

A Response to the Christian Research Institute's Evaluation* of Theophostic Prayer Ministry (Revised 10/21/05)

**Martin Bobgan
Psychoheresy Awareness Ministries**

SUMMARY

For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables (2 Tim. 4:3,4).

Elliot Miller, Editor-in-Chief of Publications, Christian Research Institute (CRI), has written a position paper on Dr. Ed Smith's Theophostic Prayer Ministry (TPM). In his paper, Miller totally misrepresents our work; ignores Smith's claim for God being the direct source of TPM; finesses the fact that TPM is not new information, as Smith claims, but merely an eclectic combination of psychotherapies practiced by him for years, plus inner healing; fails to recognize the junk science involved in TPM; overlooks the damaging effects of Smith's practice of recovered memory therapy and visualization; gives his personal impressions and opinions on important issues without the necessary support where needed; disregards a number of the outrageous and unsubstantiated claims made by Smith; does not condemn Smith enough for his extreme misuse of Scripture; and finally undermines his own many warnings about TPM by leaving the door open for Christians to pursue it.

TPM is thoroughly unbiblical and lacks scientific support for its claims and practices. Smith admits that he could not find any biblical evidence for what he does. And, the research to date on TPM does not justify its use. Many have been deceived by TPM, and Miller will have to accept some of the responsibility for TPM's continued and expanding popularity and the number of victims it leaves in its wake, because he leaves the door open to its use in spite of the warnings he gives.

... *henceforth* be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, *and* cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive (Eph. 4:14).

* The following free E-books are available at www.psychoheresy-aware.org :

CRI Guilty of PsychoHeresy?

TheoPhostic Counseling: Divine Revelation or PsychoHeresy?

See www.lyingspirits.com for another free E-book and papers critical of TPM.

**A Response to
the Christian Research Institute's
Evaluation of Theophostic Prayer Ministry
(Revised 10/21/05)**

by

Martin Bobgan

Psychoheresy Awareness Ministries

© 2005 Psychoheresy Awareness Ministries

Contents

Summary	1
Introduction	4
Divine Revelation?	5
New Information?.....	7
Junk Science.....	10
Recovered Memories, Visualization, and Hypnosis.....	14
Personal Impressions Appearing as Facts.....	31
Miller's Evaluation of TPM.....	34
Conclusion	42
Notes	46

A Response to the Christian Research Institute's Evaluation* of Theophostic Prayer Ministry (Revised 10/21/05)

INTRODUCTION

In 1999, after listening to the available tapes and reading the materials of what was then called "TheoPhostic Counseling," we published our book *TheoPhostic Counseling: Divine Revelation or PsychoHeresy?*¹ Since that time Dr. Ed Smith, the contriver of this Christianized psychotherapeutic counseling approach, changed the name to "Theophostic Prayer Ministry" (TPM) and changed a number of his earlier teachings, which he originally claimed he had received from God.

Just recently we printed from the Christian Research Institute's (CRI) web site their position paper titled "An Evaluation of Theophostic Prayer Ministry," written by Elliot Miller, Editor-in-Chief, CRI Publications.²

Miller begins his "Evaluation" by saying: "Theophostic Prayer Ministry (TPM) is perhaps the fastest-growing approach to inner healing or healing of memories in evangelical churches today."³ TPM is a highly successful, for-profit, commercial enterprise. Smith makes numerous claims that require but lack scientific support. While Miller is critical of many of Smith's claims, he either ignores or supports others that are crucial, but not backed by scientific research. Although Miller rightly exposes many of Smith's bogus claims, he fails to ask Smith even the most elementary questions about some of his momentous assertions and, as a bottom line, leaves the door open for Christians to become involved in TPM.

* The following free E-books are available at www.psychoheresy-aware.org :
CRI Guilty of PsychoHeresy?
TheoPhostic Counseling: Divine Revelation or PsychoHeresy?
See www.lyingspirits.com for another free E-book and papers critical of TPM.

In spite of all the criticisms Miller has of TPM, he begins his “Synopsis” by saying, “After an exhaustive evaluation, CRI detects nothing unbiblical about the core theory and practice of Theophostic Prayer Ministry (TPM).”⁴ Even though Miller gives enough reasons to warn believers about becoming involved in TPM, he leaves the door open with encouragements along the way, such as the following: “It seems possible, though far from proven, that virtually everyone might be able to benefit from TPM in some area of his or her life.”⁵

As I prepared to respond to Miller’s evaluation of TPM, I contacted a number of psychologists and professors of psychology, whose specialties would be helpful to me. One of the individuals I contacted is Dr. Tana Dineen, who has over 30 years of experience in the field of psychology as a licensed psychologist; is the author of *Manufacturing Victims: What the Psychology Industry is Doing to People*; is a frequent columnist; and serves as a consultant for many lawyers, agencies, and government bodies on issues related to psychology. From her professional background, she says:

TPM should be recognized for what it is: a business enterprise. While masquerading as a religious experience, it makes false promises of miraculous psychological cures. Pretending to be based on some radically new, profoundly innovative combination of Christian teaching and psychological science, it’s theories and practices are a travesty of both. On examination, what TPM sells is clearly nothing more than a concoction made up of the thoroughly discredited psychotherapeutic fad involving recovered memories, the unsubstantiated pseudo-Freudian beliefs about the roots of emotional pain popularized by Alice Miller, and an outdated “New Age” craze of seeking answers from “spirit guides.”

DIVINE REVELATION?

Miller asks, “Does TPM function as extrabiblical revelation?” Miller then says:

The Bobgans maintain exactly this in their book on Theophostic ministry. In the first chapter, which they titled “Theophostic Counseling: Latter-Day Revelation from God?” they assert that Smith claims he received TPM as a revelation from God.

Smith, however, emphatically denies this: “I’m not saying I had a divine revelation, because I did not. I simply began to understand Scripture where I had not before.”⁶

This is puzzling, considering the fact that we were probably the first to come out with a book critiquing Theophostics and had a chapter on our web site that included our answer to the above question, which Miller did not take the time to read or to ask us about. Yet, he spent a considerable amount of time with Smith and then merely reported his denial.

The following is the proof we provide in our book and on our web site that Miller either did not bother to check or ignored. On page 8 of our book we quote Smith claiming that TheoPhostic counseling was given by God: “He gave me *TheoPhostic* so I would have no room to boast.”⁷ Smith says he has been using “TheoPhostic counseling” since February, 1996.⁸ He also refers to it as “therapy” when he says, “I believe this gift of therapy will become just another part of the total healing God is accomplishing throughout.”⁹

Smith says he wondered why God would give him such a revelation as TheoPhostic and reports:

My wife Sharon believes the reason was a simple one. She said to me, “The reason He gave this process to you was because you asked.” Could it be that simple? Did I “have not” simply because I “ask not”?

The bottom line is, I asked and He gave, and I am grateful and willing to share it with those who will listen.¹⁰

In describing this revelation, Smith says:

Before God blessed me with *TheoPhostic* counseling, much of what is in this book had never passed through my mind. As I was open to learning a new approach **God began to pour this information into my mind. . . . I could not write down the new information fast enough to keep up with what God was saying to me.**¹¹ (Bold added.)

These words are reminiscent of others who have claimed to have received revelations directly from God or Jesus.

There certainly is a discrepancy between what Smith said in his 1996 manual and his later denial. If Miller had read this, he is denying the very meaning of the words Smith used and what he conveyed. There is no way to twist or rationalize this as anything but a claim of having heard directly from God.

In describing the birth of TPM Miller says

This is not to suggest that the entire system was received in one flash of illumination. Through practice, research, theorizing, application, and learning from mistakes, Smith continues to revise and refine his approach.¹²

Compare Miller's conclusion to Smith's actual words as to how he received Theophostics directly from God, as quoted above. And, if it was God-given as Smith obviously claims, why is it that Smith "continues to revise and refine his approach" after "learning from his mistakes"? And, why is it that Miller ignores this?

NEW INFORMATION?

After quoting Smith's declaration that he "could not write down the **new information** fast enough to keep up with what God was saying to me,"¹³ we say:

Please note that Smith refers to what he believes God gave him as "new information" and says, "much of what is in this book had never passed through my mind." We will demonstrate that TheoPhostic counseling is NOT "new information" to Smith and that much of what he does reflects the various psychotherapies he admittedly knew and practiced for "over twenty years."

TheoPhostic counseling is the result of many existent therapies, including psychoanalytic, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), and cognitive-behavioral therapies. In addition, TheoPhostic includes elements from the inner healing movement, which includes guided imagery, visualization, and hypnosis. **As a result of our analysis we conclude that TheoPhostic counseling came out of the evil cauldron of the perverted wisdom of men rather than from the mind of God.**¹⁴

Smith claims that his theophostic approach "is *not* a spin-off of any other traditional approach to counseling."¹⁵ Miller seems to agree when he says:

If Smith departs from **current theory** at points, how does that make him wrong? He could be on to something. He obviously was **not building on current theory** when he came up with TPM; the history of ideas is filled with innovative **departures from the current consensus** and this is how progress often is made.¹⁶ (Bold add.)

