only do we quote research psychologists throughout the book; we explicitly state the precise, limited area of our concern on pages 4 and 5 of Prophets of PsychoHeresy. We quote:

As in our earlier book, we use the term psychoheresy because what we describe is psychological heresy. It is heresy in that it is a departure away from absolute confidence in the biblical truth of God and toward faith in the unproven, unscientific psychological opinions of men.

When we speak of psychology we are not referring to the entire discipline of psychology. Instead we are speaking about that part of psychology which deals with the very nature of man, how he should live, and how he should change. This includes psychological counseling, clinical counseling, psychotherapy, and the psychological aspects of psychiatry.

Our position on the matter of psychology and the Bible is more fully stated in our book PsychoHeresy. We believe that mental-emotional-behavioral problems of living (nonorganic problems) should be ministered to by biblical encouragement, exhortation, preaching, teaching, and counseling which depends solely upon the truth of God’s Word without incorporating the unproven and unscientific psychological opinions of men. Then, if there are biological, medical problems, the person should seek medical rather than psychological assistance.

The opposing position varies from the sole use of psychology without the use of any Scripture to an integration of the two in varying amounts, depending upon the personal judgment of the individual. Integration is the attempt to combine theories, ideas, and opinions from psychotherapy, clinical psychology, counseling psychology, and their underlying psychologies with Scripture. Christian integrationists use psychological opinions about the nature of man, why he does what he does, and how he can change, in ways
that seem to them to be compatible with their Christian faith or their view of the Bible. They may quote from the Bible, utilize certain biblical principles, and attempt to stay within what they consider to be Christian or biblical guidelines. Nevertheless, they do not have confidence in the Word of God for all matters of life, conduct, and counseling. Therefore they use the secular psychological theories and techniques in what they would consider to be a Christian way.  

Morrison not only does not understand what we say; he obviously does not even know what we wrote.

Because Morrison discusses the unconscious so much in this section and the next, we will discuss it briefly here as well as in the next section titled “The Unconscious.” Let us first quote from the Dictionary of Psychology. In reference to the unconscious, it says:

. . . a troublesome and controversial term used, metaphorically, by psychoanalysts to subsume the basic drives, repressed ideas, and unwelcome impulses; it is the part of the psyche in which the id reigns supreme and which is dominated by the pleasure principle. Free associations and dream analyses are said, by psychoanalysts, to be the royal road into the unconscious mind. The doctrine of the unconscious mind was advanced by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) in his early writings, especially in the Interpretation of Dreams.

Here are descriptions of the Freudian unconscious from two different texts:

Essentially, then, the psychoanalytic [Freudian] model shows us an individual dominated by instinctual biological drives and by unconscious desires and motives.

The Hindu concept of man rests on the basic thesis that he is a layered being. .. Hinduism agrees with psychoanalysis [Freud] that if only we could dredge up a portion of our lost individual totality—the third part of our being [the unconscious]—we would experience a remarkable expansion of our powers, a vivid refreshing of life.

First, let us be clear that Sigmund Freud was not the only one to speak about the unconscious. Hermann von Helmholtz and others spoke of it, too. The Freudian unconscious is entirely different from the ordinary use of the word as defined in a regular dictionary, which gives as one of the definitions of the word unconscious: “not aware of.” Additionally, the definition of subconscious reads:

1. occurring without conscious perception, or with only slight perception, on the part of the individual: said of mental processes and reactions 2. not fully conscious; imperfectly aware.

The Freudian unconscious, as presented in his writings and as embraced by the field of psychotherapy, is the driving force behind behavior.

In his attempt to further support his own position, Morrison goes on to quote Dr. Rousas Rushdoony:
This does not mean that some interesting things have not been discovered by psychologists, psychoanalysts, and psychiatrists. To recognize an enemy as an enemy does not mean we cannot learn from him but we must at all times be aware of the framework of his ideas and discoveries.26

We think we know Rushdoony’s writings well enough to know that what Morrison implies by this would be totally repudiated by Rushdoony. Based upon Rushdoony’s past writings and our past conversations and correspondence with him, it is clear that Rushdoony would not accept or in any way endorse Crabb’s use of Freudian and Adlerian ideas. We can certainly learn from observations and from objective research, but definitely not from such psychological theories as that of the Freudian unconscious. We think Rushdoony would be most upset if anyone came to such a conclusion. There are two more quotes from Rushdoony as follows:

If the Bible is right, mental health is a product of justification, of the atonement effected by Jesus Christ, applied and developed in the life of man. . . man cannot find mental health apart from faith and obedience.27

