

**Trevor Morrison:**  
**Devoted To God And His Word**  
**Or To Dr. Lawrence Crabb**  
**And His Teachings?**

by

Martin and Deidre Bobgan  
4137 Primavera Road  
Santa Barbara, CA 93110  
United States of America

Copyright 1993

## **Bobgan Response to Morrison**

Introduction

The Sufficiency of the Scriptures

“Need” Theology

Karl Popper and the Philosophy of Science

The Unconscious

Confusion, Confusion

Drivers and Shapers of Sin

The Loss of Man

Concluding Remarks

## INTRODUCTION

Trevor Morrison has written a paper titled “Misunderstanding People: A Rebuttal of Martin and Deidre Bobgan’s Criticisms of Dr. Lawrence Crabb,” dated June 1992.

Besides having sent Trevor Morrison an original rough draft of this paper, we have written to him several times. However, he has not responded. We had hoped for some dialogue, but he is silent. We have asked for biographical information from him, but he has not provided any. The only information we have is his address as follows:<sup>1</sup>

21 Bonito Place  
Glenfield, Auckland 10  
New Zealand

When we wrote to Morrison regarding his paper, we thought Crabb would disagree with at least some of its content. However, in response to our letter, Morrison says, “I received a note from Dr. Crabb which says in part:

Your article “Misunderstanding People” is excellent. . . I have read it through (quickly) twice and want to re-read it carefully. . . I especially appreciated . . . the high level of discussion. . . reflecting clear thinking rather than a slavish polemical spirit. I really like it! . . .

Morrison goes on to say, “He [Crabb] also offers to assist me in finding a publisher for the paper.”

We ask that the reader keep Crabb’s endorsement in mind while reading our critique of Morrison’s paper. By liking Morrison’s paper enough to offer help getting it published, Crabb must also be held responsible to a considerable degree for Morrison’s misrepresentations, misunderstandings, logical errors and shortcomings!

Crabb also says in a letter to Morrison: “I do feel it [Morrison’s paper] is an effective response to criticism that severely misrepresents and distorts my thinking—and I am grateful to you for it.”

Our position is that we quite accurately represent Crabb’s position. Crabb is undeniably an integrationist. He gives evidence of not having read our critique of him in *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* and not having read the rough draft of this paper, which we sent to him. It is unfortunate that Crabb is so unwilling to meet publicly to debate these issues. A public debate will either reveal that we have severely misrepresented Crabb, as he claims, or that we have been right all along.

The organization of our response to Morrison’s paper follows his paper section by section. To simplify reading both papers together, if one wishes, we have titled each section the same as Morrison’s section headings.

John Wilkes once said, “Give me a grain of truth and I will mix it up with a great mass of falsehood, so that no chemist shall ever be able to separate them.”<sup>2</sup> It seems that Morrison has inadvertently attempted to accomplish just that. It is sometimes difficult to separate truth from falsehood in Morrison’s paper.

We are neither questioning nor confirming Morrison’s evangelical orthodoxy, because we do not know enough about him to do either. After reading his paper, however, one could easily conclude that Morrison has well earned the title of Mr. Obfuscation. As we

will demonstrate in our response, Morrison misreads Crabb and is prone to attribute to Crabb the opposite of what Crabb says. As we indicate later, Morrison does not understand that what Crabb says is what he means. It is not that some of what Crabb says is all of what he means, but that all of what Crabb says is what he means. Morrison would like the readers of his paper to believe that what he wishes Crabb to mean is what Crabb truly means.

Morrison's intellect, reasoning, and academic prowess are all straightjacketed by his devotion to Crabb. Throughout his paper one sees Crabb presented as Mr. Prophet and Mr. Perfection. At the beginning of his paper, Morrison gives an illustration of Martin Luther to prove something about Crabb. Morrison speaks of how Luther gave a new definition to the word *righteousness* in Romans 1:17.

Morrison says:

[Crabb] is challenging us to re-evaluate a number of doctrines from the first principles of scripture [sic]. Anyone who fails to ponder carefully what he is saying cannot possibly be persuaded by him.

Let me illustrate. For years Martin Luther—like the medieval church generally—thought that the word “righteousness” in Romans 1:17 and like verses referred to the awful righteousness of God which condemns us. Then at last he saw that it refers instead to the righteousness which God imputes to us to save us. The people of Berean spirit in Luther's day tested what he said against the Scriptures. Whenever the word “righteousness” appeared in the New Testament, they plugged in Luther's new definition, and they found—as the Holy Spirit enlightened them—that the Scriptures made new, life changing sense. Other people, however, just rejected what Luther said without giving it deep thought, because what he said was contrary to the received “wisdom” of the church of those days.<sup>3</sup>

Our reason for quoting the above is to show how Morrison tends to twist facts and information to fit his preconceived admiration of Crabb. Think about Morrison's illustration. Did Luther go to some extra-biblical source to conclude the meaning of Romans 1:17? Would Luther even think of going to an extra-biblical source as Crabb has done and as Morrison has supported? Luther began and ended with Scripture. Crabb begins with psychology and then goes to Scripture—a practice that Morrison wholeheartedly endorses. But Morrison offers the Luther example and twists it to support what Crabb has done. Morrison has committed the logical error of false analogy—an error he repeats throughout his paper.

Morrison's reference to Luther is no mere example for illustrative purposes. He envisions Crabb as a reformer for our time as Martin Luther was for his time. It is an elevation of Crabb to as high a place in church history as Luther's. This example, along with other instances in Morrison's paper, leads one to conclude that Morrison has an extremely high view of Crabb and the significance of his teachings.

In addition, it shows how oleaginous Morrison's reasoning is. Using Morrison's reasoning, one could conclude that if Freud, Adler et al lived at the time of Luther, he would have turned to them for their wisdom and of course checked it out with the Bible. Or, using Morrison's reasoning, one could conclude that if Luther were alive today he would recognize the brilliance of Crabb in reforming the church with his new psychotheology and join with him. Contrariwise, if Luther ever paid attention to such extra-biblical, psychological

nonsense as perpetrated by Freud, Adler, et al, he would never have concluded that we are justified by faith alone. Nor would the reformers ever have cried *Sola Scriptura*!

It is fascinating to see the level of devotion Morrison heaps on Crabb. We have over the years noticed this same devotion for other Christian psychologizers. The devotees to these individuals do the usual things that admirers of men are prone to do. They generally miss their errors and rush to their defense. In defending them, they often twist Scripture and even the writings of those they wish to defend. Their extreme loyalty eclipses common sense and simple logic.

Even if these psychologizers of the faith were bonafide latter-day saints, as their admirers seems to believe, they would not deserve the devotion given them. The Apostle Paul said to the Corinthian church:

Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ (1 Cor. 1:12).

It is this very act that caused contention, even when the object of affection was a genuine leader of the early church. How much more contention is caused by people, such as Morrison, who support individuals who psychologize the Word? We do not believe Morrison lacks the intellect necessary to understand the issues, but rather his intellect has been clouded by his loyalty to Crabb.

Morrison says:

I believe in the plenary inspiration of Scripture, and its sufficiency, and I believe that the doctrines of human nature, sin, sanctification and counselling that Crabb presents are by and large the doctrines which the Holy Spirit teaches in His inspired Word. They are there in the apostles and prophets and they can be demonstrated without reference to Sigmund Freud. Nor are they the same as Freud's teachings, even though they show that Freud was more discerning at some points than the children of light.<sup>4</sup>

This may have been Morrison's intention when he began his paper. It may have been his hoped-for result. However, any fair reading of his paper will reveal that Morrison has proven none of the above.

We have demonstrated in our writings that Crabb's teachings are psychological and not solely biblical and that much of what he says is contrary to the teachings of the apostles and prophets and cannot stand without reference to Freud and Adler. Crabb presents a psychological substitute for biblical sanctification. Crabb, indeed, has another gospel. Morrison's credulity regarding Crabb's other gospel is incredible!

The following items are demonstrated in our response to Morrison's paper.

1. Morrison fails to accurately understand Crabb's system. Morrison fails to see that Crabb's "longings" and "needs" actually represent the same concept. Such misunderstanding of Crabb is a constant problem with Morrison. Instead of allowing what Crabb writes to mean what he says, Morrison twists Crabb's writings and our critique of them to say what none of us means.
2. Morrison is unwilling or unable to see the differences between the definitions of a philosopher of science (Karl Popper) and the unbiblical opinions of men such as Freud, Adler, Jung, etc.

3. Morrison does not recognize that Popper's definitions of science and non-science cause no harm to Christianity in contrast to the psychological opinions of Freud and others. The latter intrudes upon the exclusive domain of Scripture.
4. Morrison fails to see that Christian counseling for problems of living should originate from Scripture and not from the psychological opinions of men like Freud, Adler et al. Morrison says of "Freud's doctrine of human behavior" that when it is "used as a stimulus to Christian thought—as Crabb has done—the result is a doctrine which is as unconnected with Freud as the right-hand rail of a railway line is to the left-hand one, yet whose resemblance is there for all to see." Morrison's comparison is an interesting one. The two rails of a railroad track originate from the same place and have the same destination. E. M. Thornton and Robert Fuller document that Freud's theories originated from his state of mind while under the influence of cocaine.<sup>5</sup> Is this why, as Morrison says, "Freud was more discerning at some points than the children of light"?<sup>6</sup>
5. Morrison's criticisms of us contain false accusations based upon his ignorance of logic. He falsely accuses us of "begging the question" when he is committing the error of false analogy. When he falsely accuses us of a false dichotomy, he reveals his ignorance about deductive and inductive reasoning. His use of logic in those instances is shoddy at best and ignorant at worst. It represents shallow thought and poor academics driven by an irrational commitment to Crabb.

In addition to the above, Morrison demonstrates that he does not understand the principles of Freudian and Adlerian psychology used by Crabb. He particularly misrepresents the Freudian doctrine of the unconscious. Also, Morrison apparently does not understand the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture or the doctrine of sanctification. Adding Freudian and Adlerian psychology does not reveal a full confidence in Scripture to deal with problems of living along the way to Christian maturity. It appears that Morrison must not believe 2 Peter 1:2-4.

Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.

Dr. John MacArthur, pastor of Grace Community Church and president of The Master's College and Seminary, says in his book *Our Sufficiency In Christ*:

There may be no more serious threat to the life of the church today than the stampede to embrace the doctrines of secular psychology. They are a mass of human ideas that Satan has placed in the church as if they were powerful, life-changing truths from God.<sup>7</sup>

MacArthur has also said:

I'm convinced that what we're seeing is one of the most subtle and effective attacks Satan has ever mounted against the church. . . . By substituting an

artificial, non-supernatural simulation of sanctification, he is turning Christians away from the real source of spiritual power and victory.<sup>8</sup>

Crabb was once popular at Grace community Church and at The Master's College and Seminary. However, he is no longer visible there.

