Chapter 20

PERSONALITY FORMATION

Early Life Determinants.

It is often difficult to find out whether or not Meier and Minirth have research backing for their statements. They sometimes expound their ideas completely without footnotes to indicate the source of their statements. For example they say:

In exploring possible causes for the counselee’s present difficulties, the counselor must consider early childhood. If the parents were absent and the child’s dependency needs were not met, then the individual is more prone to depression or sociopathy, depending on how he handles the conflict. If the parents would not allow the child to be an individual but were symbiotic with him, then he is more prone to schizophrenia. If the parents were harsh, then the individual may be a guilty compulsive, a critical paranoid or an acting-out sociopath, depending on how he handles the conflict. If the parents were seductive or rewarded overly dramatic behavior, then the individual is more likely to have hysterical problems. If both parents were in constant conflict, the individual is more prone to deep-seated insecurity and anxiety or neurosis. Thus man can have unresolved conflicts from childhood, and those conflicts can intensify his present problems. Man does have conflicts. Man is psychological.¹

The above statement represents their Freudian views and their own personal opinions, which would be seriously questioned by practitioners who are not of their personal and psychoanalytic persuasion.

In Happiness Is a Choice, Meier and Minirth say:

In his earlier book (Christian Child-Rearing and Personality Development, Baker Book House 1977), Dr. Meier summarized several hundred research articles on personality development to demonstrate that approximately 85 percent of our adult behavior patterns are firmly entrenched by our sixth birthday.²
In their book *Introduction to Psychology and Counseling* they say, “By the time children are old enough to go to school, most of their character structure has already been established.”

Their statement “approximately 85 percent of our adult behavior patterns are firmly entrenched by our sixth birthday” has been a repeated theme in their writing and speaking. They claim that it is demonstrated by “several hundred research articles.” But, their “85 percent” litany is actually related to their Freudian orientation. The research demonstrates change rather than the almost deterministic theory that Meier and Minirth claim. Before turning to the research we will first discuss the Freudian theory that underlies their “85 percent” statement. We begin by discussing the theory of infantile sexuality.

According to Freud’s theory of infantile sexuality, the first five or six years of life pretty much determine the rest of a person’s life. Freud believed that every human being is confronted with four stages of development: oral, anal, phallic, and genital. He taught that the four stages of infantile sexuality follow one another and occur at certain ages in normal development. The oral stage is from birth to eighteen months; the anal stage is from eighteen months to three years; the phallic stage is from three to five or six years; and the genital stage continues through puberty. All four stages have to do with sexuality, and Freud related adult characteristics and mental-emotional disorders to childhood experiences within the various stages. He believed that if a person failed to pass successfully through each stage or experienced a trauma during one of the stages, there would be inexplicable damage to his psyche.

Freud’s theory of infantile sexuality is also related to his theory of psychic determinism, both of which are within his theory of the unconscious. According to his theory of psychic determinism, each person is what he is because of the effect of the unconscious upon his entire life. Freud believed that “we are ‘lived’ by unknown and uncontrollable forces.” He theorized that these forces are in the unconscious and control each person in the sense that they influence all that the person does. Thus, he saw people as puppets of the unknown and unseen unconscious, shaped by these forces during the first six years of life.

Freud contended that as each child passes from one psychosexual stage of development to another, his psyche is shaped by the people in his environment and especially by his parents. Psychic determinism establishes a process of blame that begins in the unconscious and ends with the parents. Freud removed a person’s responsibility for his behavior by teaching that everyone has been predetermined by his unconscious, which was shaped by the treatment given him by his parents during the first few years of his life.

Freudian theory is known as psychic determinism. However, we have never seen a percentage of fixedness placed upon the time from birth to age six. Even Freud believed in some hope for the individual. In one of the Meier and Minirth programs, the following was said:

> When we get the responsibility from God to raise our children, He gives us most of that responsibility from their birth til they’re six years old. After that we’re just modifying the other 15 percent.
In Happiness Is a Choice, they speak of parents bringing in a teenager to them and they say, “All we can do is help the parents to find some ways to modify the 5 or 10 percent of that teen-ager’s personality that isn’t already formed.” Elsewhere Meier says that “what you feed into your child’s brain during those first six years is what’s going to come out of his brain the next seventy years.” While the figure they use of a child after age six is 15 percent, apparently for a teen-ager it drops to 5 or 10 percent. Meier and Minirth say 85 percent by age six and no one knows what percentage Freud would have used. But, the fact that Meier and Minirth give such a high percentage of determinism (85 percent by age six, with only 5 to 10 percent possibility for change during the teen-age years) demonstrates that this too is of Freudian origin.