However, we say in our book:

We will demonstrate that TheoPhostic is more likely a Smith-contrived, eclectic therapy that came from his “over twenty year” practice as a therapist using “every available method of therapy” [Smith, 1997, p. 31]. While TheoPhostic is not totally like any one psychotherapy, it is the sum of a variety of therapies and techniques, kaleidoscopically assembled together with known inner healing ideas and practices along with imaginative additions, which include redescribing techniques and redefining terms. TheoPhostic is unique, but primarily in its patchwork approach, which is different from any other eclectic mixture we have seen. However, TheoPhostic’s major elements originated from known psychotherapies and inner healing practices and these sources can easily be identified.¹⁷

Ask any licensed psychologists or professors who teach psychotherapy and they will confirm the psychological origins of TPM, which would put the lie to Smith’s claim for hearing it from God in such a way that he “could not write down the new information fast enough to keep up with what God was saying to me.”¹⁸ One of the psychotherapies we accuse Smith of using is Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (**EMDR**). We say in our book:

As one reads the use of the scales in EMDR and in Smith’s TheoPhostic system the similarities are readily transparent. Even a cursory comparison of the cases discussed, means of rating the intensity of emotions, and the very methodology used is too congruent between the two to be coincidental. In fact, if TheoPhostics had been in existence before EMDR, we would accuse Shapiro of obtaining her material from TheoPhostics. However, EMDR preceded TheoPhostics by a number of years. If there were only one psychotherapeutic system to choose from as evidence of the psychotherapeutic origin of TheoPhostic counseling, EMDR would be it.¹⁹

In the 4th edition of his Theophostic manual, which Smith endorses “as the authoritative source for his views,” he says:

Some have seen a likeness of this rating the lie with the work of Edith [sic] Shapiro and EMDR. (Eye Movement Desensitization Reprocessing.) I truly cannot say since **I am not that familiar with her work nor have I been trained at any level in her methodology** (bold added).²⁰

Smith claims that he is “not that familiar with her [Shapiro’s] work [EMDR].”

HOWEVER, Smith has spoken publicly about all the therapies and self-help approaches he had learned and used, including EMDR! Smith said in one of his taped lectures: **“I even went the route of the Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing—had people follow the bouncing ball. You know, I even did that.”** After completing the list of psychotherapies and self-help approaches he used, which included EMDR, Smith said, “I am not discrediting these people but **I used them all.**” **Ask anyone trained in EMDR to read Smith’s manual and to compare TPM with EMDR and come to your own conclusion about which of Smith’s statements are true,** i.e. the one in the 4th edition of his manual or the one we quote from one of his teaching tapes.

Smith now admits that he used EMDR “a couple of times without formal training.”²¹ This is a euphemistic cover up. To learn EMDR well enough to practice it responsibly takes time and often takes more time to learn on one’s own than by attending formal training, which is offered in one to three-day workshops. One needs to read, digest, and study the materials long enough even to do it a “couple of times.”

Throughout our book on Theophostics, we reveal the origins of it and prove that it was not a divine revelation and that it was an eclectic melange of a variety of therapies that Smith admittedly knew and had used. However, at no time has Smith admitted that his system is an assemblage of psychotherapies which he learned, rather than a direct revelation from God as he originally claimed.

In contrast to what he said elsewhere, Miller confirms the psychotherapeutic origins of TPM. He says:

It is true, however, that TPM incorporates in its theory and approach concepts found in some schools of the wide field of psychology. These include the idea of a

subconscious, the belief that psychological and emotional problems can be rooted in the past and that revisiting such past experiences may be necessary to resolve those problems, and the describing of such problems as wounds that need to be healed. TPM also uses psychological terms to describe phenomena believed to be encountered in the sessions, such as repression, dissociation, and abreaction (the acting out of repressed emotional conflict in sometimes extreme words or behavior).²²

Contrast this with Miller's own statement that Smith "obviously was not building on current theory when he came up with TPM."²³ And, contrast this, as we repeatedly point out, with Smith's original claim for the source of TPM being God.

JUNK SCIENCE

Junk science results when conclusions are drawn using low-quality data such as testimonials, anecdotes, and case reports rather than from randomized, controlled clinical experiments.²⁴

Junk science aptly describes Smith's TPM approach, and proof for TPM is built on junk science. The claims of success for TPM are based on "testimonials, anecdotes, and case reports" and are grossly lacking scientific support through "randomized, controlled clinical experiments." Smith's use of junk science to support TPM and Miller's occasional acceptance and recommendation of it are tragic.

A **foundational theory** of TPM is described by Miller with reference to an article by E. James Wilder, followed by comments by Miller. Miller says:

Drawing on current brain theory,* Smith argues that such primal traumatic experiences with their false interpretations are registered in the right side of our brains, while our ability to understand data intellectually and objectively is the function of the left side of our brains.** He believes this explains why he was having no success convincing adult survivors of sexual abuse that they were no longer in danger: in order for them to be delivered from the emotional power of those lies they would need to learn the truth experientially, in a manner similar to how the lies were implanted in their brains.²⁵

In the two footnotes for this paragraph Miller says:

*See James Wilder, "Current Brain Theory and Basic Theophostic Ministry," *Journal of the International Association for Theophostic Ministry* 1 (2003): 15-19.

**Wilder's development of this hypothesis (in *ibid.*) is far more complex than my use of the common right brain/left brain distinction might suggest. It is speculative and may not be accurate in fine detail, but it does seem plausible that the basic premise is correct: a different part of the human brain registers knowledge learned through experience than which registers knowledge learned through education.

In response to someone's criticism of Smith for failing "to provide evidentiary data to substantiate these ideas about the neurophysiology of memory,"²⁶ Miller refers to Wilder's article for proof. I attempted to find TPM's journal through all interlibrary loan means and learned that this journal is not available through any of the libraries throughout America. It is an in-house promo piece for TPM. This article on a scientific subject by Wilder in an in-house, self-promoting, non-peer reviewed (by qualified experts), unavailable-in-libraries journal would **not** be regarded as reliable in the scientific community. Failing to recognize this serious problem and compounding his error by adding his own amateur comments about it, Miller reveals another major drawback in his evaluation.

Rather than take Smith's, Wilder's, or Miller's word for it, I sought academic help. The above statement and footnotes were sent to two Harvard University professors and a University of Houston professor. Their responses follow:

"Sounds like bunk to me. Fighting this stuff is like fighting Hydra."

Dr. Richard J. McNally, Professor of Psychology, Harvard University.

"I agree with Rich [Dr. McNally]. This sounds like nonsense and I know of no evidence to support the 'theory.'"

Dr. Daniel Schacter, William R. Kenon Jr. Professor of Psychology, Harvard University.

"Current neuroscience has shown that memories are stored all over the brain, rather than in a specific hemisphere. There is strong professional agreement, based on the preponderance of empirical studies, that most people who were sexually abused remember all or part of what happened to them."

Dr. Susan P. Robbins, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Houston.

So, Smith's **foundational theory**, supported by Wilder and Miller, is "bunk" and "nonsense" according to two Harvard University professors and is contrary to "current neuroscience" according to a University of Houston professor.

One of Dr. McNally's interests is the study of memory in people reporting histories of childhood sexual abuse. Dr. Schacter is an expert in the area of brain, mind, and memory. Dr. Robbins' areas of specialization include recovered memories and false allegations of sexual abuse. It is understandable that these three professors do not have the time to examine TPM. However, I know enough about their academic work to conclude that they would be as critical of TPM as I am.

An article in *Discover* magazine reports on the subject of recovered memories and mentions Dr. McNally's work. The summary of the article says:

A growing body of evidence indicates that memory is deeply unreliable and that life-shattering events cannot be buried for years and then winched out of the deep waters of the subconscious.²⁷

The article reports on a study by McNally et al and says:

... the study is part of a six-year probe by Harvard psychologist Richard McNally and his colleagues into the minds of apparently sane people who believe they have memories of long-repressed events, including sexual abuse, alien abduction, and past lives. The study is an attempt to learn if humans can create memories unwittingly, memories so strong they may cause the debilitating symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder.

McNally thinks people can and do make up powerful memories. And these false memories can take on a life of their own, with profound legal, political, and social consequences.²⁸

In reporting on another study, *Discover* says:

People tend to view imagination as a purely mental activity, but it is strongly linked to vision. The work of Stephen Kosslyn, a Harvard psychologist, explains why....

Kosslyn began conducting neuroimaging studies of the brain (PET and fMRI) in 1990 and made a surprising discovery: **Every area of the brain that is activated when we see is also activated when we create an image in our mind.** "It was absolutely amazing," he says. "the primary visual cortex, the first visual area of the

brain that registers input from the eyes, is even activated by imagery with the eyes closed. That suggests the opportunity for distortion is huge. The upside is, if imagery stimulates what you actually see in the brain, you can use it for memory or reasoning or predicting. The downside is that you can become confused about the source of images. That's kind of scary."²⁹ (Bold added.)

There are “tons” of research in the area of memory by distinguished academics, but Miller chose to believe Smith and Wilder, two individuals who lack the necessary qualifications to act as authorities on the subject and lack the necessary footnote references to experts.

As we have said, “... in all our years of writing and research we have rarely seen such extraordinary claims, cures, and cases as touted by Smith.”³⁰ Scientifically speaking, phenomenal claims such as made by Smith require phenomenal proof—none of which Smith has provided.

Regarding the efficacy of TPM, Miller does state clearly that Smith's claims for success have not been verified by proper scientific means. However, right after he states this concern, Miller quotes Smith as saying:

“In retrospect, I regret that I did not wait to see what the research discovered. The truth is that I made these bold claims because I was seeing then and continue to see dramatic changes in the emotional state and behavior of deeply wounded people.”³¹

Does Miller even notice that, as Smith is stating regret for exaggerated claims, his very next sentence is another exaggerated, unproved claim?