Dr. Jay Adams has said the following:

Crabb himself is as fully an integrationist as those from whom he attempts (unsuccessfully) to divorce himself.<sup>9</sup>

Adams points out Crabb's basic problem:

[Crabb] does not believe the Scriptures are sufficient to enable Christian counselors to counsel adequately. This fundamental flaw lies beneath all the other errors apparent in the system.<sup>10</sup>

In conclusion Adams says:

In my opinion, I believe Crabb sincerely wants to be biblical and thinks that his system is. But so long as he continues to build his basic system out of pagan materials, according to the erroneous speculations of unsaved men, he will never achieve his goal. Painting such views in biblical hues does not transform them. To be biblical, the system itself, from the ground up, must be built of biblical materials according to God's plan. This Crabb has not yet done.<sup>11</sup>

This reply to Morrison's paper was written solely by Martin and Deidre Bobgan. We realize that some of what we write in this paper is very direct, challenging and confrontational. However, Morrison sets the tone in his paper. By comparing the two papers, the reader will often see us reflecting back to Morrison his comments about us. The individual who reads both papers will see two sharply opposing views. It is our hope and prayer that such a direct hit on the real issues will cause Morrison to turn around and be a man for Christ rather than a man for Crabb.

Those who want to know what we say about Crabb rather than what Morrison claims we say, may read *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* (EastGate Publishers, 1989, ISBN 0-941717-03-8). It is available through Christian bookstores. Those who wish a copy of Morrison's paper may request one by writing to the address given at the beginning of this paper or to the:

Institute of Biblical Counseling  
16075 West Belleview Avenue  
Morrison, CO 80465

<sup>1</sup> Morrison finally did respond, but after we had begun to distribute this paper. He mentions that he will be making "a few final revisions" to his paper, "Misunderstanding People."

<sup>2</sup> John Wilkes in *Gnosis Magazine*, Summer 1992, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

- 
- <sup>5</sup> E. M. Thornton. *The Freudian Fallacy* (Garden City: The Dial Press/Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983).  
Robert C. Fuller, "Biographical Origins of Psychological Ideas: Freud's Cocaine Studies," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 32, No. 3, Summer 1992, pp. 67-86.
- <sup>6</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
- <sup>7</sup> John MacArthur, *Our Sufficiency In Christ* (Dallas: Word, 1991), p. 60.
- <sup>8</sup> MacArthur quoted by Jim Morud, "Christians on the Couch," *Moody*, May 1991, p. 14.
- <sup>9</sup> Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* (Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, 1989), p. 105.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.
- 

Next: [The Sufficiency of the Scriptures](#)

Return to: [Contents](#)

**Trevor Morrison:**  
**Devoted To God And His Word**  
**Or To Dr. Lawrence Craff**  
**And His Teachings?**

by

Martin and Deidre Bobgan  
4137 Primavera Road  
Santa Barbara, CA 93110  
United States of America

Copyright 1993

## **Bobgan Response to Morrison**

Introduction

The Sufficiency of the Scriptures

“Need” Theology

Karl Popper and the Philosophy of Science

The Unconscious

Confusion, Confusion

Drivers and Shapers of Sin

The Loss of Man

Concluding Remarks

## THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE SCRIPTURES

Morrison contends that we misunderstand and misrepresent what Crabb teaches. He says:

The trouble arises I think, because Crabb has used words such as “directly” and “clearly” to describe what many Christians believe is the way that the Bible should deliver up its truth to its students. They believe it should do so easily, without requiring them to think deeply about it.<sup>1</sup>

This is the beginning of Morrison misunderstanding and misrepresenting both our position and Crabb’s position. There are times when Scripture is “direct and clear” and times that it is not. This is so transparently clear that only a biblical novice would think otherwise. Our concern is that Crabb has made what is biblically clear complex and what is biblically complex seemingly clear by the use of Freudian and Adlerian psychology.

Morrison continually takes clear communications from our book and twists them to mean something he would like them to mean. The first quote from us he uses is:

There is no need to go beyond the direct statements of God in order to address such matters [problems of living]. God deals directly with essential matters of life and godliness.<sup>2</sup>

Our meaning is clear to all, except apparently to Morrison. We provide here the entire paragraph from which this sentence is wrested.

Crabb’s line of argument seems to demand a whole host of detailed and specific information which is not in the Bible. This is the wholesale excuse of all integrationists to shift from the Bible to the world. Rather than using biblical language, they use psychological jargon. But, just because God does not employ the labels and techniques of modern psychology, we should not be fooled into thinking that problems of living have not been sufficiently addressed by Scripture. There is no need to go beyond the direct statements of God in order to address such matters. God deals directly with essential matters of life and godliness. Therefore the Scriptures can and should be the sole and sufficient guide for living and counseling.<sup>3</sup>

The meaning of this paragraph is clear and consistent with what we say throughout our analysis of Crabb’s system. Crabb adds psychology to the Bible!

Morrison’s second quote from us is as follows:

In Crabb’s opinion, the Bible does not clearly deal with questions being asked by desperate people.<sup>4</sup>

Morrison thinks we are saying that Crabb is finding fault with the Bible and says we have missed the point. We are not accusing Crabb of finding fault with what is **in** the Bible. Our concern is that he adds unproven psychological theories by posing questions (pages 54-58 of *Understanding People*) that appear to need extra-biblical answers. We believe that we are

correctly identifying Crabb's position. Else why would he be adding unproven psychological opinions to his brand of "biblical counseling"?

We invite the reader to read the above quotation in its context and also to read the entire chapter on "Integration." We quote Crabb and come to the conclusions that are obvious in his writings. Crabb biblicizes psychology and calls it biblical counseling.

Morrison is apparently unaware that cultic, occult, and psychological ideas can be biblicized or found in Scripture if one chooses to do so. For instance, one can biblicize the Freudian unconscious by calling it the "heart," and one can then seemingly support that idea by referring to the various passages in Scripture with the word *heart*. By doing so, almost any unbiblical idea can be made to appear biblical. But, just because such ideas can be biblicized and "found" in Scripture does not make them biblical in the sense of conforming to God's Word.

There are many examples of Morrison misrepresenting by quoting out of context and employing other semantic devices to criticize our critique of Crabb.

Morrison quotes the following from Crabb:

The point is that if the pastor had thought through his doctrines from a different perspective, he would feel better equipped to handle the problems he is facing. If the Bible is sufficient to address a counselor's concerns, then there should be no need for psychologists, just better prepared pastors.<sup>5</sup>

Morrison then goes on to say:

The context makes it plain that when Crabb says, "If the Bible really is sufficient to address a counsellor's concerns. . .," he means us to understand, "and it is!"<sup>6</sup>

It is clear (as we have demonstrated in our writing) that what Crabb is saying is that "better prepared pastors" does **not** mean better biblically-prepared pastors, but rather better psychologically-prepared pastors. Or, why would Crabb have spent so much time developing, promoting and teaching those psychological ideas?

Even Morrison admits that Freud is the source of some of Crabb's ideas. As Morrison says, Crabb "acknowledges himself willing to learn from Freud, Jung, Adler, etc."<sup>7</sup> As we have amply demonstrated in our book *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I*, Crabb is clearly and undeniably Freudian and Adlerian, which apparently Morrison doesn't mind. By supporting Crabb in this deviation, Morrison is not a defender of the faith once delivered to the saints, but a supporter of the psychological opinions of men, regardless of how much they contaminate or contradict Scripture.

Nevertheless, Morrison contends that Crabb finds no lack in Scripture to address "questions being asked by desperate people." Instead, he says that Crabb only finds fault with students of the Bible. Yet what these students and pastors apparently lack is such psychological insight as an unconscious filled with needs that drive behavior. Crabb teaches that if only pastors would think through their "doctrines from a different perspective" they would not be so ill prepared! And what is the "different perspective" they need to be "prepared pastors"? The view of Freud's iceberg metaphor for the mind!

Morrison accuses us of being lazy Bible students because we have not found in Scripture those insights of Freud, Adler and others that Crabb has. To strengthen his accusation, Morrison puts words in Crabb's mouth to say to us:

You want the Bible to deliver up its answers to you according to certain rules which are not entirely the Bible's own rules. Then you find fault with others who find in the Bible what you do not, on the grounds that, "What my net don't catch, ain't fish!"<sup>8</sup>

It is obvious that Crabb has been on a fishing expedition for sometime. What he hopes to do is to improve man's condition through a view of Scripture that incorporates his favorite psychological insights. In the process he has incorporated, employed and biblicalized the ideas of Freud, Adler, and other unregenerated psychological theorists.

Morrison, in his devoted loyalty to Crabb, seems to believe that since Crabb has caught some fish (Crabb does use some biblical ideas), all of what Crabb has caught are fish. In other words, Morrison would say, "Since Crabb's net has some fish, everything in his net must be fish."

Throughout his rebuttal, Morrison unsuccessfully attempts, with no real evidence, to refute our accusations of Crabb. To support Crabb, he presents two of Crabb's statements:

. . . counseling models must demonstrate more than mere consistency with Scripture; they must in fact emerge from it.<sup>9</sup>

. . . every question a counselor *or therapist* needs to ask is answered by both the content of Scripture and its implications.<sup>10</sup>

Apparently it is too difficult for Morrison to conceive that Crabb could say the above while at the same time also add psychological theories and techniques to the Bible. It is especially fascinating that Morrison does not see this when he quotes Crabb's idea of "Scripture **and its implications**," since the way Crabb manages to have his counseling model "emerge" from Scripture is through his very use of the word *implications*. It is through so-called biblical implications (such as Crabb's use of the word *thirst* taken from the biblical text to **imply** the longings for relationship and impact) that Crabb makes psychological notions expressed by unredeemed men appear to "emerge" from Scripture, when, in fact, there is no evidence that God was implying anything close to the theories of need psychology.

Morrison chooses to quote Crabb's statements that seem to indicate he is thoroughly biblical and either ignores or rationalizes Crabb when he is definitely psychological. The following are two of many statements from our book which demonstrate that we understand this, even though Morrison doesn't:

Crabb agrees that the Bible answers some important questions, but contends that it lacks the so-called direct information necessary to address the legitimate questions that real people ask about the harsh reality of their real world. He says that "no passage literally exegeted directly responds" to a host of legitimate questions. Therefore one must supplement Scripture with creative thoughts gleaned from psychology to answer such questions. By such reasoning, Crabb seems to be saying that the Scriptures are both

sufficient and insufficient. While claiming to believe in the sufficiency of Scripture, he goes outside of the Scriptures and turns to psychological opinions.<sup>11</sup>

Christian doctrines which are taught in Crabb's books all come under the umbrella of his psychological theories.<sup>12</sup>

It is possible that in Morrison's haste to defend Crabb at any cost to the Bible, he chooses to overlook the above. Morrison does employ a pick and choose method of reading Crabb and us, possibly because of his own psychoheretical orientation.