A little thoughtful reflection on the setting of percentages would lead one to conclude that such use of numbers is not a good idea. Think about what “adult behavior patterns” are. How would one be able to sum up and put down all that constitutes “adult behavior patterns”? Also, a child before age six would be cognitively and behaviorally incapable of performing some “adult behavior patterns.” In addition to this, some “adult behavior patterns” would be illegal for a child under six. Even if one could develop this impossible list of behavior patterns, what does it mean when they apply an 85 percent figure? Even if we used an adjective, such as gregarious, what is 85 percent of it by age six? While those who create and use such percentages may gain a sense of security, there are too many variables which are beyond investigation to make any sense of such numbers.

Besides a misleading sense of authority in the use of such percentages, there is research which refutes the idea of such iron-clad determinism. In his book The Psychological Society, Martin Gross summarizes the work of Dr. Stella Chess, professor of child psychiatry at New York University Medical Center. Gross says that a potent conclusion that evolves from Chess’s work is that “the present psychiatric theory that the first six years of life are the exclusive molders of personality is patently false.” (Emphasis his.)

Social psychologist Dr. Carol Tavris discusses the idea of constancy versus change in an article titled “The Freedom to Change.” She discusses Freud and his psychoanalytic therapy and says:

Now the irony is that many people who are not fooled by astrology for one minute subject themselves to therapy for years, where the same errors of logic and interpretation often occur. . . . Astrologists think we are determined at birth (or even conception) by our stars; psychoanalysts think we are determined within a few years of birth by our parents (and our anatomy). Tavris goes on to discuss the research that opposes the idea of Freudian determinism. And, the very same research would stand in opposition to Meier and Minirth’s eighty-five percent notion. She cites the work of Dr. Orville Brim of the Foundation for Child Development in New York and says, “Most of Brim’s career has been devoted to charting the course of child development and its relation to adult personality.” She declares that Brim is convinced that “far from being programmed permanently by the age of 5, people
are virtually reprogrammable throughout life.” She quotes him as saying, “Hundreds and hundreds of studies now document the fact of personality change in adulthood.”¹⁰ She also quotes Brim as saying:

Social scientists are unable to predict adult personality from childhood or even from adolescence in any important way. We can’t blame the methods anymore, and we can’t say that people who don’t fit the predictions are deviant, unhealthy or strange. They are the norm.¹¹

In addition to Brim, Tavris discusses the work of Dr. Jerome Kagan, a professor at Harvard University. Kagan, together with Howard Moss, wrote a classic book in the field titled *Birth to Maturity: A Study in Psychological Development*, which agrees with Meier and Minirth’s views. However, after further research, Kagan made an 180-degree turn in his ideas of child development. After taking a second look at *Birth to Maturity*, Kagan and Moss “could find little relation between psychological qualities during the first three years of life . . . and any aspect of behavior in adulthood.”¹² According to Tavris, “Kagan now believes that few of a baby’s attributes last indefinitely, unless the environment perpetuates them.”¹³

Brim and Kagan later wrote a book together titled *Constancy and Change in Human Development*. They say:

The view that emerges from this work is that humans have a capacity for change across the entire life span. . . there are important growth changes across the life span from birth to death, many individuals retain a great capacity for change, and the consequences of the events of early childhood are continually transformed by later experiences, making the course of human development more open than many have believed.¹⁴

While writing this section we wrote to Brim and Kagan and asked their current response concerning Meier and Minirth’s eighty-five-percent idea. Brim responded:

The statement that you report about adult personality [Meier and Minirth’s eighty-five percent] cannot be substantiated by any scientific research at all. In fact, what evidence there is, and there is a good amount of it, shows a continuing change in personality over the lifespan.¹⁵

Kagan’s reply also indicated disagreement with Meier and Minirth’s eighty-five-percent determinism.¹⁶

We also wrote to Dr. Bernard Rimland, who is the director of the Institute for Child Behavior Research in San Diego. In his reply about Meier and Minirth’s eighty-five percent notion, he says the idea “that the personality is the product of the individual psychosocial experiences . . . is totally unsupported by any scientific evidence that I’ve been able to find.”¹⁷

Our greatest concern with the eighty-five-percent statement is that it once more expresses Meier and Minirth’s strong Freudian ideology. In addition, their use of a
number such as eighty-five percent, even though it is preceded by the word *approximately*, makes no sense when considering the complexity and incomparability of “adult behavior patterns” and those of pre-six-year-olds. And finally, based upon the research, we doubt that Meier, Minirth, or anyone else could “demonstrate that approximately 85 percent of our adult behavior patterns are firmly entrenched by our sixth birthday.”