Miller refers to “the anecdotal reports of its [TPM's] effectiveness” in his synopsis.³² Yes, TPM relies highly on “anecdotal reports,” which is one characteristic of junk science. Miller admits that “much more scientific research needs to be done before even the modest claims of TPM can be validated, and some of the extravagant claims seem unlikely ever to be established.”³³ In addition, Miller says that CRI is “unable to endorse TPM's specific claims of efficacy.”³⁴ That statement alone should rule out CRI's leaving the door open to Smith's money-making empire.

What if Smith had proposed a cure for cancer and made extravagant claims for its effectiveness and that there were only “anecdotal reports of its effectiveness” and that “much more scientific research” needed “to be done before even the modest claims” could “be validated, and some of the extravagant claims seem[ed] unlikely ever to be established” and the “specific claims of efficacy” could not be endorsed? Would Miller leave the door open for its use? Where is Miller’s clear warning to fellow Christians to avoid TPM? And why does Miller refuse to condemn the outrageous claims that are unconnected to appropriate scientific evidence? At best, Miller is sitting on the fence thereby leaving fellow believers and their families vulnerable to harm.

There is no need to take the word of two Harvard University professors and one University of Houston professor. I can give Miller a list of distinguished academics who, if they would take the time to read Smith’s TPM claims and practices, would sound warnings about it and NOT leave the door open to its use as Miller has.

RECOVERED MEMORIES, VISUALIZATION, AND HYPNOSIS

The following is a brief description of Theophostic theory and practice: Present problems are due to past (usually early-life) events, interpretations of those events (“lies”), and their accompanying emotions. The “lies,” which drive present thinking, feeling, and behaving, are embedded in early-life memories, located in the “dark room,” which must be accessed through “drifting” into the past in search of early “memory pictures” that feel the same as the negative feeling accompanying the present problematic situation. During this search, the client is encouraged to describe the memory and the associated feelings. Once the memory holding the “original lie” has been located and the lie identified (e.g., “I’m bad,” “It’s my fault,” “I’m worthless”) the practitioner asks the recipient to rate the lie. If it feels true, the

participant is to feel and “embrace” the “lie” and then to hear Jesus speak “truth” directly, thereby replacing the darkness with “light.” The experience is again rated by the recipient with the goal being “perfect peace.”

Miller describes the TPM process and in doing so reveals how DIRECTED it truly is.

Note Miller’s description in the following:

“The practitioner **invites** Jesus into the session and **asks** Him to reveal His truth.”

“The recipient is then **asked** [by the practitioner] to try to identify the memory....”

“The practitioner **encourages** the recipient to describe the memory.”

“The practitioner **asks** the recipient to rate....”

“[The practitioner] **encourages** the recipient to feel....”

“[The practitioner] **asks** Jesus what He wants the recipient to know....”

“The practitioner then **asks** the recipient whether the previous interpretation of the experience feels true....”

“The practitioner **keeps** the session focused on that memory.”³⁵ (Bold added.)

Miller says, “To accuse TPM of practicing recovered memory therapy and visualization, however, is to betray either ignorance or a bias against TPM that refuses to be corrected by clear and consistent facts.”³⁶ We will deal with the issues of recovered memories, visualization, and hypnosis separately to demonstrate who is ignorant or biased and who “refuses to be corrected by clear and consistent facts.”

Our concern about recovered memory therapy and the resulting false memories began about 30 years ago when people started asking us about inner healing. Inner healing began to be very popular in certain Christian circles during the mid-seventies. Ruth Carter Stapleton (Jimmy Carter’s sister) practiced inner healing and wrote a book titled *The Gift of Inner Healing* (1976). We became concerned and wrote a critique of her book. We continued

looking into the inner healing movement during the early eighties because we were concerned about the whole idea of people attempting to return to the past to fix the present. There were certain psychological ideas involved, such as psychic determinism, repression, and catharsis. Also, it was very clear that a great deal of imagination, visualization, and hypnotic suggestion were major components of inner healing.

After the publication of our first book in 1979, my wife, Deidre, and I were on various radio and television programs, so people were somewhat familiar with our concerns about psychological counseling. As a result, Christians began calling us and describing how they were being accused by adult children who were in psychotherapy. We also were called by people who had been in inner healing or regressive therapy, who described how they were encouraged to regress, to remember early life experiences, and to imagine Jesus being with them in their “early life traumas.” As the years went on, more and more Christians were being regressed by “Christian psychologists,” as well as by “Christian inner healers.”

From scientific research we know that the power of authority (TPM therapist)³⁷; the power of the placebo³⁸; the phenomenal claims, cures, and cases touted by Smith; and even a little participant pre-knowledge of what is supposed to happen in TPM are enough to impel individuals into following the TPM **psychobiblical** fabrication. It is quite common for the participants in Freudian psychoanalysis to do the Freudian thing, etc., and for the participants in Smithian **psychobiblical** therapy to do the Smithian thing.

The healer expects the person not only to experience the actual or created past, but also to feel the pain and agony. This highly emotional part of inner healing (TPM) is similar to Freud’s abreaction. Either prior to or at this point of emotional intensity, a Jesus figure is imagined to bring truth or healing. Some inner healers do this through guided imagery; others lead the client through memories and eventually the imagined Jesus appears; and still others

(TPM) let the person, who is expected to come to this point of intensity, wait for Jesus to speak or act. This is all highly imaginative and, because of the use of occult-like visualization and because the Jesus being visualized is imagined by the client, it is doubtful that the person who appears is actually the Jesus of the Bible any more than in other inner healing approaches.

Inner healing beliefs and techniques, such as TPM, continue to deceive many Christians. A central belief is that we are the way we are because of past hurts that need to be healed through reliving the past and bringing Jesus into past events. The inner healer believes and teaches that present problems are expressions of past wounds (or, as with TPM, the person's response to them) that must be healed before the person can overcome problems of living and get on with life. When these beliefs are mixed in with the Christian faith, they can become part of a person's overall belief system. When this happens, people will hold onto these false ideas as tenaciously as their beliefs about God and how He works in their lives. **Right now TPM is one of the most influential and dangerous combinations of psychotherapy and inner healing.**

While one does not always include the other, there is a fluid relationship among mental imagery (which is involved in recovered memories), visualization, and hypnosis.³⁹ As we will demonstrate shortly, Smith is DIRECTIVE; the client generally knows about the TPM process; the client becomes involved with expectations; and, as Miller seems to conclude, the "participants trust that Jesus will answer their prayers for emotional healing."⁴⁰ Adding to this, Smith's use of the "dark room" (unconscious), light room (consciousness), drifting (free association), and early life "memory pictures" and "discerning the lie," the ingredients are all there for mental imagery, visualization, and, at times, an hypnotic trance. TPM is a dynamic

situation where the end result of the combination of ingredients will be recovered memories from imagination, visualization, and, at times, hypnosis, no matter how much Smith denies it.

Recovered Memories

Over the years our warnings about inner healing and false memories have largely been ignored. The media and many Christian counselors continue to promote the whole idea of repressed memories and how forgotten but later “remembered” abuse causes all kinds of problems. But, at least Robert Epstein has it straight in his article “Loose Screw Awards” in *Psychology Today* in the section titled “The Idea that Launched a Thousand Suits: Recovered Memories.”⁴¹

The process of recovered memories is central to the practice of TPM. The following are a few of the many statements from “Recovered Memories: Are They Reliable?”⁴² which should be kept in mind when evaluating TPM:

“The use of recovered memories is fraught with problems of potential misapplication.” The American Medical Association, Council on Scientific Affairs, *Memories of Childhood Sexual Abuse*.

“It is not known how to distinguish, with complete accuracy, memories based on true events from those derived from other sources.” American Psychiatric Association, Statement on Memories of Sexual Abuse.

“At this point it is impossible, without other corroborative evidence, to distinguish a true memory from a false one.” American Psychological Association, *Questions and Answers about Memories of Childhood Abuse*.

“Psychologists acknowledge that a definite conclusion that a memory is based on objective reality is not possible unless there is incontrovertible corroborating evidence.” Canadian Psychological Association, *Position Statement on Adult Recovered Memories of Childhood Sexual Abuse*.

“Research has shown that over time memory for events can be changed or reinterpreted in such a way as to make the memory more consistent with the person’s present knowledge and/or expectations.” American Psychological Association.

Even though Smith has changed his mind and warned about the possibility of memories being false, TPM by its very nature produces memories that are mostly not verifiable and therefore suspect. The known unreliability of memory and the inability in most cases to verify what is remembered should be major reasons to avoid TPM. Even if “known” memories are involved, they are altered by time and life experiences. One psychiatrist reports:

Memory is, however, not like a photograph that may fade with time, but not change its outlines. Memory is a painting repeatedly touched up and “corrected” when times past are summoned. If this seems a fanciful metaphor, consider the research report by Nader and colleagues. They report that each time it is called into use, “consolidated” memory in the amygdala becomes “labile” and requires new protein synthesis for its reconsolidation. It is not likely to be reencoded in precisely the same form. **What any of us “remember” is not quite what “actually” happened**⁴³ (bold added).