Morrison reminds us of a former acquaintance who belonged to a cult. His statements made his church sound very orthodox when, in fact, his church was very heterodox. Whenever we would bring up teachings of his church that were heretical, he would remain silent. This pattern repeated itself during the years we knew him. He loved to quote those orthodox-sounding statements, but was totally unwilling to consider the heretical ones.

Morrison's reasoning is that Crabb must be right since the Bible is sometimes supported by Crabb and since some psychological ideas **appear to be** in the Bible. He criticizes us for criticizing Crabb and believes we must be wrong—apparently on the grounds that if Crabb is partly right, he must be all right.

Morrison says that “the Bobgans commit the logical fallacy of ‘begging the question’ when they say that the insights into human behavior which Crabb includes there are psychological rather than Biblical.”<sup>13</sup> Morrison nowhere in his paper proves that we have committed such a logical fallacy. And nowhere in his paper does he give the form of our begging the question, possibly because he does not know how to. He says several times that we are begging the question, but never provides evidence for it.

For the benefit of the reader, “Begging the question is the fallacy of assuming as true the very point under question.”<sup>14</sup> It is a type of circular reasoning. It is sometimes called “petitio principii.” We amply provide (and Morrison himself confirms this) evidence that Crabb uses both Freudian and Adlerian psychology. And we sufficiently demonstrate what Morrison refuses to accept—that those ideas are not biblical.

For Morrison's information, our argument is based upon a categorical syllogism, which involves two premises and a conclusion.<sup>15</sup> We will not elaborate this here, but merely mention it to indicate the form of our argument, which Morrison mistakenly contends is begging the question. The major problem here is that Morrison has not presented the case for his accusation that we are “begging the question,” possibly because he does not understand what the fallacy of begging the question is. And, he may be totally unaware of what a categorical syllogism is. In spite of his concern over our use of logic making a freshman ashamed, Morrison should be ashamed of misrepresenting the issues through misuse of logic.

Morrison is concerned about how we understand what Crabb means by the words *sufficiency of Scripture*. He is particularly concerned about our following statements:

Crabb attempts to alleviate the problem of integration in the opening chapters of *Understanding People* by arguing that the sufficiency of Scripture means that it is sufficient as a framework. Then he proceeds to supplement that framework with psychological insights.<sup>16</sup> He says:

Yes, the Bible is sufficient to answer every question about life, but not because it **directly** responds to every **legitimate question**. (Emphasis added.)<sup>17</sup>

Then he argues that psychology can be used to fill in the direct information to unanswered questions that he regards as legitimate. Repeatedly using the terms *directly* and *legitimate*, he attempts to build a case for seeking definitive answers outside the Scriptures.<sup>18</sup>

Morrison quotes the final two sentences from the above quote and argues that Crabb “is teaching no such thing.” He goes on to say:

The Bobgans’ claims mislead their readers about what Crabb actually says there, because the Bobgans insert into everything Crabb says their own wrong view of what he means.<sup>19</sup>

He then lists pages 54-70 of *Understanding People* as his proof. The best way for a reader to find out who better understands Crabb is to read Crabb and to read our critique of him.

If Crabb believes that Scripture is sufficient in itself, then why does he devote so much of his book to a psychological explanation of a Freudian/Adlerian type of unconscious filled with needs for security and significance, relabeled as “deep longings in the heart for relationship and impact”?<sup>20</sup> Why does he draw so heavily from secular psychological theories for understanding the nature of man and how to help him, if Scripture is sufficient for more than a framework on which to hang psychological theories of Glasser, Ellis, Frankl, Fromm, Adler, Harris, Freud, Perls, Skinner and others, which he lists as some of his spoil from the “Egyptians of secular psychology”?<sup>21</sup> For Morrison’s information, one way to understand what an author means when he begins to change his language and terms to make them sound more biblical, is to read his previous books, unless, of course, he has repudiated his previous writing. Crabb indicates that he is building on his former premises in the Preface to *Understanding People*, when he says:

Readers familiar with my earlier books will recognize movement in my concepts but not, I think, fundamental change.<sup>22</sup>

Morrison often attributes to Crabb not only what Crabb does not mean, but what Crabb, based on his own writings, cannot mean. What Morrison does not understand is that what Crabb means is what he says, and not what Morrison hopes he means. Hopefully, Morrison does not read the Bible in the same way.

Morrison quotes the following from Crabb:

If properly approached, the Bible is sufficient to provide a framework for thinking through every question a counselor needs to ask.<sup>23</sup>

Morrison goes on to say:

. . . the Bobgans seem to conceive of him as teaching that the Scriptures are a structure with holes in it—God has provided the building’s skeleton, so to speak, but we have to shop at a different lumber yard to buy the panels to fill in the walls and make a complete house of it.<sup>24</sup>

Morrison denies that Crabb does this. To continue Morrison’s metaphor of the lumber yard, if Crabb is not going to the lumber yard and picking and choosing boards, nails, insulation, plaster, and paint from the theories of Freud, Jung, Adler, Maslow, Ellis, Perls, and others, what other metaphor might one use? Either the Scriptures are sufficient for life and godliness or they must leave room for extrabiblical additions to diagnose the condition of man and prescribe treatment.

Morrison represents Crabb as believing:

. . . that what we need to know is comprehensively contained within the Scriptures, but not always in so many words in a verse somewhere. We have to use our minds if we are to benefit from the full riches of the Bible’s wisdom.<sup>25</sup>

In one way that does represent what Crabb hopes to communicate—that what he adds to Scripture from the wisdom of unregenerate men is actually in Scripture, hidden in its comprehensiveness and in implications that can be drawn from such words as *thirst* and *heart*. Thus, when he adds the theories of Freud, Adler and others, he is simply using his mind to discover what he thinks has been alluded to in Scripture.

Even if that were the case, such a position would declare (through implication, of course) that Christians did not know what the Scriptures included, yea, really meant, until the brilliant insights of Freud, Adler and others, who discovered (quite by chance) what had been hidden in Scripture all along.

Indeed, this is the stance of many integrationists. Some truly believe that the tidbits which they have drawn from secular personality theories were all along implied within the general comprehensiveness of Scripture. That is why the word *comprehensive* is so convenient. It can be used as a generality in the same way as *framework*—and thereby make room for the addition of whatever an integrationist may wish to add—be he a meager “tossed salad” type or an astute “spoiler of the Egyptians.”

Biblical theology did without psychology for almost two thousand years. The prophets of the Old Testament, the disciples and apostles of the New Testament, and the saints right up to the present century did very well without the theories of counseling psychology. Why would the church need such modern-day psychologizers to help them understand the Bible now?

There is no question about Crabb bringing much psychological thinking to the Scripture as an addition. If Crabb truly believed in the sufficiency of Scripture, he would not have wasted all his time attempting to convince others through his writings and teachings that one must know his psychological concepts in order to counsel better. It is sad that this is his position and sadder yet that Morrison has fallen for it.

Morrison fears that we are “in danger of falling into the kind of error that Jesus condemned when he opposed the Jews’ perverted doctrine of the Sabbath.”<sup>26</sup> Jesus “opposed the Jews’ perverted doctrine of the Sabbath,” which consisted of the **addition** of man-made rules to the Sabbath law in Scripture. But, that is exactly the problem with Crabb. He has

added the psychological opinions of men to the pure Word of God and therefore fallen into error.

Morrison quotes from a lecture by Dr. Noel Weeks. We have no disagreement with this section except for the page footnote reference. Morrison says:

Dr. Weeks establishes, that a process of questioning is necessary if we are fully to understand the Scripture, since not all its truths are delivered as propositions.<sup>27</sup>

Morrison has purposely shifted the focus here from our criticism of Crabb's use of psychological opinions to a "process of questioning." Our problem is not with a "process of questioning," but rather with a process of answering. Crabb is not raising biblical questions except when providing psychological explanations of and psychological answers to life's problems. Morrison is adept at attempting to establish a truth unrelated to the real issue in hopes the reader is ignorant enough to believe he has proven the real issue. This is known as the red herring fallacy. One logic book says:

The fallacy of *red herring* gets its name from the practice of using a herring, a particularly smelly fish when cooked, to divert hunting dogs from the scent of a fox. To commit the fallacy of red herring in an argument is to draw attention away from an issue by raising some other, seemingly related issue.

It goes on to say:

To recognize the fallacy of red herring, look for an argument in which the speaker responds by directing attention away from the issue to other, seemingly related issues.<sup>28</sup>

This logical error will not be appreciated by his intelligent readers.

Morrison says:

What Crabb does, is to allow life to provoke him to bring to the Scripture a wider range of questions than has previously been customary, and to expect fruitful answers, as we see him doing in pages 163-164 (for instance) of *Inside Out*.<sup>29</sup>

Apparently Morrison does not notice that the very pages to which he refers include Crabb's emphasis on a psychological form of self-exposure to discover the deep longings of the heart—stated in his previous books as the unconscious needs for security and significance which motivate all that a person does. Though couched in biblical language, these pages along with their chapter context rely heavily on Freudian and Adlerian psychological theories and demand an exposure of the unconscious along the lines developed by Adler and Fritz Perls.<sup>30</sup> Such exposure is not limited to confessing one's own sins, but to the confessing of other people's sins, since in Crabb's system some of the primary things to be exposed are our own disappointments and emotional pain.<sup>31</sup>

Though Crabb may be allowing life to ask a "wider range of questions," one must wonder if perhaps his extensive exposure to the questions and answers about life addressed by his favorite psychological theories have been instrumental in his asking this "wider range

of questions.” Crabb’s study of psychology contributed to the questions asked and the answers given. Nevertheless, unless one is familiar with the psychological cisterns from which Crabb has drawn, one might conclude that Crabb brought such questions to Scripture without any psychological bias.

In closing this section, Morrison says:

The Bobgans understand the complexity of Scripture in respect of those doctrines, but they need to learn that it is also more complex than they think in the matter of pastoral counselling.<sup>32</sup>

Indeed, the real complexity has to do with what it means to walk according to the Spirit rather than according to the flesh that has led Christians to look for psychological answers outside Scripture, where one does not have to come to terms with the depth of one’s own depravity and the magnitude of God’s grace.

We would say that the Bible is violated by bringing to it the psychological opinions of men, by declaring that they exist in Scripture when they do not, and then by having Morrison come along and support such a position. Morrison has not aided the cause of Christ; he has hampered it. The fact is that pastoral counseling is both more complex and less complex than Morrison imagines it to be, but it is not dependent on the opinions of Freud, Adler, and others from whom Crabb has drawn and integrated with Scripture.