**Child Care.**

Meier and Minirth’s Freudian views on early life development can also be seen in what they say about child care. On one of the broadcasts a woman asked about going back to college. She said she was married and had a six-month-old. Meier’s response was:

> If you went back to college right now that baby would be neglected. If that baby got taken care of by somebody else full-time the baby would be neglected. If you put that baby in day care forty hours a week that baby would be neglected and according to psychiatric research he would have permanent psychological damage.

A similar statement was said on another broadcast. And, in *Introduction to Psychology and Counseling*, Meier and Minirth refer to the possibility of “some degree of permanent emotional and intellectual damage.”

Before we discuss the statement above and the problems associated with it, we want to make it clear that we believe that the best possible arrangement for an infant is to have a mother home with the child at least during the first two or three years of life. We believe this for biblical reasons which we shall not discuss here. In addition, we think that the research in the area of child development on the one hand and the availability of quality substitute care on the other hand would support our position, not only because it is clear that good quality, affordable child care is difficult to obtain, but also because there is a need to develop a healthy parent-infant relationship. Our strong counsel to mothers is to be home to care for their own babies during the early years of life.

There is also another factor to consider before responding to Meier’s remark about full-time child care leading to “neglect” and “permanent psychological damage.” Yale University’s Edward Ziegler says, “In modern America mothers work for the same reasons fathers do-----economic necessity.” Most of the jobs today do not provide enough pay to support a family. It is not surprising then that men with low salaries are much more likely to have a working wife. *Insight* magazine reports that “68 percent of two-parent households now have both parents on the job and in most cases need two incomes to make ends meet.”

Economist Eli Ginzberg calls the movement of women into the labor force “the single most outstanding phenomenon of the twentieth century.” While the day-care call-in question was from a woman planning to attend college, Meier’s answer would apply to all women who would resort to full-time child care. It would apply to intact families with both working parents, as we just discussed, but it would also apply to single-parent (almost all of whom are women) families with infants.
Probably at least equal to the movement of women into the labor force as “the single most outstanding phenomenon of the twentieth century” is the growth in female-headed single-parent families. This explosion in numbers of female-headed single-parent families in the last fifty years has left large numbers of women with no choice about work or child care. According to *The Parental Leave Crisis*, “Experts predict that one out of every three families, possibly even one out of two will be headed by a single parent in 1990.”

With almost half of the marriages ending in divorce, numerous women do not receive enough child and spousal support to run a household. If two-parent families often cannot make it on one salary and need to make ends meet, it is even more true that single-parent families with infants are even more affected. The answer Meier gave literally affects millions and primarily it affects women who, even in intact families, bear the responsibility for child care.

The first problem we have with Meier’s answer to the child care question is its categorical sound. It has an ecclesiastical, pontifical ring to it. He says that the “baby would be neglected and according to psychological research he would have permanent psychological damage.” (Emphasis ours.) In cases such as this, where there are numerous variables involved, an extreme categorical statement such as the one just quoted is bound to be wrong even though it may have some truth behind it. Day care is a dramatic fact in America. To imply that “neglect” and “permanent psychological damage” are certainties is a gross over-interpretation of the research.

Child care is not a simple matter. It involves many factors, including the type of day-care environment, the care giver(s), the child, the child’s home environment, involvement of the parents, involvement of relatives and friends, just to name a few. The day-care could be given in the child’s home by a relative, friend or other person or in the home of a relative, friend or other person. Or it could be family day-care in the home of a woman who may or may not care for her own children at the same time; parent co-ops; day-care centers and so on. Another variable is the age at which a child receives child care (infant or older child) and the length of time. If we enumerated all of the factors, sub-factors and related factors, it would be clear how enormously complex the situation is. It is a complexity undeserving of a glib, extreme categorical statement such as the one quoted.

There are some studies which indicate good results for children in day care. Fredelle Maynard, in summarizing the effects of day care on intellectual development says, “In general, studies agree that day care of average quality has no apparent ill effects on children’s intellectual development.” Researcher Jerome Kagan compared day care and home care of children during the first three years of life. He concluded that “day care and home-reared children developed similarly with respect to cognitive, social and affective qualities during the first three years of life.” However, he qualified his statement with certain provisions, such as a good ratio of children to adults, nurturant and capable care givers, similar values between family and care giver, and other conditions of good child care.

Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, former director of the National Institute of Education says:
Some of the most encouraging data in education come from studies done on Head Start by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation of Ypsilanti, Michigan. Basically, the High/Scope research shows that every dollar spent on Head Start saves us $7 - in prisons that don’t have to be built, in detoxification centers that don’t have to be run, and in psychiatrists and counselors who don’t have to be hired. Children who have been through a good Head Start program go to college far more often than those in the control groups. They get jobs more often, and they end up in jail less often.31

These brief examples should refute Meier’s categorical statement about the effect of day care, dogmatic accusation of “neglect,” and prediction of “permanent psychological damage.”

There are studies that support both sides of the child care issue. Dr. Thomas Gamble and Dr. Edward Zigler discuss “Effects of Infant Day Care: Another Look at the Evidence.” They say:

Some prominent workers have highlighted the potentially damaging effects of infant day care, while equally prominent workers have asserted that such care is essentially benign.32

The prestigious Merrill-Palmer Institute concludes: “According to our preliminary findings, day care is not necessarily harmful. But some day care programs might produce harm.”33 We think that a fair reading of the research will give a variety of results, but none so drastic as the categorical “neglect... permanent psychological damage” remarks expressed on Meier and Minirth’s radio program.

Meier and Minirth’s position on child care is based on their Freudian bias rather than on any solid research. Dr. Louise Bates Ames, co-director of the famed Gesell Institute of Child Development, says:

I am afraid that the whole environmental school which has dominated child care in America in the last twenty-five years has made parents too anxious, too insecure and too guilty. . . . They created the attitude that the child’s psyche is fragile, which it is not. Most of the damage we have seen in child rearing is the fault of the Freudian and neo-Freudians who have dominated the field. They have frightened parents and kept the truth from them. In child care I would say that Freudianism has been the psychological crime of the century.34 (Emphasis added.)

Martin Gross says, “This environmental system is based on the psychodynamic theory in which the unknowing parent forces the child to repress its unconscious drives.”35 Gross concludes, “Modern research indicates that the skeptics have been right all along: that environmental or Freudian theory is false.”36 (Emphasis his.) Gross also says:
In the raising of children the parent is generally the most knowledgeable guide. This reassuring philosophy is repeated by no less an expert than Dr. Spock himself. “The more people have studied different methods of bringing up children the more they have come to the conclusion that what good mothers and fathers instinctively feel like doing for their babies is usually best after all.”

Gross concludes by saying:

The modern sin of parenting has not been one of psychological ignorance. It has been quite the opposite. By absorbing the half-truths, shibboleths and outright fallacies of the Psychological Society, the parents of the last thirty-five years have unfortunately put into massive practice an idea whose time should not have come.

A writer to the editor in *Science News* says:

Our culture is obsessed with redefining all natural developmental processes, making them look like a laundry list of pathologies. Normal childhood fears have become phobias, temper outbursts are now oppositional disorders, worry is overanxious disorder and wanting one’s mama around is separation anxiety.

Next come the statistical horror stories, followed by political sanction of more “health” care and treatment facilities.

In conclusion, because Meier and Minirth’s categorical, extreme statement of “neglect” and “permanent psychological damage” primarily affects millions of women, we see that Freudian psychology with its anti-woman and particularly anti-mother bias is the basis for their advice, rather than psychiatric research, as they maintain. A number of examples of the Freudian anti-parents and particularly anti-mother bias come through in *Happiness Is a Choice*. Meier and Minirth speak of “A child with a cold, rejecting mother and a passive or absent father.” The strong mother/weak father theme is found in their other books as well. In one case they refer to “his mother’s rejection.”

In another case they refer to the mother who “was extremely Victorian” and the maternal grandmother as the “boss of the family” and “very domineering.” In Appendix 2 of *Happiness Is a Choice*, the mother or step-mother is implicated in the problem in all eleven cases. Those cases are repeated in *Introduction to Psychology and Counseling*. In their book *Taking Control*, a comment is made by Meier in a section on teenage addicts. One element in Meier’s formula of what he calls “cure” is to get the addict away from his mother.

Almost like a refrain from the Garden of Eden, Freudian theory from the beginning pinned blame on women and has been particularly hard on mothers. Meier and Minirth’s type of advice only amplifies the difficulties women encounter in the world and fuels the fires of feminism.
Sexual Identity.