Smith’s excursion into the mishmash of memories of wounds inflicted and lies embedded is a central activity of TPM. TPM majors in woundedness and lies. Smith not only majors in “woundedness” itself, but also in the amount of it. As far as Smith is concerned it is epidemic! He says:

My estimate is around 75% of any local congregation is hurting deeply from early suppressed wounds. I believe 100% of the members of all congregations (this includes pastors) have some element of woundedness. Even the little bruises and scratches produce handicaps in our daily lives and need to be healed. It is really not a question who is wounded but rather to what extent are we all wounded.⁴⁴

Using Smith’s expanded numbers and definition of “woundedness” and his use of a variety of questionable psychological techniques related to memory, it is easy for him to make such a claim, and then “Presto!” Everybody can be a client for his latter-day, “divine revelation” of TPM. After reading Smith’s statement, researcher/clinician and former university professor of psychology Dr. Paul Cameron said, “The theory is well calculated to fill psychiatrists’ and psychologists’ offices—and their coffers—and divert Christian energies away from attempting to serve God to attempting to ‘heal’ themselves.”⁴⁵

In addition to the amount of woundedness, Smith majors in the kind of woundedness. He says: “I have found that no less than 40-60% of all the females that come to me for counseling have at the root of their pain childhood sexual molestation.”⁴⁶ In response to this statement, Dr. Cameron says, “I strongly suspect his enthusiasm for his ‘theory of counseling/theory of psychological harm’ is driving this statement.”⁴⁷ Because of a criticism of Smith’s statement, Miller rushes in with the following explanation: “that Smith was only ‘guessing’ from his experience, not presenting this figure as a scientific ‘claim.’”⁴⁸

In response to Smith’s expanded number of wounded, Dr. McNally asks, “How does he know? What is his evidence?”⁴⁹ One does not need to be a Harvard University professor to ask such questions. Miller would probably answer “that Smith was only ‘guessing’ from his experience, not presenting this figure as a scientific ‘claim.’” Smith and Miller could rationalize and excuse many of Smith’s early false statements by claiming they were only guesses even though they were stated with confidence by a man deriving huge profits from his TPM brain child.

The following is another list of quotations from “Recovered Memories: Are They Reliable?”⁵⁰ that should be kept in mind when evaluating such therapies as TPM:

“The AMA considers recovered memories of childhood sexual abuse to be of uncertain authenticity, which should be subject to external verification.” American Medical Association, Council on Scientific Affairs, *Memories of Childhood Sexual Abuse*.

“Psychiatrists are advised to avoid engaging in any ‘memory recovery techniques’ which are based upon the expectation of past sexual abuse of which the patient has no memory.... Techniques on regression therapy including ‘age regression’ and hypnotic regression are of unproven effectiveness.” Royal College of Psychiatrists, *Reported Recovered Memories of child Sexual Abuse* (UK).

“There is no single set of symptoms which automatically indicates that a person was a victim of childhood abuse. There have been media reports of therapists who state that people (particularly women) with a particular set of problems or symptoms must have been victims of childhood sexual abuse. There is no scientific evidence that supports

this conclusion.” American Psychological Association, *Questions and Answers about Memories of Childhood Abuse*.

“Psychologists recognize that there is no constellation of symptoms which is diagnostic of child sexual abuse.” Canadian Psychological Association, *Position Statement on Adult Recovered Memories of Childhood Sexual Abuse*.

“Most people who were sexually abused as children remember all or part of what happened to them although they may not fully understand or disclose it.” American Psychological Association, *Working Group on Investigation of Memories of Child Abuse*.

In regard to recovered memories, Mark Pendergrast, author of *Victims of Memory*, wrote a letter to *Christianity Today* after it featured an article about TPM. Pendergrast is a board member of the National Center for Reason and Justice (NCRJ). NCRJ is a non-profit group that works to educate the public about the continuing problem of people falsely charged with abusing children. The following is used with his permission:

Your [*Christianity Today*’s] favorable story about Theophostic Ministries does a grave disservice to your readers, since it is clear that Ed Smith, the Theophostic founder and guru, believes in and practices so-called recovered memory therapy. Your article states that he works “primarily with victims of childhood sexual abuse,” but it is quite likely that many of the people he works with were not, in fact, sexually abused as children, since they did not recall any memories of abuse until they went for therapy. People do not “repress” years of traumatic events. Rather, they recall them all too well.

On the Theophostic website, Ed Smith writes that “unless the person is able to return to the original memory event where the lie was first embedded, true release of the emotional pain in the present will not occur.” This kind of wording and thinking is all too familiar to me. As I documented in my book, *Victims of Memory*, this type of misguided therapy has harmed rather than healed. It results in misery and destroyed families. Unfortunately, many “Christian” counselors have fallen for it, and Ed Smith appears to be the latest.

Because his wording was somewhat vague, I wrote to Ed Smith to ask his opinion about recovered memories of sexual abuse. His reply was extremely alarming.... **“I really do not concern myself with what is factual in a memory. I focus on the emotional pain that is present and look for the belief that is producing it.” ... Smith’s cavalier lack of concern about whether memories of abuse are true or not is shocking.** Your readers need to be warned about this man and his theories—not encouraged to seek his help. At a time when recovered memory therapy has been completely discredited, it is amazing to me that Smith is once again practicing it now, in the 21st century. It is particularly distressing that he is doing so in the name of

religion, telling people that Jesus is the one who is revealing the “truth” to them (bold added).

Indeed, Smith’s advice to those whom he trains is: “Let what is reported [by the recipient] be what it is: the person’s reality.”⁵¹ Therefore, in regard to false memories and repressed memories, Miller says:

I have advised him [Smith] that after a session where previously unremembered abuses come to mind, it should be a standard procedure for the practitioner to encourage the recipient to seek independent proof for the memory before believing it.⁵²

Nevertheless, Smith does not believe that it is necessary for the details of the memory to be accurate to get to the lies, because the so-called lies are connected to whatever the person is remembering, whether true or false.⁵³ This whole area can get pretty murky—**looking for lies in the midst of memories that could themselves be lies in order to find the truth.** This is more dangerous than spelunking in a subterranean cavern; it’s more like attempting to fossick about in quicksand. Smith and even Miller put too much faith in the Freudian idea of reaching the so-called deep layers of the unconscious in order to bring healing to the soul. Smith claims to have found the way and Miller believes he may have.

Miller’s suggesting “independent proof for the memory before believing it” would certainly interfere with the process. It would challenge the client and very likely put her on the defensive and weaken the relationship of trust between client and practitioner. Furthermore, if the person must find external proof for a memory to continue drifting from memory to memory, such a requirement could end the therapy. Where might that proof come from, especially if the so-called perpetrator is no longer living? While certain memories of “wounds” occurring in therapy can be clearly disproved, few memories of “wounds” can be fully substantiated. There are few memories of past events, especially long past events, that

are easily verifiable. This should be very troubling for any therapy that relies on memory of past events for any hope of healing and change.

Smith has changed his mind about the accuracy of recovered memories, as well as about a number of his other original teachings. However, to my knowledge, Smith has not warned TPM recipients about the potential for false memories. I asked Dr. Robbins about the need to warn a recipient or client about the possibility of false memories in the practice of TPM. I asked her, “What is the professional thing to do?” She said, “Clients need to be warned that memories may not be accurate.”⁵⁴ Dr. Robbins says the following in the *Social Workers Desk*

Reference:

Most early organizational statements on recovered memory therapy [RMT] urged the use of caution, with the acknowledgment that recovered memories may or may not be true. Many of the later statements more explicitly warn against the use of memory recovery techniques as a method or focus of practice....

More recently, professional concerns have focused on informed consent and, as noted by the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, in light of the warnings given by most professional organizations, “Few would currently argue against informing patients about the fallibility of memory and the dangers involved with recovering memories of sexual abuse.” Given the unproven clinical utility of RMT, coupled with the lack of evidence that benefits of such therapy outweigh the risks, the issue of **informed consent** is critical for social workers inasmuch as this is also mandated by the National Association of Social Workers’ (NASW) code of Ethics.

... it is the responsibility of the social worker to inform the client that their memory may be “an accurate memory of an actual event, an altered or distorted memory of an actual event, or the recounting of an event that did not happen.”⁵⁵ (Bold added.)

It is obvious that the responsible professional will warn the client or recipient of the fallibility of memory and particularly “the dangers involved with recovering memories of sexual abuse.” It is not enough to warn the facilitators of TPM; informed consent is necessary for the participants. I carefully read the Theophostic Ministry Facilitator Guidelines and it is not explicitly there. If Smith has clearly informed and warned the participants about the fallibility of memory and the risks involved and if I receive a reference to where I can read

such an informed consent statement, I will remove this section from this paper. Otherwise, failing a specific informed consent reference, Smith and other TPM practitioners are functioning unethically!

And, where is the warning to the many who are still using his original teachings? Where is his public confession and apology to all he directly or indirectly damaged by much of what he originally taught? Rebates along with apologies should be in order for those who were therapized or trained by him at the time. And, where is Miller's confronting Smith for the tremendous damage he has done to individuals and their families with these and other false teachings, which Miller admits Smith promoted in the past?

Visualization

To visualize is to recall or form mental images or pictures. Recollections, formations of mental images, or formations of pictures are all involved in TPM. Smith's early reported cases were saturated with mental pictures of Jesus, and Smith dwelt heavily on those mental images. The pre-knowledge of TPM and the openness to forming mental pictures influence what the participant will imagine, in spite of the fact that Smith now simply asks the recipient to **feel** the presence of Jesus. The very process of drifting back through memories, which one generally sees visually in the mind, will certainly influence visualizing Jesus at the appropriate time regardless of Smith's subterfuge of using the word *feel*.