- 
- 1 Trevor Morrison, “Misunderstanding People,” unpublished paper, p. 3.
  - 2 Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* (Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, 1989), p. 120.
  - 3 *Ibid.*, p. 120.
  - 4 *Ibid.*, p. 115.
  - 5 Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr.. *Understanding People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), p. 67.
  - 6 Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
  - 7 *Ibid.*, p. 2.
  - 8 *Ibid.*, p. 3.
  - 9 Crabb, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
  - 10 *Ibid.*, p. 62.
  - 11 Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 115.
  - 12 *Ibid.*, p. 219.
  - 13 Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
  - 14 Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992), p. 258.
  - 15 *Ibid.*, p. 88.
  - 16 Crabb, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67.
  - 17 Crabb, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
  - 18 Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
  - 19 Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
  - 20 Crabb, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
  - 21 Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr. *Effective Biblical Counseling*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977), pp. 52-56.
  - 22 Crabb, *Understanding People*, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

- 
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.  
<sup>24</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.* , p. 5.  
<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.  
<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.  
<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.  
<sup>28</sup> Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992), p. 262-3.  
<sup>29</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.* , p. 6.  
<sup>30</sup> Dr. Larry Crabb. *Inside Out*. (Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1988), pp. 163-164.  
<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 168-169.  
<sup>32</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.* , p. 6.
- 

Next: ["Need" Theology](#)  
Return to: [Contents](#)

### “NEED” THEOLOGY

Morrison’s unabashed devotion to Crabb can be seen in his misunderstanding and misrepresenting Crabb’s shift from using the word *needs* to using the word *longings*. Morrison quotes the following from Crabb:

Readers familiar with my earlier books will recognize movement in my concepts but not, I think, fundamental change. For example, my preference now is to speak of *deep longings in the human heart for relationship and impact* rather than *personal needs for security and significance*. Some have interpreted me to teach that man’s needs for security and significance define his essential nature and therefore properly become his lifelong concern. The result, in the minds of some, has been a man-centered focus on fulfillment rather than a God-centered emphasis on obedience to Him and preoccupation with His glory.

Because my choice of the term “need” has apparently communicated to a few what I do *not* believe and what I strongly oppose, I hope that referring to “deep longings that constitute the thirst which our Lord alone can quench” will better convey what I have always believed.<sup>1</sup>

Morrison then says:

What Crabb has said could be paraphrased, “My doctrine has not fundamentally changed, but my earlier terminology caused people to badly misunderstand my doctrine; therefore I have changed my terminology.”<sup>2</sup>

Morrison contends:

The Bobgans show no sign of having given serious thought to what Crabb has said: they treat “longings” as identical to “needs”, and their every page imports to their argument all the emotional baggage that “needs” carries with it.<sup>3</sup>

Instead, it appears that Morrison has missed the very point Crabb was making in the section he quoted. Crabb was expressing his concern that people would think he teaches that *needs* “define his [man’s] essential nature and therefore properly become his life concern.” Crabb is still not deviating from his earlier writings in which he taught that people are motivated by unconscious needs for security and significance.

We understand that Crabb’s use of the word *needs* is not his complete definition of the essential nature of man—even though he teaches that the “deep longings for relationship and impact” are part of what it means to be created in the image of God.<sup>4</sup> Crabb’s use of the word *needs* is only part of his definition of man, but his writings do indicate that *needs* constitute a strong motivation residing in the unconscious and that if pastors neglect those needs in the unconscious they are missing the bulk of the iceberg and are therefore ill equipped to counsel.<sup>5</sup>

We also understand that Crabb is not teaching that needs become a person's "life concern." However, Crabb is teaching need psychology and an emphasis on the unconscious and its needy contents. Whether Crabb intends it or not, his kind of psychology does encourage a man-centered self focus. And, we also understand that Crabb would not want Christians to assume that every aspect of humanistic psychology is intrinsic to his system. For instance, he would disagree with one of the foundations of humanistic psychology—that man is born good. Nevertheless, Crabb does incorporate a good deal from humanistic psychology, including the basics of need psychology.

The focus of our criticism remains the same—Crabb's doctrine has not fundamentally changed. On that fact we are in agreement with Morrison and Crabb. If Crabb's earlier terms *security* and *significance* represent the same doctrine as his later terms *relationship* and *impact* (we all agree on this), then the terms are equivalent. This is a simple, basic form of reasoning that escapes Morrison.

Is this ignorance on his part? No. Is this dishonesty on his part? We don't think so. We think it is further evidence of the blind devotion that Morrison pays to Crabb. Even our simplest, most obvious reasoning escaped Morrison for fear his idol might be wrong in even one instance. Morrison's argument does not refute what we say; it distorts it. In ignoring what we say, distorting what Crabb says, and coming to an illogical confusion that doesn't fit the facts, Morrison further exposes his unwillingness to objectively read Crabb, to fairly represent what we say, and to use common sense.

Morrison states one of his central tenants of support for Crabb as follows:

Crabb's doctrines of man and of change are grounded in the Bible and his model does not "borrow" from humanistic psychology, so the entire section is irrelevant to any objective critique of his work.<sup>6</sup>

Morrison dogmatically declares that Crabb's doctrines are "grounded in the Bible" and that Crabb's model "does not 'borrow' from humanistic psychology." Morrison supplies no adequate support for his assertion, no systematic analysis of Crabb's model of man or methodology of change. In fact, he admits that he does not even include a "systematic summary of Crabb's thought."<sup>7</sup> Thus Morrison would have us believe what he says because he says so.

Morrison's declaration that Crabb's doctrines are "grounded in the Bible" and that Crabb's model "does not 'borrow' from humanistic psychology" constitutes a false presentation of Crabb's position. Morrison refuses to recognize that if one were to delete a Freudian/Adlerian unconscious from Crabb's system, it would collapse. We have carefully analyzed Crabb's model in *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* to reveal the psychological foundations for Crabb's counseling model and methodology. One would have to be ignorant of those psychological theories not to see them. Crabb's methodology is dependent upon an unconscious that is filled with motivational material that drives behavior. Rather than repeating our systematic analysis of Crabb's system here, we suggest the reader refer to *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I*.

Crabb is more open and direct in his early books concerning his heavy dependence upon humanistic psychology. However, because people criticized him for his integration of psychology with Scripture, he changed his vocabulary. Yet, his later books are just as dependent as his early books, because the same psychological presuppositions have colored his system. He has attempted to make his counseling model more biblical through the

language he uses, but the heavy influence of the very psychologies he admits to using in his early books continues throughout *Understanding People* and *Inside Out*.

It may be that Morrison is totally ignorant of Freudian, Adlerian, and humanistic psychology and/or totally unwilling to apply common sense to the situation. The result is just another higgledy piggledy.

We agree with Morrison's final statement in this section:

All lies proceed from the father of lies. They do not become true just because they pass through the hands of born again Christians *en route*.<sup>8</sup>

Disregarding what Crabb says and contrary to what we say, Morrison has presented to his readers a fallacious bunch of information in hopes of rallying support for his hero and encouraging antagonism towards us. Only blind devotion could have entrapped a seemingly earnest person to such abandonment of truth.

---

1 Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr.. *Understanding People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), pp. 15-16.

2 Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 9.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 9.

4 Crabb, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-95.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 129.

6 Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 1.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 10.

## KARL POPPER AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Though we may not be consciously aware of what we are telling ourselves at every given moment, the words that fill our minds control much of what we do and feel. Much of our behavior is a direct product of what we are **thinking unconsciously**.<sup>6</sup>

Not only the motives but also the unique theme or style of our interactions remains unidentified. . . .<sup>7</sup>

Therefore the sinfully wrong strategies by which we manipulate people with our well-being in mind are intentionally hidden from view. They take their place in the **unconscious**.<sup>8</sup> (Emphasis added.)

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

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

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

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

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

We repeat Morrison's second point: "Crabb does not speak of his theory as though it were a scientifically established fact. Rather, he speaks of it as based on the Bible."<sup>12</sup>

Morrison thinks that if Crabb has not directly appealed to the authority of science, he cannot speak of his Freudian-based theory of the unconscious as though it were a scientifically established fact. Crabb's presentation of Freud's iceberg metaphor of the mind is not presented from a position of tentative possibility, but rather from a position of authority. And since such a metaphor cannot be found in Scripture, the only possible lesser

authority would be science. While this kind of psychology does not qualify as a science, it operates as though it does. Therefore whenever anyone authoritatively presents Freud's iceberg metaphor of the mind he is appealing to science, whether he calls it that or not.

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

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

Morrison quotes Popper as saying, "Theories are . . . *never* empirically verifiable." Morrison has once more changed the subject. Then he says that we use Popper to support our contention that "the existence and contents of the Freudian unconscious . . . have never been proven."<sup>13</sup> We did **not** use Popper to support that statement, but in the next paragraph of the same section we used Popper to emphasize the unscientific nature of such personality theories.<sup>14</sup> Morrison has confused arguments and evidence because of their proximity on the page.

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

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

. . . the Bobgans are not wrong to make discerning use of Popper, just as Crabb is not wrong to make discerning, biblically-informed use of Freud.<sup>15</sup>

Morrison concludes:

Their own example shows that the Bobgans have no grounds for finding fault with Crabb for his willingness to read and learn from secular sources.<sup>16</sup>

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

Freud, on the other hand, has devised a system whereby he purports to know who man is and how he changes. These are the very things that Scripture reveals about man.

According to Freud, man is the result of his early psychosexual stages of development and particularly the result of resolving his Oedipus Complex. According to Freud, man is psychically determined. That is why Freudianism is known as psychic determinism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In this section Morrison uses various quotes from Dr. Cornelius Van Til to demonstrate that Van Til subscribed to a Freudian unconscious. We accept that Van Til probably did. However, the major difference between Van Til and Crabb is that for Van Til it was a minor deviation from his major writings. The Freudian unconscious is not the rosetta stone of his teachings as it is for Crabb. As we often say, if you remove the Freudian

and Adlerian ideas from Crabb's system, it no longer exists. Removing the references to the Freudian unconscious from Van Til would purify his apologetics.

Though Morrison badly misuses logic, he does seem to support the use of it. One writer on Van Til says, "Professor Van Til's attitude toward logic is somewhat different from the Westminster Confession's attitude. Nearly every reference to logic in his books is a disparaging reference. He continually criticizes, belittles, and deprecates logic, not the misuse of logic, but logic itself."<sup>18</sup> To use Morrison's logic, we should do away with the use of logic because Van Til disparaged its use. Make sense? We think not.