Meier and Minirth’s Freudian bias also affects their notions about the development of sexual identity. From their Freudian vantage point, they promote a theory of how boys become homosexuals and girls become lesbians. Their formula, reduced to its simplest, is that homosexuality is the result of an absent father and lesbianism is the result of significant separation from the mother, and all, of course, by Freudian necessity, before the age of six.

On a radio program a male caller asked about a situation with his ex-wife. He had joint custody of his three-year-old boy. The boy spends one week with his father and three with his mother and grandmother. After further description of the situation, the following response was given about the boy:

. . . his sexual identity will be formed from about two to six. And so if he lived with her [the boy’s mother] and with the grandma and not with you he would almost for sure become a homosexual. And he needs to spend a lot of time with you so he’ll identify with you, pattern his life after you, walk like you, talk like you and act like you. . . . I wish he was with you three weeks and with her for a weekend a month or something.47

The daddy, absent through work or divorce during the first six years of life, leading to homosexuality or homosexual tendencies, is a repeated theme on their broadcasts.48 In Introduction to Psychology and Counseling they put part of the blame on the mother. They say:

An early history characterized by an overprotective mother who forms an alliance with her son against a hostile detached father does make male individuals more prone to temptation in the homosexual direction.49

In Happiness Is a Choice they describe a hypothetical obsessive-compulsive who is at work and absent from the household. They say:

He is the medical researcher who spends seven days (and nights) a week in the lab in order to save mankind from various diseases while his wife suffers from loneliness and his sons become homosexuals and eventually commit suicide.50

This is another reiteration of their formula of a father’s absence leading to his son becoming a homosexual and another pathetic pontifical pathological prediction (suicide), unsubstantiated by the research.

While for Meier and Minirth the basic factor in homosexuality is an absent father, their basic factor in lesbianism is an absent mother, or a hostile one. In reference to the absent mother factor, these words were said on one of their broadcasts:
Now a little girl needs to spend a lot of time with her mom so that she won’t develop a mother vacuum later on in life. And if she doesn’t spend very much time with her mother, if she’s stuck in day care centers and things of that nature and doesn’t spend very much time with her mother or with significant females to identify with, stable significant females, I mean the same person throughout many years, not multiple care, then she will develop lesbian tendencies when she gets older. Satan will use that mother vacuum to tempt her to meet it in a sexual way with other females.\(^51\)

In reference to a hostile mother they say: “Females with a hostile, competitive mother and a passive father are more prone to be tempted in the lesbian direction.”\(^52\)

In addition to Meier and Minirth’s predictive formulas for homosexuality and lesbianism are their formulas for male and female promiscuity. They are the flip side of the formulas for homosexuality and lesbianism. While for homosexuality the absent father is the important ingredient, for male promiscuity it is the absent mother. They say on one broadcast:

The little boy who doesn’t get much time with mom when he’s growing up will be more sexually promiscuous. He’ll have a mother vacuum. Even though he may develop a good male sexual identity, he may become very sexually promiscuous and look down on women and be a womanizer and a male chauvinist pig, because he has a mother vacuum that was never met. He’ll turn to sex to meet that vacuum even though it never really satisfies that vacuum.\(^53\)

Now the flip side of the formula for lesbianism is the absent father. On one broadcast they say that “a girl that doesn’t spend time with her dad . . . will become very promiscuous sexually later on in life, if she doesn’t get enough time with daddy.”\(^54\) On another broadcast they say:

If a little girl grows up being close to her mom but dad is gone all the time, then that little girl will crave her father’s affection and not get it. She’ll have a father vacuum and she’ll end up becoming a hysterical female later on and she’ll probably become sexually promiscuous.\(^55\)

In the Freudian theory of heterosexual development the boy ends up by identifying with the father and yet retains the mother as the primary love object. As Freudian Theodore Lidz says, the girl ends up identifying with the mother and yet “must shift her basic love object from the mother to the father.”\(^56\) According to Freud, even though the girl must shift her love object she does not need to shift the parent with whom she identifies. Like-parent identification and unlike-parent as love object are supposedly the end result of properly navigating the rough waters of the Oedipus complex. However, according to Freudian theory, failure to accomplish the changes required can lead to homosexuality or lesbianism.

Martin Gross explains the Freudian view of homosexuality very simply. He says:
Freud and many of his modern successors saw homosexuality as the penalty for the boy child’s failure to win the Oedipal battle against a seductive, overbearing, over-affectionate mother-----the classic Mrs. Portnoy. Instead of finally identifying with the hated father at the resolution of the Oedipal rivalry, the child identifies with the mother. Thereafter, the now homosexual male seeks other men as his love object.57

Gross goes on to say:

In the Freudian homosexual model, the penis-adoring child also shows disgust for the penisless woman. This is coupled with his castration fear at the hands of an angry father-rival.58 (Emphasis his.)