Miller says, "Unlike visualization, in TPM the subject is in a state of passive trust in the Spirit of God and **there is no active effort to shape the spiritual experience**"⁵⁶ (bold added). Smith says, "I will ask NON-DIRECTIVE [capitalization in original] questions to help you discern the lies you may believe in your memories." Smith also says, "I will avoid making suggestions as to what I assume your lie-based thinking may be and thus allow you

to make this discovery yourself while relying on the Holy Spirit and through my asking NON-DIRECTIVE [capitalization in original] questions.”⁵⁷ If one examines the above statements, one can see that while these may be promises not to be directive, they are directive in themselves in that they set up expectations for what the client is to do and find. Contrary to his claims to be “NON-DIRECTIVE,” Smith says, “I will encourage you to listen and receive understanding from the Spirit of Christ.... I will defer my opinions and thinking to the Spirit of Christ, trusting Him to provide you with His truth.... My desire is that you have a genuine encounter with the Spirit of Christ.”⁵⁸

While it may be the intent of TPM to bring the subject into “a passive trust in the Spirit of God,” passive trust in TPM is also in the therapist, just as in other similar psychotherapeutic approaches. Miller seems in agreement with me when he says in regard to false memories:

It cannot be ruled out that the client would produce a false memory at this point, but this kind of effort to please or meet the expectation of the facilitator happens in any number of counseling and ministry situations and can hardly be blamed on TPM.⁵⁹

However, just because they happen in other situations besides TPM does not exonerate TPM.

While there is an effort to be “NON-DIRECTIVE” in order not to “shape the spiritual experience,” research would conclude otherwise. Dr. Carl Rogers, one of the best-known and most admired humanistic psychologists of the twentieth century, spent a lifetime studying human behavior. He developed a technique of treatment called “nondirective” or “client-centered” therapy, which he believed to be nondirective in that the therapist does not lead the client’s attention to any topic or material. The client chooses. It is client-centered in that it proposes to allow the client to have his own insights and make his own interpretations, rather than depend on the therapist to provide the insights and interpretations.

Carl Rogers, in his nondirective therapy, claims that he does not influence the client in any way. Because the person expresses himself any way he chooses, many believe

nondirective therapy is truly nondirective. However, Jay Haley, a widely acclaimed pioneering therapist and former professor, says: “Actually nondirective therapy is a misnomer. To state that any communication between two people can be nondirective is to state an impossibility.”⁶⁰

Without intending to do so, a counselor will communicate some response and thus influence the client’s thoughts, words, and actions. Two independent studies, conducted ten years apart, showed that Rogers himself was, in fact, a **directive counselor**. His response to his clients rewarded and punished and therefore reinforced or extinguished their expressions. Academic psychologists acknowledge Rogers’ directiveness, as they would Smith’s as well. If Rogers cannot be nondirective, it is certainly unlikely that any other psychotherapist or counselor can refrain from being directive in one way or another. The therapist’s format and expectations will seep through any system and influence clients.

In a paragraph discussing visualization Miller defends Smith by saying:

If the Jesus sought in TPM is the Jesus of orthodoxy (and everything I have seen indicates that He is), then what TPM does should rather be called what Smith calls it: prayer.⁶¹

Smith calls it **prayer**. Miller agrees. In addition, according to Smith, TPM is a **ministry**. Apparently Miller would agree. Nevertheless, Smith has charged money for this ministry (nee counseling) since he originated it. And, it is my guess that of all those who pay for the TPM training most charge for this “prayer ministry.” Obviously Smith believes it is biblical to charge for a prayer ministry and apparently Miller agrees. We have been on record and have demonstrated from Scripture that charging a fee for prayer or ministry, as many do, is unbiblical and borders on simony.⁶² When Jesus sent out his disciples, he commanded them saying, “Freely ye have received; freely give” (Matt. 10:18).

By the way, we challenge Miller to name one inner healer who claims to be a Christian and uses even the most obvious occult, spiritist, or new age practice who would admit that the visualized Jesus involved is NOT “the Jesus of orthodoxy.” Our chapter “Guided Imagery, Visualization, and Hypnosis” in our book on Theophostics gives sufficient evidence to debunk Smith’s use of visualizing or **feeling** the presence of Jesus and Miller’s support of it.⁶³

Dr. Michael Yapko, in his well researched book *Suggestions of Abuse: True and False Memories of Sexual Trauma*, tells how therapists use “suggestive questions” that are similar to questions used by Smith with his clients and that are often, according to him, the sexually abused ones. As a result, Yapko says;

The client emerges from these imagery sessions armed with more and more suggested or confabulated details that seem to further “prove” that abuse must have occurred. The power to misinform and to establish a chain of subsequent reactions is potentially the most dangerous part of any therapy process.⁶⁴

Dave Hunt says in his book *Occult Invasion*:

Occultism has always involved three techniques for changing and creating reality: thinking, speaking, and visualizing. . . .

The third technique [visualizing] is the most powerful. It is the fastest way to enter the world of the occult and to pick up a spirit guide. Shamans have used it for thousands of years....

Paul speaks of loving “his [future] appearing” (2 Timothy 4:8). Visualizing Jesus would seem to be an unbiblical attempt to have Him appear before the proper time— unless, of course, one insists that it is only imagination. Yet those who are involved attribute results to this process that could scarcely be explained as resulting from fantasy conversations with oneself.

Furthermore, a “Christ” who would take on any color of hair or eyes and any form to suit the visualizer is not the real Lord Jesus of the Bible and history.⁶⁵

Pastor Alan Morrison’s book titled *The Serpent and the Cross: Religious Corruption in an Evil Age* includes a chapter titled “Sorcerous Apprentices: The Mind-Sciences in the Church Today,” which should be read by all who are interested in TPM. A subsection in that chapter is titled “In Your Mind’s Eye: The Occult Art of Visualization” and is a must-read

for those who want to learn about the roots and promoters of visualization in the church. The following quotations are from that section:

This confusion of an *imagined* Jesus with the *actual* Person of Christ is the fatal flaw in the entire psychotherapeutic visualization process, about which we shall say more shortly. How convenient it is to invite the Jesus of your own imaginings into scenes where sins can be forgiven without repentance—not only those of others who have wronged you, but also your own!⁶⁶

A further question can here be raised: if each of these visualized “christs” is *not* the objective, risen Christ of Scripture, then who or what are the entities which are conjured up in the imaginations of professing Christians and others who are encouraged to fantasize these images by Christian psychotherapists? The plain truth is that they are little different to those “inner guides” of the secular visualizer.⁶⁷

What, therefore, should be the response of the Christian to the use of visualizations involving the image of Jesus Christ? Of primary concern should be the fact that this type of activity is specifically forbidden and warned against within the pages of the Bible. It is a solemn fact that every figurative representation of God contradicts His being; and although we do not wish to obscure the fact that Jesus (as God manifested in the flesh) was a real human being, **the conjuring up of a visualized image of Christ for the purposes of mental manipulation is surely a gross form of idolatry. The last thing that the Christian should be doing is relying on such images in the imagination for guidance in life or to increase faith** (bold added).⁶⁸

In spite of what Smith says, there is mental manipulation within the TPM process. And, whether there is purposeful mental manipulation or not, the very process of a client regressively conjuring up an image of Christ opens one up to errors at least and to demonic possibilities at worst.

Miller says that one of the critics of TPM “doesn’t seem to appreciate the fact that while other inner healing approaches manipulate Jesus and put words in His mouth, TPM assiduously seeks to avoid this.”⁶⁹ The entire process guides a person into the past according to Smith’s format of drifting into past memories that elicit similar painful feelings, experiencing the pain and drifting further back to a prior memory with similar painful feelings, and so on through each memory until the person reaches the so-called original lie. While the participant may agree to do this and actually follow the process within her own

mind, the very process itself of drifting, feeling, drifting, feeling, rating the pain, looking for the lie, and so on serves as a manipulation to get the person to contact an entity called “Jesus.” Smith claims that the person is actually manipulating herself in order to receive from God.⁷⁰ However, the most effective means of mental manipulation, as Smith uses, is that which makes the person believe she is doing this on her own according to her own will.⁷¹ And this is exactly what happens in TPM.

Miller says, “Smith unapologetically believes that Jesus is answering their prayers.”⁷² Humans can easily be manipulated without even knowing it, but the Lord Jesus Christ cannot be manipulated. Jesus answers prayer according to His own will and according to His own timing. There is no formula or conjuring that can make Him appear and answer prayer in a particular way at a particular moment as is expected and claimed in TPM. Therefore, it is most **unlikely** that Jesus appears. These kinds of formulaic procedures that conjure up a “Jesus” are more akin to witchcraft than to prayer as described and illustrated in Scripture.

Hypnosis

Having researched and written a book on hypnosis, we are very well acquainted with how memory can be enhanced and how the use of memory activities can lead to a trance state. The inner healer, through various means, encourages or expects (TPM) the person to remember past events and to connect them with present problems or pain. The client is usually familiar with what is expected. An inner healer may use hypnosis or he may simply have expectations or make suggestions about what might happen. Such suggestions on the part of the healer or expectations on the part of the client can act as an induction into a trance for people who are susceptible. Through the healer’s or the client’s expectations (TPM), the person goes back to past events, which may or may not have happened as remembered.

Miller says, “This passivity [in TPM] is not the dangerous passivity of hypnosis or other ASCs.” Miller then defines what he believes “hypnosis or other ASCs” are. He then says: “The TPM process by contrast is a simple drifting back from memory to memory with the goal of locating the original lie, in faith that at that point Christ will replace the lie with His truth.”⁷³ Miller claims that “Asking a client to trace a memory trail per se, which is all that is done in TPM, is not an effective or standard means of inducing hypnotic trance.”⁷⁴

In answering the question “What is Hypnosis?” *The Harvard Mental Health Letter* says:

Although even experts do not fully agree on how to define it, they usually emphasize three related features: absorption or selective attention, suggestibility, and dissociation.⁷⁵

In her book *Creative Scripts for Hypnotherapy*, Dr. Marlene Hunter says, “There are surely as many induction techniques in hypnosis as there are people who practice hypnosis.”⁷⁶ The leading questions, expectations, indirect and direct guidance, voice intonation, and the authoritative role of Smith and other TPMers are enough to serve as an induction into the trance state for some individuals. The “simple drifting back from memory to memory with the goal of locating the original lie” makes it possible for some individuals to enter a trance state.