Following his discussion of Van Til, Morrison says:

There is no need, therefore, to view with horror (as the Bobgans do) everything that comes from the pen of a non-Christian psychologist, and to expect that nothing true will be found there.<sup>19</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

The opposing position varies from the sole use of psychology without the use of any Scripture to an integration of the two in varying amounts, depending upon the personal judgment of the individual. Integration is the attempt to combine theories, ideas, and opinions from psychotherapy, clinical psychology, counseling psychology, and their underlying psychologies with Scripture. Christian integrationists use psychological opinions about the nature of man, why he does what he does, and how he can change, in ways

that seem to them to be compatible with their Christian faith or their view of the Bible. They may quote from the Bible, utilize certain biblical principles, and attempt to stay within what they consider to be Christian or biblical guidelines. Nevertheless, they do not have confidence in the Word of God for all matters of life, conduct, and counseling. Therefore they use the secular psychological theories and techniques in what they would consider to be a Christian way.<sup>20</sup>

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

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

. . . a troublesome and controversial term used, metaphorically, by psychoanalysts to subsume the basic drives, repressed ideas, and unwelcome impulses; it is the part of the psyche in which the id reigns supreme and which is dominated by the pleasure principle. Free associations and dream analyses are said, by psychoanalysts, to be the royal road into the unconscious mind. The doctrine of the unconscious mind was advanced by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) in his early writings, especially in *the Interpretation of Dreams*.<sup>21</sup>

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

Essentially, then, the psychoanalytic [Freudian] model shows us an individual dominated by instinctual biological drives and by unconscious desires and motives.<sup>22</sup>

The Hindu concept of man rests on the basic thesis that he is a layered being. . . Hinduism agrees with psychoanalysis [Freud] that if only we could dredge up a portion of our lost individual totality—the third part of our being [the unconscious]—we would experience a remarkable expansion of our powers, a vivid refreshing of life.<sup>23</sup>

First, let us be clear that Sigmund Freud was not the only one to speak about the unconscious. Hermann von Helmholtz and others spoke of it, too. The Freudian unconscious is entirely different from the ordinary use of the word as defined in a regular dictionary, which gives as one of the definitions of the word *unconscious*: “not aware of.”<sup>24</sup> Additionally, the definition of *subconscious* reads:

1. occurring without conscious perception, or with only slight perception, on the part of the individual: said of mental processes and reactions
2. not fully conscious; imperfectly aware.<sup>25</sup>

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

In his attempt to further support his own position, Morrison goes on to quote Dr. Rousas Rushdoony:

This does not mean that some interesting things have not been discovered by psychologists, psychoanalysts, and psychiatrists. To recognize an enemy as an enemy does not mean we cannot learn from him but we must at all times be aware of the framework of his ideas and discoveries.<sup>26</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

He goes on to say:

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

Then Rushdoony tells why the heresy exists:

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

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

Dr. Jay Adams says:

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

Dave Hunt has said:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is his first question:

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

We say not “What if?” because it is precisely on the foundation of Freudian and Adlerian psychology that Crabb’s system is based. And Morrison not only admits the influence of Freud, Adler, and Jung in his next question, but does not see the implications of it:

What if the kind of use he makes of Freud and Adler and Jung is precisely and only the kind of use that Van Til says a Christian should be able to make of them?

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

In conclusion:

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

Unfortunately Morrison misunderstands and misuses our case against psychology. His quoting Rushdoony is spurious. His support for Crabb's use of Freudian and Adlerian ideas is unsubstantiated. Morrison's logic and explanations are at times appalling!

In closing this section, Morrison says:

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

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

---

1 Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 11.

2 *Ibid.*

3 Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr. *Understanding People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), pp. 26ff, 142ff.

Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr. *Effective Biblical Counseling*.(Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), pp. , 91ff.

4 Crabb, *Effective Biblical Counseling*, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 92.

6 Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr. and Dan B. Allender. *Encouragement* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), p. 95.

7 Crabb, *Understanding People*, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

9 Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr. *The Marriage Builder* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p. 49.

10 Crabb, *Understanding People*, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

11 *Ibid.*, pp. 144-145.

12 Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 11.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
- <sup>14</sup> Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* (Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, 1989), p. 151-152.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- <sup>17</sup> Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992), p. 258.
- <sup>18</sup> John Robbins. *Cornelius Van Til: The Man and the Myth* (Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1986), p. 23.
- <sup>19</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
- <sup>20</sup> Bobgan, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5.
- <sup>21</sup> Philip Lawrence Harriman. *Dictionary of Psychology* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), p. 342.
- <sup>22</sup> James Coleman and Constance Hammen. *Contemporary Psychiatry and Effective Behavior* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman 1974), p. 30.
- <sup>23</sup> Houston Smith. *The Religions of Man* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 52-53.
- <sup>24</sup> *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language*, 2nd ed. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), p. 1545.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1417.
- <sup>26</sup> Rousas John Rushdoony. *Revolt Against Maturity* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, 1977), p. 328.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 336.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 336.
- <sup>29</sup> Rousas John Rushdoony, "The Counselling Heresy," Position Paper No. 136, *Chalcedon Report*, June 1991, p. 10.
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- <sup>32</sup> Jay E. Adams. *More than Redemption* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979), p.p. xi, xii.
- <sup>33</sup> Dave Hunt. *the Cult Explosion* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1980), p. 70.
- <sup>34</sup> C. I. Scofield. *The New Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 1301.
- <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 336.
- <sup>36</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
- 

Next: [The Unconscious](#)

Return to: [Contents](#)

## THE UNCONSCIOUS

We have already seen that contrary to what Morrison would have us believe, Rushdoony would not support the Freudian/Adlerian ideas as taught by Crabb.

It is obvious that the issue of the Freudian unconscious is simpler than Morrison would have us think. Morrison states that there are five elements in our argument that Crabb's doctrine is Freudian-based. Though our argument extends well beyond these five elements and there are misrepresentations in these elements, we will nonetheless address them as Morrison presents them.

Morrison says:

*First* they point out similarities between the definitions of the word *unconscious* as given in the secular *Dictionary of Psychology*, and the use Crabb makes of the idea of unconscious forces within the personality.<sup>1</sup>

Morrison admits:

There are indeed likenesses between Crabb's doctrine of the unconscious and the doctrines of secular psychology.<sup>2</sup>

Morrison's justification is as follows:

There are also similarities between the Bobgans' doctrine of the scientific method and Karl Popper's.<sup>3</sup>

Earlier in this paper we exposed Morrison's error in equating Popperian and Freudian thought. Therefore, based upon his error which we discussed in the previous section, Morrison's present argument fails. If Morrison would have thought through his idea logically, he would not even have listed this point. Additionally, Morrison refers to "likenesses between Crabb's doctrine of the unconscious and the doctrines of secular psychology." Without proof he presents what Crabb preaches and promotes as "likenesses," as if that is our criticism of Crabb. Our criticism is documented in our book and begins with the following:

The Freudian concept of the unconscious serves as the cornerstone of Crabb's model of man and methodology of change.<sup>4</sup>

We amply and clearly demonstrate what part of Freud's theory Crabb uses in the pages following the above quote. It is not a *likeness*, but rather an important part of Freud's theory of the unconscious that is used by Crabb. Once more the reader can see how Morrison uses words to misrepresent what we say and to alter what Crabb teaches.

Morrison says:

Secondly, the Bobgans find fault with Crabb for finding anything of value in Freud.<sup>5</sup>

Obviously we have not found fault with Crabb for finding some small tidbit from Freud which might be tangential to his model of man. We are concerned with the overwhelming influence of Freudian thought on Crabb's model. Nevertheless, Morrison continues his argument by saying:

In the same way, too, a Christian can praise a non-Christian for what is valuable in his thinking without becoming allied with his ethical rebellion against God, just as the Bobgans praise Popper as a "world-renowned scholar and philosopher of science."

This second point is problematic in several respects. First, contrary to what Morrison says, we do **not** "find fault with Crabb for finding anything of value in Freud." We **do** find fault with Crabb for claiming that he found his version of the Freudian unconscious in Scripture and for then using it as a foundational element in his counseling model. Second, we do **not** "praise Popper as a "world-renowned scholar and philosopher of science." We merely list his credentials as stated by others. Third, Morrison's second element fails for the same reason his first element failed. As we have shown in the previous section and restated above, there are two different kinds of thinking, Freudian and Popperian. To quote a well-known philosophical statement, "Not all four-legged animals are dogs."

Morrison then goes on to say:

A Christian's thinking can be stimulated and helped forward by what the non-Christian has to say, just as Jay E. Adams was encouraged by what he read in the secular psychologist O., Hobart Mowrer.<sup>6</sup>

If by "Christian's thinking," Morrison means biblical theology, for which Crabb uses Freudian and Adlerian thought, then we severely disagree. If Morrison is suggesting that Adams' theology was "stimulated and helped forward by what the non-Christian [i. e. Mowrer, Glasser, Freud, Rogers] has to say," he is dead wrong! It is interesting that the two following quotes used by Morrison prove he is wrong.

I am not a disciple of Mowrer or William Glasser. . . . I stand far off from them. Their systems begin and end with man. . . . their presuppositional stance must be rejected totally. Christians may thank God that in his providence he has used Mowrer and others to awaken us to the fact that the "mentally ill" can be helped. But Christians must turn to the Scriptures to discover how God (not Mowrer) says to do it.

. . . neither Mowrer nor Glasser has solved the problem of responsibility. The responsibility they advocate is a relative, changing human responsibility; it is a non-Christian responsibility which must be rejected as fully as the irresponsibility of Freud and Rogers.<sup>7</sup>

Morrison evidently thinks there is a parallel between Adams' and Crabb's response to psychology. But, Adams learned that psychology does **not** have anything to offer. Mowrer's rhetorical question, "Has Evangelical religion sold its birthright for a mess of psychological

pottage?” did indeed drive Adams back to the Scriptures. When Adams looked at psychological counseling theories and therapies he saw they were bankrupt.

Crabb’s situation is quite different. He does not “stand far off from” Freudian and Adlerian thought. Instead of abandoning the psychological models and methods in favor of Scripture, Crabb has embraced the presuppositional stance of a Freudian/Adlerian unconscious filled with material which drives behavior. Crabb’s system is an adaptation of Freud. Adams, on the other hand, did not adapt from Mowrer. Adams was encouraged to quit looking for the answers in psychology and to go to Scripture instead.

Jay Adams would deny that his theology has been altered one iota or been “stimulated and helped forward by what the non-Christian [i.e. Mowrer, Glasser, Freud, Rogers] has to say.” Adams refers to these individuals to demonstrate how wrong they are, not how much his theology has been influenced by them.