Dr. Irving Bieber, another Freudian, says in the Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry:

Thus, the parental constellation most likely to produce a homosexual or heterosexual with severe homosexual problems was a detached, hostile father and a close-binding, overly intimate, seductive mother who dominated and minimized her husband.59

Dr. Ronald Bayer, in his book Homosexuality and American Psychiatry, presents another facet of Freud’s idea. He says:

Later, Freud asserted that homosexuality was linked to the profound frustration experienced during the oedipal phase by those boys who had developed especially intense attachments to their mothers. Denied the sexual gratification for which they yearned, these boys regressed to an earlier stage of development, and identified with the woman they could not have. They then sought as sexual partners young men who resembled themselves and loved them in the way they would have had their mothers love them.60

It is difficult to tell if Meier and Minirth accept the entire classical Freudian theory. However there is enough similarity to conclude that they are at the very least utilizing a slight variation of the Freudian theory. Their belief that sexual identity is established before age six, that a boy needs a father present with whom to identify, and that the sole presence of a mother will move a boy to homosexuality are all variations of the Freudian formula. During his lifetime, Freud developed several versions or explanations for homosexuality. However, the basis for each explanation was always the same, that is, the unconscious Oedipal conflict occurring before age six. Meier and Minirth’s explanation can certainly be traced to the same source.

With the prior information given about Freudian theory and the added information given in this section, it should be easy to fill in the details of the earlier formulas for
lesbianism and promiscuity. Because a girl is unable to navigate the troubled waters of the Oedipal conflict and has not been able to make the proper parental love object/identification, she may end up a lesbian. The promiscuity formulas arise out of the same Oedipal cauldron of “castration anxiety,” “penis envy,” parental love object and parental identification. Following the Freudian formula, failure can result in later life promiscuity for either a boy or a girl, though the psychodynamics are different for each.

In discussing sexual identity on one of their broadcasts, Meier said:

Patients will come in and they’re thirty years old and let’s say its a young man. It’s a young man who was brought up by his mom and his grandma and had two older sisters and he had no father in the home and then he went off to church and had female Sunday school teachers. He went to elementary school and had female teachers. . . . I’ve had many of them say, “I’m a woman who’s locked into a man’s body.” And it really isn’t their fault that they have a female sexual identity. He didn’t choose it. It was sort of forced on him. . . . It’s not your fault that you’re a woman locked into a man’s body, not your fault at all, and I sympathize with you like crazy.61

Please notice the words “not your fault at all.” When one begins with the Freudian early determinants and adds the Freudian psychosexual stages of development, and then adds the Freudian formation of sexual identity, the equation will naturally result in “not your fault at all.” This not only contradicts the Bible; it is an unsubstantiated leap from theory to unbiblical dogma to state, “not your fault at all.”

On one of Meier and Minirth’s programs, The Person by Theodore Lidz (a Freudian) was recommended. Lidz’s chapter on “The Oedipal Period” gives additional information about Freud’s view of this early period of life that (without meaning to) illustrates both the degeneracy and creativity of Freud’s mind. But while Meier, Minirth, and Lidz give credence to Freud’s Oedipal notion, Gross says it is about as true as “the correlation between human personality and the Zodiac chart.”62

We do not necessarily concur with any of the views quoted earlier. We are providing information in opposition to the Freudian view and its variations, including Meier and Minirth’s, because we believe that the only truthful approach to problems of living is biblical, not psychoanalytical or even psychological. And we believe that there are biblical explanations for homosexuality and lesbianism to occur. However, Meier and Minirth have chosen psychoanalytical explanations.

In conclusion, as one studies Meier and Minirth with respect to their teachings on early life determinants (eighty-five percent factor), child care (“neglect” and “permanent psychological damage”), and homosexuality/lesbian/promiscuity (absent father/absent mother), it is transparent that Freud should be given much credit for what they say. Their continued failure to credit and compliment Freud is puzzling and disconcerting. Puzzling because it is only fair that Freud be given credit for their ideas. And, it is disconcerting because it should be morally mandatory to give credit where it is due, especially when Freud’s opinions are spoken as facts and alluded to as research. We realize that their ideas
are not completely congruent with Freud’s, but that they originated with Freud is without question.
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