Yapko describes a hypnotic procedure that sounds like what happens in TPM:

“Age regression” is a hypnotic procedure in which the client is immersed in the experience of memory. The client may be encouraged to *remember* events in vivid detail, a procedure called “hypermnnesia.” Or, the client may be encouraged to *relive* the events of the past as if they were going on right now, a procedure called “revivification.” Either or both of these procedures are commonly used in memory recovery-oriented therapies.⁷⁷

Both encouragement and expectation are involved in TPM and can lead to an hypnotic state.

The suggestions, the emotions, and the focus on feelings in the past rarely produce fully accurate memories. In various forms of regressive therapy, such as TPM, the therapist

believes that present problems are from past hurtful events and then encourages the client to remember and re-experience hurtful events in the past. However, rather than positive change, many false memories may be produced. Some writers, such as Campbell Perry, indicate that **such techniques as the eliciting of memories, relaxation, and regression work are often disguised forms of hypnosis.**⁷⁸ Yapko and others who know about hypnosis would certainly see in TPM the ingredients for inducing some into a trance state.

PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS APPEARING AS FACTS

Miller expresses a number of unsubstantiated personal impressions. For example, he says:

We do believe, however, that there are some traumas Christians have suffered in their lives that properly can be described as emotional wounds and that do call for some kind of wise and biblically informed therapy. We do not believe that the Bobgans or any other antipsychology writers have constructed a biblically and logically coherent argument against this premise.

Christian counselors* have often observed that when such Christians attempt to deal with their problems through simple repentance and discipleship, the underlying wound remains unhealed and continues to create emotional pain and relational conflict in the Christian's life. Might it be that the problem needs to be dealt with on a different level? They can continue on the treadmill of repentance and relapse ad infinitum, but if there is a way to get at such wounds and allow Jesus to heal them, why should a Christian resist this?⁷⁹

Miller says in a footnote: * "Including this writer, whose counseling experience spans a 33-year period and includes directing a Christian hotline and counseling center, providing pastoral counseling, and counseling occult and cult-related problems through CRI."

Miller's experiences as a counselor are reflected in his evaluation of TPM. My wife and I have been doing what we used to call counseling and now call ministry for longer than Miller and have been in touch over the years with numerous individuals who minister likewise. We have for years spoken with these individuals at conferences, on the phone, and through correspondence. We and others have had different results than Miller. We, as well as

numerous others, adhere to the sufficiency-of-Scripture position for all the problems dealt with by TPM. Miller and CRI subscribe to an insufficiency-of-Scripture position for these same problems. It seems Miller's counseling experiences have led him to doubt the sufficiency of Scripture for "emotional wounds" and may be the reason he misrepresents our work as well as the work of others.

Miller's statement "We do not believe that the Bobgans or any other antipsychology writers have constructed a biblically and logically coherent argument against this premise" is one more example of Miller misrepresenting our work and that of others. To set the record straight, the "antipsychology writers" who give counsel regularly deal with individuals described by Miller and have "constructed a biblically and logically coherent argument" against such practices as TPM and provided biblical means absent any man-made TPM psychotherapy to deal with such problems. **It is sad that Miller has evidently not had enough success relying fully on the Lord and His Word empowered by the Holy Spirit when counseling individuals in such circumstances; otherwise he would not keep the door open to using such extrabiblical psychological and inner healing means as TPM.** It is doubly sad that he is so unfamiliar with the writings of many who have been successful ministering to such individuals. I repeat: Miller holds to an insufficiency-of-Scripture position, which influences him to support the TPM **psychobiblical** approach.

Smith has a habit of making appalling claims that are enormously important and highly controversial and yet are reported by Miller without accompanying warnings, probably because he does not think any are needed. The following is one of them. Miller says, "The vast majority (Smith surmises 98 percent) of the people that receive TPM surface memories that were known to them prior to the session."⁸⁰

At times Miller states crucial things about TPM that are just his own personal impressions that come across as facts. Miller spent a week observing an entire Theophostic basic training seminar. Miller reinforces Smith on this highly controversial issue by saying, “Most of the memories revisited in TPM sessions were known to the recipients prior to the sessions, but occasionally memories do surface that can be called ‘recovered.’”⁸¹ How did Miller conclude this? Did he survey those present? And, if so, what was the form and content of the survey? Or, was it merely his impression? This is a very significant observation stated by Miller that begs the evidence, but none is provided! Such significant affirmative statements about significant issues require significant proof, but none is given. What is Smith’s evidence? The burden of proof is on Smith and yet surprisingly Miller did not ask for it. Because of TPM’s memory recovery method, the amount of regression involved, and the expanded numbers of early life sexual abuse reported, I would conclude that there is a plethora of false memories that are recovered. (See previous section titled “Recovered Memories, Visualization, and Hypnosis.”)

Another impression by Miller is: “I observed TPM sessions wherein the recipients reported answers from Christ that seemed quite credible and others wherein the answers seemed quite dubious.”⁸² This is an enormously significant impression by Miller. What percent of the answers were “credible”? What constituted a “credible” answer? Why were some answers “quite dubious”? How did Miller check the credibility or dubiousness of the answers? Without this additional information, the simple statement by Miller is meaningless and misleading and leads one to conclude that the answer to one of the most critical questions about TPM is settled when, indeed, it is not.

MILLER'S EVALUATION OF TPM

Miller briefly sums up the CRI evaluation of TPM as follows: “CRI finds **nothing inconsistent with Scripture** in TPM’s core theory and practice” (bold added). Miller also contends that **TPM fits a biblical world view**.⁸³ Now let us examine Miller’s statements. We begin with the fact that TPM is a **psychobiblical** attempt to help those experiencing problems of living.

Psychologically

At the present time there are about 400 competing and often contradictory psychotherapies and over 10,000 not-always-compatible psychological techniques. To determine methodological systems used by Christians who practice psychotherapy, we conducted a survey with the Christian Association for Psychological Studies (CAPS), a national Christian organization composed of numerous practicing therapists. In our survey we used a simple questionnaire in which we asked the psychotherapists to list in order the psychotherapeutic approaches that most influenced their private practices. We listed only ten approaches, but provided blank spaces at the bottom of the sheet for adding others before final ranking. The results indicated that Client-Centered Therapy (Rogers) and Reality Therapy (Glasser) were the two top choices and that psychoanalysis (Freud) and Rational Emotive Therapy (Ellis) followed closely behind.

One especially interesting result from the survey is that many of the psychotherapists listed a variety of approaches at the end of the form as well as checking and ranking many of the approaches listed. Their doing so indicates that they have a highly eclectic approach to counseling. In our conclusion we had this to say:

If this survey constitutes a representative sample, it is probably fair to say that there is not just one Christian psychotherapeutic way. There is a great variety in the

approaches influencing the clinical practices of CAPS members. This survey seems to demonstrate that, while some psychotherapies are more influential than others in the practice of Christian counseling, in general the Christian psychotherapist is both independent and eclectic in his approach to counseling.⁸⁴

Each Christian practicing psychotherapy has his own conglomeration of approaches. That is not surprising. Researcher Dr. Morris Parlof observes, “Most psychotherapists are eclectic either by intent or default.”⁸⁵ The *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change* says, “Therapists identify themselves as eclectics more frequently than any other orientation.”⁸⁶

If one were to ask the numerous Christian psychologists if they met Miller’s criteria, we would venture to guess that they would all say they do. The various Christian psychologists, with their numerous and often contradictory psychological approaches, would all say that they find “**nothing inconsistent with Scripture**” with whatever psychotherapy they practice and that what each does “**fits a biblical world view.**” But then we have to ask why it is that the numerous Christian psychologists who would say that they meet Miller’s criteria come to contradictory conclusions about what therapeutic systems to use and which techniques to apply. There must be a lot of proof texting going on, to say the least.

Over 15 years ago we sent out a challenge to find even one Christian psychotherapist who would admit that what he practices is not compatible with Scripture, or in Miller’s words “inconsistent with Scripture.” So far no Christian psychotherapist admits such a thing nor would they. Thus, Miller’s criteria would apply equally well to all psychotherapies practiced by Christians, no matter how contradictory they are to one another and no matter how silly, satanic, or occult. It is doubtful that Miller knows of even one Christian psychotherapist who would admit that what he does violates his criteria.

Biblically

In describing “The Basic Theophostic Theory and Method,” Miller says, “One of the elements that make TPM a radically new approach to healing emotional pain is the central place practitioners seek to give the Spirit of Christ in the sessions.”⁸⁷

Miller asks, “Does TPM illegitimately presume that Christ is willing to cooperate with the process?”⁸⁸ Miller says:

If Jesus is cooperating with the process, then the apparent successes of TPM become readily explainable and many of the concerns raised by critics become groundless. If, on the other hand, there is no basis for assuming Jesus would respond to their requests then at best TPM is getting some positive results because participants, while **mistakenly believing that it is Jesus who is revealing truth to them**, are nonetheless facing truth about their past experiences and thus finding some release from the false beliefs that caused them pain (bold added).⁸⁹

This is a serious biblical issue, which Miller has glossed over! If the “Jesus” of TPM is not the Jesus of the Bible, that should be the end of TPM! Nothing more need be said. If the “Jesus” of TPM is not the Jesus of the Bible, then how will the participants in this deception find the truth by believing a lie? And if the participant does find “truth,” from whence did it come and what may be the consequences of following this sham? If the one conjured up is not Jesus, then it could be a spirit guide and the consequences may not become obvious until later. As a result of our extensive research, we conclude: **The JESUS of TPM is NOT the JESUS of the BIBLE!** Smith is guilty of psychoheresy and Miller is guilty of leaving the door open to this heretical use of Jesus.