Following his misrepresentation of what Adams means, Morrison lists a number of quotes from Crabb and claims “some interesting parallels to what Adams said.”<sup>8</sup> These quotes demonstrate that Crabb believes psychodynamic theory is valuable and “that Freud was correct on at least three counts.” These are not parallels to “what Adams has said,” as Adams would deny both of the above quotes.

Morrison ends his second element by saying that the Bobgans “cannot impugn him [Crabb] . . . for being willing to learn from Freud.”<sup>9</sup> Morrison so quickly either loses the focus or changes it. We critique Crabb for using the unproven Freudian unconscious as the base of his psychotheological system for dealing with problems of living. “Crabb’s openness to Freud” is “different in principle to Adams openness to Mowrer.” The difference is that Crabb is open to the use of the Freudian unconscious in his system and Adams is not open to Mowrer’s psychology. Nor is his counseling theology influenced by it.

Morrison says:

*Thirdly*, they quote a particular aspect of Freud’s doctrine of the unconscious that is indeed biblically objectionable, but they leave the reader unaware until four pages later that Crabb explicitly rejects Freud at that point.<sup>10</sup>

Morrison criticizes us for not clarifying a statement about Crabb until “four pages later.” This is the quote about Freud to which he is referring and it occurs on page 126:

Freud stated that the unconscious is a place where all kinds of powerful drives and mysterious motivations cause people to do what they do, whether they want to or not.<sup>11</sup>

Then he says that we give our clarification “four or five pages later.”<sup>12</sup> Yes, we do give **additional** clarification on those pages. However, Morrison entirely missed our statement on page 125, **before** the above cited passage. Here we say:

Crabb does not agree with all that Freud taught and even sees errors in his theories, but he insists that “the error of Freud and other dynamic theorists is **not** an insistence that we pay close attention to **unconscious forces** within personality.”<sup>13</sup>

Therefore, we were careful to state early in this section on Freud that “Crabb does not agree with all that Freud taught and even sees errors in his theories.”<sup>14</sup>

Then based upon his careless reading, Morrison makes this unfounded accusation:

. . . throughout the intervening pages of criticism of Crabb, the Bobgans have allowed their readers to believe that Crabb’s doctrine is identical with Freud’s in its entirety.<sup>15</sup>

The intervening pages to which he refers are pages 126 to 130. In spite of the fact that we clearly say on page 125 that “Crabb does not agree with all that Freud taught and even sees errors in his theories,” Morrison says:

Every statement of criticism the Bobgans make of Crabb in those pages therefore carries with it a negative emotional force that is likely to grip an unsuspecting reader and persuade him or her to accept the Bobgans’ criticisms as factual, without careful analysis.<sup>16</sup>

Morrison’s word *therefore* in the middle of that sentence relies upon his own careless reading.

Morrison continues with his fourth element:

*Fourthly*, they assert that Crabb teaches what he does “without Scriptural warrant;” “without providing a **biblical** definition of the *unconscious*;” and without providing “biblical verification of his view.”<sup>17</sup>

Morrison says:

Quoting Psalm 139:23-24, they then say what is undeniably true: “. . . the Lord Himself knows and understands exactly what lies hidden beneath the surface of every person. He knows and He brings cleansing to those inner parts that we may never understand.”<sup>18</sup>

Morrison goes on to say:

However, the wonderful fact of God’s grace, that “He knows and He brings cleansing to those inner parts that we may never understand,” does not mean (1) that those parts do not exist; (2) that it is inherently impossible for us to learn to understand them; or (3) that we ought never to try to understand them.<sup>19</sup>

Instead, we would say that “the wonderful fact of God’s grace, that ‘He knows and He brings cleansing to those inner parts that we may never understand,’” does **not** mean (1) that those inner parts resemble in any way a Freudian unconscious; does **not** mean (2) that it is impossible for us to know ourselves and respond to the work of the Lord in the inner man without Crabb’s gleanings from psychology; and does **not** mean (3) that we must turn to the psychological wisdom of men to “learn to understand them.”

Morrison believes that Crabb's brand of the unconscious is biblical rather than Freudian/Adlerian. So far Morrison has not been able to demonstrate that Crabb's use of the unconscious is biblical. He believes it is because Crabb has said that it is. Morrison often surfaces as many cult followers do; if the leader says it's so, it's so.

Morrison's fifth and final element is the following:

And, *fifthly*, they quote Crabb in several places, but misrepresent to the reader what Crabb's words mean.<sup>20</sup>

Morrison gives a quote from Crabb followed by a quote from us. He then says:

However, Crabb's words follow an extended quotation which he has given from a passage of Richard Lovelace, a passage in which Lovelace asserts that during the past two centuries the church has declined in its understanding of the depth of sin, and, in particular, of "the deforming presence of original sin, the compulsive force operating behind the individuals acts of transgression," whose effect is that "the human heart is now a reservoir of unconscious, disordered motivation and response, of which unrenewed personas are unaware if left to themselves."<sup>21</sup>

He then quotes Crabb as follows:

Perhaps the major error of evangelical churches today involves a deficient and shallow understanding of sin such as Lovelace describes. Many pastors preach an "iceberg view" of sin. All they worry about is what is visible above the water line.<sup>22</sup>

In conclusion, Morrison says:

. . . when you read the full context of his words you cannot deny that when Crabb finds fault with pastors who preach an "iceberg" view of sin, he does so because he believes they have failed to read the Scriptures with the same depth of understanding as their forefathers of earlier centuries, *not* because they have not listened to Freud.<sup>23</sup>

We disagree with this. Lovelace and Crabb **both** have a Freudian orientation. That's why Crabb quotes Lovelace. They are compatible.

Read in context, Crabb's words are not suggesting that the failure is due to pastors failing to read the Scriptures. Please note the Freudian metaphor "an 'iceberg view' of sin." This is a key element in Crabb's psychotherapy. The problem with pastors, according to Crabb's system is that they need to understand sin "below the waterline," which is another Freudian expression. In Crabb's system the view below the waterline is best understood in a Freudian/Adlerian context.

Morrison proceeds at almost every point with half-truths, untruths, and fickle statements, which he firmly believes to be true. Morrison unwittingly poisons the readers mind against the power of the Scripture uncontaminated by Freudian/Adlerian psychology to deal with problems of living.

After 20 pages, Morrison finally comes to one of the crucial questions related to Crabb's system and then he is incapable of even asking it correctly. He asks in a subheading, "Is the Doctrine of the Unconscious in the Bible?" This question has nothing whatsoever to do with Crabb's teachings or our criticism of them. The question which Morrison painfully wishes to avoid if possible and disguises when necessary is this: Is the doctrine of a **Freudian/Adlerian** unconscious in the Bible? There is a huge difference between the two questions. Morrison even begins the subsection by saying, "The crucial question is, does the Bible teach that there is an unconscious?"<sup>24</sup> He seems to equate and apparently believes that unconscious (unawareness) and the Freudian/Adlerian unconscious (filled with powerful motivating drives/needs) are the same.

Morrison says of us, ". . . but I believe that—at least in part—they fail to see what Crabb sees in the Scriptures because they insist on reading into the word a thorough-going Freudian interpretation which Crabb himself does not put there."<sup>25</sup> Throughout our critique of Crabb we have explained that Crabb's use of the Freudian unconscious is similar to Adler's adaptation of it. For instance, we demonstrate that Crabb's unconscious (like Adler's) is filled with a basic motivating force of a need for worth (expressed as needs for security and significance) rather than Freudian id impulses. The dynamics are the same: an active, motivating unconscious filled with needs that directly affect what a person thinks, says and does. That, by the way, is quite different from a passive unawareness or from passive material in our minds of which we are not currently aware.

But, we are surprised that Morrison accuses us of insisting "on reading into the word a thorough-going Freudian interpretation which Crabb himself does not put there."<sup>26</sup> Morrison already admitted earlier that we have not accused Crabb of such a position. He quoted us as saying:

Crabb is careful to say that he does not believe in unconscious *determinism* or its complement of early determinants of behavior.<sup>27</sup>

. . . Crabb promotes a combination of unconscious motivation and personal responsibility and insists that a person be held responsible for wrong attitudes and actions which originate from wrong assumptions in the unconscious.<sup>28</sup>

Incidentally, that is also a description of the Adlerian adaptation of the Freudian unconscious.

In our critique of Crabb we confront his use of Jeremiah 17:9 and Hebrews 3:13 to support his view of the unconscious. Morrison criticizes the fact that we deal with Jeremiah 17:9 first and then with Hebrews 3:13 later when Crabb refers to them in the reverse order. Regardless of the reference order by Crabb or by us the burden of proof remains the same. The burden of proof is on Crabb and Morrison to show that these or any other Scriptures teach the Freudian unconscious. Morrison, again, misunderstands what we are getting at and so he completely misunderstands our argument. Morrison misunderstands the purpose of our argument, so he does not recognize its reasoning.

Morrison again admits the following in this section:

Of course his [Crabb's] thinking and questioning *en route* has been stimulated by his knowledge of secular psychology. . . .<sup>29</sup>

Morrison also says:

The important thing is that his [Crabb's] thinking has been controlled in its outcome by his biblical presuppositions, not by the presuppositions of humanistic psychology.<sup>30</sup>

This is a critical issue that continues to surface. Let's use a little logic here. If Crabb had not been trained in Freudian/Adlerian psychology, would the substance of his system remain the same? Better yet, would it even exist? The answer is obvious. No knowledge of Freud and Adler would have resulted in no use of their doctrines in Crabb's system. If Crabb had started with Scripture and remained with Scripture, his system would be biblical and not an amalgamation. If Morrison had stayed with Scripture, he wouldn't be naively following Crabb. Crabb is an integrationist. Morrison supports Crabb in being an integrationist to such a degree that he sees "red" every time he reads a reasoned argument of ours and ends up avoiding it or playing topsy-turvy with it.

We criticize Crabb for claiming support for a Freudian/Adlerian unconscious in Scripture on the basis that there is no support for what he says in any of the standard Bible lexicons and dictionaries. Morrison's reply is:

Since those authorities do not agree with Crabb, he must be wrong, they conclude. This procedure is exactly equivalent to a 16th century scholar going to the lexicons of his day to check on Luther's new suggestion about the meaning of *righteousness*, and rejecting it because the lexicographers did not mention it. The dictionary-writers might be wrong! To assume they are right is to beg the question.<sup>31</sup>

This is a most outrageously ridiculous reasoning by Morrison. Can't you just imagine all the cults cashing in on that one?! The cults could all say of the orthodox doctrine consistently supported throughout the ages by biblical scholars, "To assume they are right is to beg the question." We have demonstrated earlier that Morrison apparently does not know what the logical fallacy of begging the question means. Morrison's reponse also reveals his preference for hermeneutics, which is psychological/pathological rather than grammatical/historical.