. . . the popular psychology of our time has no rightful place in the church, in that it is implicitly anti-theological; and man-centered rather than God-centered. For pastors to borrow from contemporary humanistic theologies means to introduce an alien doctrine of salvation to their congregations.28

Rushdoony has written a Position Paper which addresses this very issue. The title of the paper is “The Counselling Heresy.” In his paper he specifically criticizes Freud. He says:

Freud saw guilt as basic to the human problem, and those who enabled men to cope with it would become the true priests of the future. Out of this premise, psychotherapy was born. Sadly, the churches have been very quick to adopt it.29

He goes on to say:

The therapy heresy by-passes the fundamentals of Christian faith: the atonement, regeneration, restitution, and more.30

Then Rushdoony tells why the heresy exists:

The counselling heresy is a thriving evil because exegesis and theology are no longer central to the church or the pulpit.31

Some of Rushdoony’s criticisms can rightly be applied to Crabb’s system and to Morrison as a result of his defense of it.

Dr. Jay Adams says:
In my opinion, advocating, allowing and practicing psychiatric and psychoanalytical dogmas within the church is every bit as pagan and heretical (and therefore perilous) as propagating the teachings of some of the most bizarre cults. The only vital difference is that the cults are less dangerous because their errors are more identifiable.32

Dave Hunt has said:

Today the church is being destroyed from within by “Christian psychology” that interprets Scripture on the basis of a bankrupt, atheistic philosophy, which at best turns Christ into a heavenly psychiatrist. Months and even years of “Christian psychiatry” are now attempting to do what was once accomplished in a moment by coming to the cross.33

Paul exhorts Timothy to avoid “profane and vain babblings” and refers to “science falsely so-called” (1 Timothy 6:20). C. I. Scofield comments:

If theories that rest upon mere speculation or insufficient evidence are presented as fact, in any area of knowledge, e.g. in religion, philosophy, science, etc., they deserve the description that the apostle gives here: “knowledge [science, KJV] falsely so-called.”34

Psychotherapy is a most subtle and devious spectre haunting the church, because it is perceived and received as a scientific salve for the sick soul rather than as what it truly is: a pseudoscientific substitute system of religious relief.

Because they rest on different foundations, move in contrasting directions, and rely on opposing belief systems, psychotherapy and Christianity are not now, nor were they ever, natural companions in helping individuals. The faith once delivered to the saints was displaced by a substitute faith, often disguised as medicine or science, but based upon foundations which are in direct contradiction to the Bible.

Morrison asks two questions after quoting the following statement from Rushdoony:

If the Bible is right, mental health is a product of justification, of the atonement effected by Jesus Christ, applied and developed in the life of man. . . man cannot find mental health apart from faith and obedience.35

This is his first question:

What if Larry Crabb’s doctrines of psychology and counselling are in fact built upon that kind of foundation?

We say not “What if?” because it is precisely on the foundation of Freudian and Adlerian psychology that Crabb’s system is based. And Morrison not only admits the influence of Freud, Adler, and Jung in his next question, but does not see the implications of it:
What if the kind of use he makes of Freud and Adler and Jung is precisely and only the kind of use that Van Til says a Christian should be able to make of them?

It is not surprising that Morrison gives such a muddled presentation because he neither realizes the issues involved nor the implications of the answers Crabb presents.

In conclusion:
1. Morrison’s case against Popper does not address the issue of science and pseudoscience.
2. Morrison misrepresents our views in order to criticize them.
3. He has presented no evidence to support his contention that Freudian and Adlerian ideas are in Scripture, and it is transparent that Crabb’s views are psychological in nature.
4. Morrison says, “Even in the days when law was explicitly Christian, judges did not go solely to the Scriptures when deciding a case.” It is hard to understand his point. To what time is he referring? There has been no nation that has been explicitly Christian, though nations have been influenced by Christianity. Is he using the word *Christian* to refer to Israel and suggesting that the Old Testament judges would go to “extra-biblical material” for assistance? To the Amalekites?! To the Hittites?! Unfortunately Morrison misunderstands and misuses our case against psychology. His quoting Rushdoony is spurious. His support for Crabb’s use of Freudian and Adlerian ideas is unsubstantiated. Morrison’s logic and explanations are at times appalling!

In closing this section, Morrison says:

... a Christian counsellor can go to extra-biblical material for assistance without compromising his stand on the Scriptures themselves.36

It is sad that Morrison is little able to discern between the simple, yet profound difference between Popper and Freud and between extrabiblical and unbiblical. In this section he once more gives proof positive of a desire for obfuscation by use of ramble-scramble and topsy-turvy reasoning. All of this appears to be related to a desire to exalt and protect Crabb at any price to logic and the Scriptures.
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