Miller apparently sees nothing wrong and something potentially positive about the participants “mistakenly believing that it is Jesus who is revealing truth to them.” If we rely on testimonials absent scientific support as in TPM, every inner healing we have examined, including those that are tainted by the occult, would qualify with their “positive results.” Where is the question that inner healing researchers should ask, “If it’s not Jesus, who is it?”

In addition, why lend support to an inner healing approach in which a questionable “Jesus” is involved, such as TPM, even if there seem to be positive results? A question for Miller: Have you ever evaluated an inner healing approach that did not have, according to the practitioner, positive results?

This question of the unwillingness of Christ to cooperate is a major question with respect to the biblical legitimacy of TPM. Miller answers this important question with four TPM assumptions, which he seems to endorse. The following is abbreviated from these assumptions:

- (1) ... if we ask our Father ... we will receive what we need through the agency of His Spirit ...
- (2) ... if we ask for wisdom, we will receive what we request as long as we don't doubt that God will answer us ...
- (3) ... if we ask for anything according to His will we can be assured that we will receive it ...
- (4) ... if we are willing to face the truth about such beliefs [Satan's lies], He is willing to reveal it to us.⁹⁰

Miller is giving the answer to the original question above with these four TPM assumptions. However, the four assumptions given by Miller could be used by all the inner healers we have examined over the years, though some would define “Satan's lies” differently than Miller. In fact, we challenge Miller to name one inner healer who would not subscribe to these four assumptions regarding “TPM's trust that Jesus responds.” Therefore, Miller has drawn his readers' attention away from the required specific answer to the specific question and given a general answer (the four assumptions) that could apply to all inner healers. In other words, his answer could be used to justify biblically even approaches to which he would be opposed.

And, though Miller has not answered the original question, but instead provided four assumptions to which all inner healers would subscribe, he nonetheless concludes:

“Theophostic prayer for healing of emotional pain caused by believing lies therefore may be a legitimate exercise of stepping out on faith in God’s promises and Fatherly love rather than an act of presumption.”⁹¹

Miller says, “This [TPM’s] emphasis on conforming one’s beliefs to truth is entirely biblical.” Miller then quotes a number of Bible verses and adds, “and complete dependence on Christ ... to the point of giving him central place ... is commendable....”⁹² Every **psychobiblical** inner healing approach of which we are aware would describe itself as having a “complete dependence on Christ ... to the point of giving him central place” and being “commendable” according to Miller’s standards. They would further state emphatically that what they do fits a biblical world view, and a number of them have theologians to support their biblicity and commendability. We challenge Miller to name one that would admit otherwise.

Miller asks, “Does TPM function as extrabiblical revelation?” He says, “A very legitimate concern would be that these extrabiblical visions of, and words or realizations from, Jesus would begin to rival the Bible as a source of authoritative revelation in the believer’s life.”⁹³ According to Miller, Smith

... clarifies that no new truth is being revealed to TPM recipients. God is instead personalizing for them the truth already revealed in Scripture. “We do not need new truth,” he writes, “because the written Word contains all the truth we need.”⁹⁴

Miller appears to agree with Smith as he says:

Oftentimes these truths came straight from the Bible; in any case they needed to pass the test of scriptural consistency and were rejected if they didn’t.⁹⁵

Who determines whether or not what the client says is biblically true? How does one know if the personalizing for them is “the truth already revealed in Scripture”? Read our

Chapter 3 about Smith's "Misuse of Scripture" and see how he misuses and abuses Scripture.

After giving a number of examples, we end that chapter by saying:

Smith's skewering of Scripture should be enough to turn Christians away from this self-proclaimed prophet of God and his psychological eclecticism offered as divine revelation.⁹⁶

Smith has put God in a TPM box, because he says that "God will not speak His truth" if the original lie has not been "correctly identified"⁹⁷ Thus God's hands are tied and His mouth is shut without the expert, the TPMer who has mastered Smith's system, to lead the participant to "discover 'the lie' that matches 'the picture'" and "the accompanying emotion" so that the client can hear "the divine truth."⁹⁸

Smith's system is dependent on several different sources: (1) psychotherapeutic theories devised by nonChristians; (2) inner healing techniques, which themselves are based on misuse of Scripture and false theories of memory that may result in occult activities; and (3) corrupted Bible verses and unbiblical techniques.

Miller admits that "in the past he [Smith] has inappropriately interpreted **several** biblical passages in the light of his TPM experience (e.g., finding too many examples of theophostic principles in Scripture)"⁹⁹ (bold added). But Miller is wrong in limiting it to just **several**. If Smith's abuse of Scripture is the standard, almost anything a recipient reports as being personalized for them from Scripture by Jesus could be accepted. Even without Smith's misuse of Scripture as the standard, it is quite easy for recipients to justify what they imagine is from Jesus as true and personalized for them. It would be naïve to think otherwise.

Miller correctly reports:

Some TPM critics have charged Smith with portraying lie-based thinking as a more important issue in the life of the believer than sin. In other words, they believe he views Christian growth more as the healing of the Christian from past victimization than as the Christian taking increasing responsibility for his or her life and choices.¹⁰⁰

According to Miller, “Smith answers this question by affirming that this too is not an either-or situation.”¹⁰¹ Miller reflects support for Smith when he says that “it seems possible that TPM could bring God’s truth to these deeper layers of their psyches.”¹⁰² Miller increases his support of Smith by saying,

If, however, sin is ultimately rooted in something even deeper than our subconscious minds—something more fundamental to our natures—**then a more radical approach to overcoming sin would be required**” (bold added).¹⁰³

As confirmation of Smith, Miller says:

It is not an either-or situation. God has established many elements in the Christian life for our spiritual growth.... These provisions are intended to complement each other and it is a mistake to set one against another.¹⁰⁴

CRI endorses a general revelation position that supports the integration of psychotherapy and the Bible. Smith, contrary to his original claim that he received TPM from God at such a rapid pace he could not keep up with Him, is a committed integrationist. Smith and Miller have a common bond and it is their openness to the Bible **plus** psychotherapy, which is **psychoheresy**.

As an excuse for what he does, Smith says, “Lie-based thinking and sinning are interrelated, and both need attention.”¹⁰⁵ Because both Miller and Smith are integrationists and because neither will accept the idea that **the Bible alone is the most “radical approach to overcoming sin”** with no added psychotherapy needed, they are open to a Bible-plus position as represented in TPM. Miller says:

Smith believes that the cross is the answer to sin and that “mind renewal” is the answer to lie-based thinking. Since TPM is a mind-renewal ministry, its emphasis naturally is on healing rather than repentance, but repentance is still a vital issue in the Christian life.¹⁰⁶

This is certainly clear. The ultimate result is that Miller and Smith do not believe in the sufficiency of Scripture to deal with issues normally addressed by TPM.

Smith has devised another system to use along with the way that the Lord has given and insists that it's not an either or situation. He contends that repentance is the answer to sin, but that "healing of their pain will help them in their battle against sin."¹⁰⁷ Therefore he believes Christians need the cross **and** TPM. But, his system is based on the idea that the root of pain is lie-based thinking that originated when someone else hurt them. In contrast, the Bible clearly teaches a person's sinful nature is the source of sin. External factors may serve as temptations but cannot be the cause or even the root.

Smith is contending that renewing the mind for the sake of healing past wounds needs more than Scripture and the work of the Holy Spirit in the believer. In contrast to TPM, God works through His Word and Spirit to bring all that is necessary for dealing with the past, present and future. In the Bible renewing the mind is connected with complete transformation and can be done any time a Christian is sinning or struggling to deal with problems according to what the Bible calls "the old man."

That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; And be renewed in the spirit of your mind; And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness (Eph. 4:22-24).

Clearly Scripture relates deceptive thinking with the corruption of the sinful "old man."

Scripture does not look for roots of sin outside the old sinful nature. While people may be horribly sinned against, their own actions come from within, from either the old sinful nature or the new life in Christ. The answer to lie-based thinking is not psychotherapy, inner healing, or the combination labeled TPM. The answer is walking according to the new man rather than the old. Paul clearly delineates the biblical process of walking in the truth in Colossians 2 and 3. Especially notice Colossians 2:6-8 and 3.10.

Smith has set up a competing system to set people free and has the audacity to proof-text John 8:32 in support of what happens in TPM.

Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, *then* are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free (John 8:31, 32).

But in context, Jesus is teaching that as one learns and follows His Word the person is set free. In other words, it is by living according to His Word and His life by walking according to the spirit rather than the flesh. Notice that one becomes free through being Jesus' disciple and following His Word, not by waiting to hear something special during some inner healing or TPM ritual.

In attempting to correct Smith's wrong assumptions about the nature of man in his section on sanctification, Miller clearly presents the correct doctrine concerning the Christian continuing to have a sinful nature that must be put off and denied. Smith's system is built on the wrong idea of the root of problems (lies connected with past hurts rather than the sinful nature). That is why Smith's doctrinal problems regarding sanctification and the sinful nature are NOT peripheral to the practice of TPM. They are basic to the entire process!