It is quite a different thing for Luther to have realized the application of Christ's righteousness to sinners, which is clearly presented in Scripture, from Crabb discovering "new meaning" through implication of what he thinks Scripture might mean in light of the doctrines of Freud and Adler.

Morrison examines our criticism of Crabb's teaching on Romans 12 and says:

The Bobgans are showing their usual incomprehension of the meaning of Crabb's words. Crabb believes on other biblical grounds that there is a deceitfulness within our hearts that wilfully hides from our conscious view many of our motives and beliefs. He comes to Romans 12 with that already established. But if our hearts are deceitful, of course the renewal that Paul speaks of must include that hidden level, not just the level of conscious thought. However, change at the conscious level is also included. Crabb says that "Sin . . . *includes* unconscious beliefs and motives." [Emphasis

Morrison's] It includes unconscious beliefs and motives, but that does not exclude *conscious* ones.<sup>32</sup>

Please remember that the Freudian metaphor of the iceberg is used and often referred to by Crabb. It is the basic model of his system. Also, remember that only the tip of the iceberg is above the water line. The rest is below. In conclusion, how much of sin is in a Freudian unconscious? Obviously an overwhelming amount according to Crabb's model. It is not we who are "showing their usual incomprehension of the meaning of Crabb's words"; it is Morrison!

Morrison expands his accusation of us as follows:

There is a kind of logical fallacy that is called "false dichotomy." If I said to you, "The door is open; therefore the window must be shut," my sentence would sound like nonsense because I doubt that any of us have ever encountered a building where the door and the window could not be open simultaneously. My sentence is an example of false dichotomy—saying that two things cannot be simultaneously true when in fact there is no reason why they shouldn't be. The Bobgans are guilty of a subtler form of this error in their handling of Romans 12. They point to evidence within the chapter that shows that Paul is referring to conscious thinking, and therefore conclude that he does not also have the deeper, deceitful levels of the heart in view. But nothing Paul says excludes the idea that he means us to apply what he says at every level of our mind.<sup>33</sup>

To respond to Morrison's accusation we refer to a logic book which says the following:

The *either/or* fallacy, sometimes called *false dichotomy*, consists of mistakenly assuming that there are only two possible solutions to some problem or that solving some problem consist of choosing between only two alternatives.<sup>34</sup> (Emphasis his.)

The author of this logic book advises:

*To identify the either/or fallacy, look for an argument that makes the false assumption that there are only two alternative (or perhaps three or more) available and that one must be taken because the other is unacceptable.*<sup>35</sup> (Emphasis his.)

The issue involved here is the one that Morrison has had trouble all along articulating. It is the issue involved in the question that he can't get right. It is the answer to this question: Is the doctrine of a Freudian unconscious in the Bible? The answer is clearly **no**. Morrison would like us to believe that the answer is yes, even though the evidence is clear that "Paul is referring to conscious thinking." Morrison's logic always seems to evaporate as he develops an idea. This is readily apparent when he says, "But nothing Paul says excludes the idea that he means us to apply what he says at every level of our mind."<sup>36</sup>

Rather than falling into the error of a false dichotomy in our argument about Crabb's use of Romans 12, we are using inductive reasoning. What Morrison must do is to provide

evidence for what he says. We have shown that Paul did not intend a Freudian/Adlerian unconscious here and we have amply demonstrated that it is not revealed elsewhere in Scripture. Therefore Morrison falsely lays the responsibility on us for demonstrating that Paul could not have meant the Freudian/Adlerian unconscious too, when the responsibility is clearly his.

Morrison accuses us of misunderstanding what Crabb means in his use of Jeremiah 17:9. The following is the section of our book to which he refers:

In addition to superimposing his notions of the unconscious upon the biblical term translated mind, Crabb seeks to equate the word heart with the unconscious:

My understanding of unconscious elements within the personality is rooted in the biblical teaching that, above all else, our hearts are deceitful and desperately wicked.

According to God's revelation the heart is deceitful. However, the deceitfulness of a person's inner being does not prove or even imply that a person's heart or inner being is the unconscious described by Crabb. The word heart as employed in Scripture will not support his psychological agenda concerning the unconscious, its crucial role, or its contents.<sup>37</sup>

Morrison insists that "Crabb makes no such equation" between "the word *heart* and the unconscious."<sup>38</sup> Morrison says that Crabb's "understanding is 'rooted in' Jeremiah 17:9." But, if his "understanding is 'rooted in' Jeremiah 17:9," then Crabb is certainly using the heart to support his use of the unconscious. We are not saying that Crabb is saying that the *heart* of Jeremiah 17:9 is limited to his doctrine of the unconscious. We are merely showing how Crabb uses Scripture to support a Freudian/Adlerian unconscious.

Morrison goes on to say, "'The unconscious' is a reasonable term to use to describe the part of the heart where this deceptive process occurs."<sup>39</sup> We would say that a person can use any seemingly "reasonable term," but when the doctrine of a man is attached to a particular term and the doctrine follows, one is not simply choosing a reasonable term, but rather an entire system. Morrison's misunderstanding of the use that Crabb has made of secular systems can be seen in his next statement:

The only worthwhile objection to using it ['the unconscious'] is that secular psychology used it first, and so its use may bring with it a baggage of extra meaning that goes beyond what the Scripture teaches.<sup>40</sup>

But Crabb is not simply using a term with "baggage of extra meaning"; Crabb has **included** the Freudian/Adlerian baggage! Morrison would like to be able to divorce Crabb's system from Freud, but he cannot. The connection is clear. Crabb is not just using a word. His use of the Freudian unconscious is as clear as Adler's use of the Freudian unconscious. Regardless of who developed a psychological model of the unconscious first, it is still unbiblical.

Crabb's unconscious (filled with motivating needs) is so similar to Adler's adaptation of the Freudian unconscious that if one were to remove all direct similarities, Crabb's model

would collapse. Crabb's unconscious is as much a derivative of Freud's unconscious as is Adler's. And the contents of Crabb's unconscious are like Adler's and Maslow's: emotional "needs."

Crabb has admitted to learning from Freud and others. His model of the unconscious could not have been solely derived from Scripture, because the Freudian/Adlerian/Maslowian elements are too strong. See *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I*, pages 130 to 134, for a few of the similarities. Crabb's background is psychology, and he has borrowed from psychotherapeutic systems.

Morrison ends this section of his paper by accusing Jay Adams of "Muddled Thinking." It should now be clear that Morrison, not Adams, is muddled.

---

<sup>1</sup> Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* (Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, 1989), p. 124.

<sup>5</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Jay E. Adams quoted by Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 8 (no reference given for Adams).

<sup>8</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>11</sup> Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

<sup>12</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>13</sup> Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 125.

<sup>15</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>22</sup> Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr.. *Understanding People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), p. 129.

<sup>23</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>27</sup> Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 131.

<sup>29</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>34</sup> Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book*, 2nd ed. (Belmont, CA:Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992), p. 248.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 250.

<sup>36</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

<sup>37</sup> Bobgan, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-158.

<sup>38</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

## CONFUSION, CONFUSION

In paragraph after paragraph of Morrison's rebuttal there is an obfuscation fueled by a devotion to Crabb at the expense of common sense and Scripture. Morrison quotes us out of context and distorts what he properly quotes from both Crabb and us. All of this driven by an irrational admiration of Crabb.

Morrison once more raises the issue of begging the question. We have already addressed his misunderstanding and misapplication of begging the question. He goes on to complain about some of our endnote references to Crabb's writings which support statements that we make. He says:

At some places, though, the discrepancy is so great that I can offer no guess as to why the Bobgans interpreted Crabb as they did.<sup>1</sup>

His examples from *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* are as follows: "Chapter 8, notes 3, 8, 12, 14, Chapter 10, note 25, Chapter 11, note 28."

We will address his first example of a so-called discrepancy between what we say and the supporting reference to what Crabb has written. Chapter 8, note 3 is at the end of the first sentence of a paragraph. We say:

Like other integrationists, Crabb seeks to combine psychological theories and therapies with the Bible.<sup>2</sup>

The reference we give refers to pages 66-72 of *Understanding People*.<sup>3</sup> We simply refer to that section of Crabb's book because it contains examples of his attempts to "combine psychological theories and therapies with the Bible."

This section of Crabb's book may appear to be biblical on a surface reading. However, on close inspection one can see that Crabb's "biblical categories" are subservient to his doctrine of two motivating needs in a Freudian/Adlerian unconscious. In this section Crabb sets forth the idea of biblical categories and using the Bible as a foundation for counseling. However, it is here that he talks about people having questions that are not directly answered by Scripture. Therefore Crabb moves to "implications of the biblical categories"<sup>4</sup> which for Crabb fit with the very theories from psychology that he uses. Thus he attempts to combine ideas such as denial (a central defense mechanism from Freudian theory) with the Bible. He even fills his "biblical categories" with psychological explanations for such activities as male exhibitionism.<sup>5</sup> Then a verse or two (Jeremiah 2:13, in this instance), which might seem to apply from a psychological view of Scripture, is added for further "biblical support."

Morrison titles this subsection "Footnotes that Don't." We demonstrated that for one of his listed footnotes Morrison is wrong. He has merely stated what footnotes he believes are wrong and not said anything more. We suggest that the readers examine what we have said, follow our footnotes to Crabb's books and read what he says. It seems as if Morrison had a random footnote generator and used it to select which footnotes of ours to list. It will become apparent as we demonstrate with the one reference above that these are "Footnotes that Do." They do what Morrison wishes they wouldn't do, which is to expose Crabb's integrationist position.

The balance of this section is subtitled “Foolish Statements,” to which Morrison responds foolishly. Because our paper will be longer than Morrison’s rebuttal, we will select only a few items to comment on from the balance of this section. In most cases Morrison just quotes us and states that he disagrees without giving any evidence.

Morrison quotes us as follows:

David asks, “Who can understand his errors? Cleanse thou me from secret faults.” He did not despair because God did not give a full explanation of why he sinned. Instead, he trusted God and asked Him to cleanse him. . . . But, according to Crabb, any counselor who does not address those questions has a “shallow understanding of problems and solutions that sounds biblical but helps very few.”<sup>6</sup>

The sentence which was ellipsed, however, was very important to the point we were making. The sentence is this: “He believed in the cleansing power of the Word of God.” Morrison fails to see that it is God’s Word that cleanses the inner man and not some biblicized Freudian/Adlerian system.

To help the reader see what we were saying, we include here the entire two paragraphs from which Morrison took his quote from us.

Crabb uses the term legitimate to argue that people have a fundamental right both to ask and to seek answers to such questions. Nevertheless there are examples in Scriptures in which people did not insist on that right. After extolling the Word of God, David asks, “Who can understand his errors? Cleanse thou me from secret faults.” He did not despair because God did not give a full explanation of why he sinned. Instead, he trusted God and asked Him to cleanse him. He believed in the cleansing power of the Word of God.