CONCLUSION

For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables (2 Tim. 4:3,4).

I have shown in this paper that Miller totally misrepresents our work; ignores Smith's claim for God being the direct source of TPM; finesses the fact that TPM is not new information, as Smith claims, but merely an eclectic combination of psychotherapies practiced by him for years, plus inner healing; fails to recognize the junk science involved in TPM; overlooks the damaging effects of Smith's practice of recovered memory therapy and

visualization; gives his personal impressions and opinions on important issues without the necessary support where needed; disregards a number of the outrageous and unsubstantiated claims made by Smith; does not condemn Smith enough for his extreme misuse of Scripture; and finally undermines his own many warnings about TPM by leaving the door open for Christians to pursue it.

TPM is thoroughly unbiblical and lacks scientific support for its claims and practices. Smith admits that he could not find any biblical evidence for what he does.¹⁰⁸ And, the research to date on TPM does not justify its use. Many have been deceived by TPM, and Miller will have to accept some of the responsibility for TPM's continued and expanding popularity and the number of victims it leaves in its wake, because he leaves the door open to its use, in spite of the warnings he gives.

Contrary to what Miller has concluded, we contend that TPM is biblically and scientifically rotten to the core. The “core theory and practice” of TPM involve psychotherapeutic theories and practices, which include recovered memories, visualization, and, at times, hypnosis. The conjuring up of a Jesus figure to answer prayers and give truth in the manner practiced in TPM is absent in Scripture and is centered on the sins of others and the accompanying “wounds” inflicted by others. This is just the opposite of what is seen in Scripture. The wounds received rather than the wounds inflicted on others is the message of therapism and not the Bible. TPM majors in hurts received rather than sins committed. TPM is not in Scripture. It is a product of our psychotherapeutic age in which there is a centering on self and playing the victim. **The fact that Miller would leave the door open to TPM and yet consider that the “Jesus” of TPM may not be the Jesus of the Bible is biblically appalling!**

Miller refers to Smith as being a “man of integrity.”¹⁰⁹ Smith has been in error biblically and scientifically for some time and has changed his verbiage and shifted his stance, often without biblically repenting of his errors and never, to my knowledge, asking forgiveness from the hapless victims of his Frankensteinian creation. As we have demonstrated in our book on Theophostics, as well as in this paper, TPM is not only **psychobiblical**; it is **psychoheretical**. In spite of what Smith has changed, what still remains of his current practices described in our book on Theophostics should condemn its very use.

Our research leads us to question Miller’s judgment. Any fair reading of our book should lead one to condemn Smith’s Theophostic concoction. Smith has transmogrified the truth of God to support his **psychobiblical** miasma that centers on false images of Jesus constructed through memory drifting, regressive therapy, and occult-like visualization that can occur through the use of his process. Moreover, Miller and CRI, an organization many trust, have left the door open for others to practice or participate in this charade from which Smith has greatly prospered financially. Smith looks more like a business entrepreneur who has a product to sell, redesigns it to make it salable, and denies what he has said and done to dodge criticism.

Our conclusion is that a fair theological and scientific evaluation should lead one to conclude that TPM should be banned for believers. Miller provides sufficient reasons in his paper to support our conclusion and yet he backs away from it. In spite of Miller’s warnings, Christians will be sucked into the vortex of Smith’s grandiose claims, cures, and cases absent any divine revelation or academic proof. Miller has failed the thousands and maybe hundreds of thousands of victims of TPM past, present, and future! Christians need to heed Paul’s urging: “That we *henceforth* be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried

about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, *and* cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive” (Eph. 4:14).

NOTES

-
- ¹ Martin & Deidre Bobgan. *TheoPhostic Counseling: Divine Revelation or PsychoHeresy?*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1999.
- ² Elliot Miller, "An Evaluation of Theophostic Prayer Ministry," Christian Research Institute, <http://www.equip.org/free/PST001.pdf>.
- ³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- ⁶ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
- ⁷ Ed Smith. *Beyond Tolerable Recovery: Moving beyond a tolerable existence to genuine restoration and inner healing*. Campbellsville, KY: Family Care Publishing, 1996, p. 31.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 142.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 164,165.
- ¹² Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 4, footnote 5.
- ¹³ Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 165.
- ¹⁴ Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
- ¹⁵ Ed Smith, "Breakthroughs in Biblical Counseling and Genuine Inner Healing," FAX regarding TheoPhostic Training Seminars, Campbellsville, KY, p. 4.
- ¹⁶ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
- ¹⁷ Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
- ¹⁸ Smith, *Beyond Tolerable Recovery, op. cit.*, pp. 164,165.
- ¹⁹ Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
- ²⁰ Ed Smith. *Beyond Tolerable Recovery: Moving beyond a tolerable existence to genuine restoration and inner healing*, 4th Ed. Campbellsville, KY: Family Care Publishing, 2000, p. 54.
- ²¹ Ed Smith. *Theophostic Prayer Ministry Basic Seminar Manual. New Creation Publishing Incorporated*. Campbellsville, KY: New Creation Publishing Incorporated, 2005, p. 90.
- ²² Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- ²⁴ *Skeptical Inquirer*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 31-32.
- ²⁵ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- ²⁷ Jill Niemark, "Are Recovered Memories Real," *Discover*, August 2004, p. 73.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 74.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.
- ³⁰ Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
- ³¹ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
- ³² *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- ³³ *Ibid.*
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ³⁷ *Psychotherapy Networker*, Vol. 29, No. 2, p. 67.
- ³⁸ *Science News*, Vol. 168, No. 1, p. 13; *The Harvard Mental Health Letter*, Vol. 15, No. 8, p. 7.
- ³⁹ See Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Hypnosis: Medical, Scientific, or Occultic?* Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 2001, Chapter 5, pp. 45-56.
- ⁴⁰ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
- ⁴¹ Robert Epstein, "Loose Screw Awards," *Psychology Today*, January 2005, p. 56.
- ⁴² "Recovered Memories: Are They Reliable?" False Memory Syndrome Foundation, 3401 Market Street, Suite 130, Philadelphia, PA 19104-3318.
- ⁴³ Leon Eisenberg, "The Past 50 Years of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry: A Personal Memoir," *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, July 2001, p. 743.
- ⁴⁴ Smith. *Beyond Tolerable Recovery* (1996), *op. cit.*, p. 20.

-
- ⁴⁵ Paul Cameron email.
- ⁴⁶ Smith. *Beyond Tolerable Recovery* (1996), *op. cit.*, p. 20.
- ⁴⁷ Cameron, *op. cit.*
- ⁴⁸ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
- ⁴⁹ Richard McNally email.
- ⁵⁰ “Recovered Memories: Are They Reliable?” *op. cit.*
- ⁵¹ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 24.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 23.
- ⁵⁴ Susan Robbins email.
- ⁵⁵ Susan Robbins, “Working with Clients who have Recovered Memories,” <www.sprobbins.com/cv/recovmem.html>.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.
- ⁶⁰ Jay Haley. *Strategies of Psychotherapy*. New York: Grune & Stratton, Inc. 1963, p. 71.
- ⁶¹ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 10.,
- ⁶² Martin Bobgan, “Simony & Biblical Counseling,” *PsychoHeresy Awareness Letter*, Vol. 5, No. 5, www.psychoheresy-aware.org.
- ⁶³ Bobgan, *TheoPhostic Counseling*, *op. cit.*, Chapter 5.
- ⁶⁴ Michael D. Yapko. *Suggestions of Abuse: True and False Memories of Childhood Sexual Trauma*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994, pp. 121,122.
- ⁶⁵ Dave Hunt. *Occult Invasion*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 1998, pp. 180-181.
- ⁶⁶ Alan Morrison. *The Serpent and the Cross*. Birmingham, UK: K & M Books, 1994, pp. 440,441.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 443.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 447,448.
- ⁶⁹ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ⁷¹ Philip G. Zimbardo. “Mind Control: Political Fiction and Psychological Reality.” *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Peter Stansky, ed. Stanford: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983, pp. 197-215.
- ⁷² Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.
- ⁷⁵ “Hypnosis,” *The Harvard Mental Health Letter*, Vol. 7, No. 10, p. 1.
- ⁷⁶ Marlene E. Hunter. *Creative Scripts for Hypnotherapy*. New York: Burnner/Mazel, Publishers, 1994, p. 3.
- ⁷⁷ Yapko, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
- ⁷⁸ Campbell Perry, *Hypnos*, Vol. XXII, No. 4, p. 189.
- ⁷⁹ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ⁸³ *Ibid.* p. 6.
- ⁸⁴ Martin Bobgan, *CAPS Bulletin* 6, No. 1, p. 13.
- ⁸⁵ Morris Parloff, “Psychotherapy and Research: An Anaclitic Depression,” *Psychiatry*, Vol. 32, p. 291.
- ⁸⁶ Allen E. Bergin, Sol. L. Garfield, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1994, p. 7.
- ⁸⁷ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 11.
- ⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ⁹¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁹³ *Ibid.*, p.11.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.12.

-
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.13.
- ⁹⁶ Bobgan, *TheoPhostic Counseling, op. cit.*, p. 48.
- ⁹⁷ Smith, *Beyond Tolerable Recovery* (1996), *op. cit.*, p.76.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- ⁹⁹ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- ¹⁰⁸ Smith, *Beyond Tolerable Recovery* (1996), *op. cit.*, p. 111.
- ¹⁰⁹ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 27.