But, according to Crabb, any counselor who does not address those questions has a “shallow understanding of problems and solutions that sounds biblical but helps very few.” In fact, he declares that a counselee could be “significantly harmed” if counseled by shallow thinkers who have not yet addressed those legitimate questions. Crabb implies that counselees are entitled to answers to those legitimate questions, because if no one addresses their legitimate questions they will be forced to accept “superficial solutions.”<sup>7</sup>

Following this Morrison says:

David acknowledges that, as a congenital sinner, inevitably he has faults that are invisible to himself. His words do not mean that there is no possibility of ever seeing for himself what they are. Nor do they mean it was not his duty to try. (Some of his faults—e.g. in his treatment of Absalom—were visible to his friends even though not to David). This verse (Psalm 19:12) is in fact further Scriptural evidence of the existence of that deceitful corner of the heart that Crabb terms “the unconscious.”<sup>8</sup>

It is obvious from what Morrison has said thus far in his paper that he apparently believes that what needs to be dealt with is the Freudian unconscious through some Adlerian system, though he would not identify them with Freud and Adler. Is this what God meant all

along? And did Crabb just now discover what God meant all along through having been open to learn from Freud, Adler, and others? Is Crabb's great discovery on a par with Martin Luther's understanding of justification by faith? We think not!

Morrison quotes us as follows:

One psychological counsellor's answer may disagree sharply with another's even if both of them are Christians.<sup>9</sup>

Morrison responds:

But not if both have worked from a thoroughly biblical framework of presuppositions. This is exactly what has been lacking and what Crabb is beginning to put into place.<sup>10</sup>

In essence, what Morrison is saying is that if the other psychological counselors will agree with Crabb's use of the Freudian/Adlerian unconscious within Crabb's understanding of a "biblical framework," then perhaps the problem of disagreement among psychological counselors will be solved.

Indeed there is a problem of disagreement among Christians who pick and choose among the numerous secular systems. The Christian Association for Psychological Studies (CAPS) is a group of psychologists and psychological counselors who are professing Christians. At one of their meetings the following was said:

We are often asked if we are "Christian psychologists" and find it difficult to answer since we don't know what the question implies. We are Christians who are psychologists but at the present time there is no acceptable Christian psychology that is markedly different from non-Christian psychology. It is difficult to imply that we function in a manner that is fundamentally distinct from our non-Christian colleagues . . . as yet there is not an acceptable theory, mode of research or treatment methodology that is distinctly Christian.<sup>11</sup>

Although Christian psychological counselors claim to have taken only those elements of psychology that fit with Christianity, anything can be made to fit the Bible, no matter how silly or even satanic it is. Each Christian therapist brings his own individual psychology borrowed from the world to the Bible and modifies the Word to make it fit. What they use comes from the bankrupt systems of ungodly and unscientific theories and techniques.

Christians who seek to integrate psychology with Christianity have actually turned to secular, ungodly sources for help. And, because these unbiblical, unsubstantiated theories and techniques have been blended into the dough, they are well hidden in the loaf. Thus many Christians honestly believe they are using only a purified, Christianized psychology. Instead, they are left with a contaminated loaf, not with the unleavened bread of the Word of God. A. W. Tozer declares:

At the heart of the Christian system lies the cross of Christ with its divine paradox. The power of Christianity appears in its antipathy toward, never in its agreement with, the ways of fallen men. . . . The cross stands in bold opposition to the natural man. Its philosophy runs contrary to the processes of the unregenerate mind, so that Paul could say bluntly that the preaching of the

cross is to them that perish foolishness. To try to find a common ground between the message of the cross and man's fallen reason is to try the impossible, and if persisted in must result in an impaired reason, a meaningless cross and a powerless Christianity.<sup>12</sup>

Those who attempt to integrate psychology and Christianity hope to bring together the best of both. Their faith rests in a combination of one or more of the many psychological systems of men's minds along with some form of Christianity. Dr. Gary Collins says that Christian therapists have goals that are different from secular therapists. Nevertheless they use theories and methods borrowed directly from approaches devised by secular psychologists whose systems have underlying presuppositions that are antithetical to the Bible.

Collins admits that Christians cannot trust all of psychology. However, in answer to his book title *Can You trust Psychology?* Collins says, "It all depends on the psychology and the psychologist."<sup>13</sup> Then he gives his criteria of acceptance. He says:

When a psychologist seeks to be guided by the Holy Spirit, is committed to serving Christ faithfully, is growing in his or her knowledge of the Scriptures, is well aware of the facts and conclusions of psychology, and is willing to evaluate psychological ideas in the light of biblical teaching—then you can trust the psychologist, even though he or she at times will make mistakes, as we all do. If the psychology or psychological technique is not at odds with scriptural teaching, then it is likely to be trustworthy, especially if it also is supported by scientific data.<sup>14</sup>

Now let us try to apply this criteria. At the present time there are over 250 competing and often contradictory therapies and over 10,000 not-always-compatible techniques. To determine methodological systems used by Christians who practice psychotherapy, we conducted a survey with the Christian Association for Psychological Studies. In our survey we used a simple questionnaire in which we asked the therapists 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.<sup>15</sup>

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.”<sup>16</sup>

If one were to ask the numerous Christian psychologists if they meet Collins’ criteria, we would venture to guess they would say that they do. But then we have to ask why it is that the numerous Christian psychologists who would say they meet Collins’ 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.

Morrison says:

Because Jay E. Adams has used the term *nouthetic counselling* to describe the counselling model he subscribes to, people may wrongly assume that Crabb’s model is not *nouthetic*—i.e., that it evades confrontation with sin. That is not the case: it confronts *more* sin, more *thoroughly* than does Adams’ model.<sup>17</sup>

In one negative way, Morrison is right about Crabb’s model confronting more sin: In Crabb’s system counselees are to **confront and confess the sins of others committed against them** so that they can re-experience their own pain and disappointments to find the so-called source of their erroneous thinking, which in Crabb’s system is the real sin that lies hidden in the unconscious. This kind of confrontation is certainly **not** what Adams has in mind when he uses the term *nouthetic*, nor is this system for discovering hidden sin apparent in Scripture.

In a footnote Morrison says: “. . . the Christian public needs to know that [Adams’] model is not wholly correct, and that the word *nouthetic* more properly belongs in Crabb’s system.”<sup>18</sup> This is one additional hyperbolic statement made by Morrison about Crabb. It is another example of the high homage he pays to Crabb. We do not deny that Crabb confronts sin. Our position is that Crabb confronts sin with a Freudian/Adlerian psychological model. It is not a matter of whether Crabb confronts sin; it’s a matter of how he confronts sin and how he even psychologically represents sinful behavior, which requires him to have a psychological answer.

Morrison says:

The Word of God *is* quick and powerful, but pastoral counsel, together with encouragement by fellow-believers, is still required if the people of God are to grow in holiness. That is God’s own plan.<sup>19</sup>

We agree entirely with this statement by Morrison. It is Crabb that would disagree, unless the pastor and the people understood all about what is underneath the water line and how to peel the layers of denial. Crabb has already demonstrated that the Word of God is not quick and powerful on its own or why would he add the Freudian/Adlerian ideas to it?

Morrison does not seem to comprehend what Crabb means when he says, “It is therefore true that no one sees himself clearly until he is exposed by another,” because he objects to our concluding that “This denies the sovereign work of God in a person’s life.”<sup>20</sup> He says that our conclusion is “False,” since Crabb includes the Holy Spirit in the word *another*. Crabb’s statement still denies the “sovereign work of God in a person’s life” because it subjects the Holy Spirit and the Word of God to Crabb’s psychological system of a Freudian/Adlerian unconscious and a psychological method of exposure. Because of

Crabb's Freudian/Adlerian model of man, his psychological exposure is quite different from what the Bible says about God revealing one's sinfulness.

The following quote from Morrison is one more example of his great adoration of Crabb:

From the time of the death of the apostles until the days of Anselm of Canterbury, God allowed the Church to operate with a faulty doctrine of the atonement; for an even longer period (until Luther), he allowed it to operate with a faulty doctrine of justification. People were saved, and achieved progress in sanctification nonetheless. But our walk in our day is that much easier than theirs because of the greater light we have received.<sup>21</sup>

We are grateful that Luther's doctrine of justification came directly from the Bible. It was only hidden by the false doctrines of the Catholic Church that added to the Word of God. Luther went back to the Bible. He did not go outside to the opinions of unregenerate men. Conversely, Crabb's psychological system did not come directly from the Bible. What he has discovered was not hidden by false doctrines added to the Word of God; what he has discovered was **revealed** by false doctrines added to the Word of God. Crabb did go outside of the Bible to find insight and revelation from unregenerate men.

Morrison gives evidence of having read our critique, but only through the lens of faith in Crabb and his system. He likens Crabb to Martin Luther on page 1 of his paper. He claims that Crabb is more nouthetic than Jay Adams on page 27. And, as noted above, he considers Crabb to be a man like those who recovered the church from its "faulty doctrine of the atonement." Morrison elevates Crabb, misrepresents our critique of him, and even misrepresents what Crabb's system is truly about.

---

<sup>1</sup> Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* (Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, 1989), p. 111.

<sup>3</sup> Lawrence J. Crabb, Jr. *Understanding People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), pp. 66-72.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70.

<sup>6</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>7</sup> Bobgan, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-116.

<sup>8</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>11</sup> Sutherland, P. and Poelstra, P., "Aspects of Integration." Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Association of Christians for Psychological Studies, Santa Barbara, CA, June 1976.

<sup>12</sup> A. W. Tozer, *That Incredible Christian* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications, Inc., 1964), p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> Gary Collins, *Can You Trust Psychology?* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988), p. 19.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>15</sup> Martin and Deidre Bobgan, "Psychotherapeutic Methods of CAPS Members," *Christian Association for Psychological Studies Bulletin* 6, No. 1, 1980, p. 13.

<sup>16</sup> Morris Parloff, "Psychotherapy and Research: An Anaclitic Depression," *Psychiatry*, Vol. 43, November 1980, p. 291.

<sup>17</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>20</sup> Bobgan, *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I, op. cit.*, p. 154.

---

<sup>21</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

---

Next: [Drivers and Shapers of Sin](#)  
Return to: [Contents](#)

## DRIVERS AND SHAPERS OF SIN

Morrison indicates that part of Crabb's theoretical development has been a greater emphasis on "fallen mankind's commitment to autonomy as the essence of sin." Morrison says that "The other major tenet of his doctrine of human behavior remains, as ever, the effect of the longings we have for those attributes which were part of Adam and Eve's existence before the fall, but which they lost when they sinned." But he wants to make it clear that "Crabb does not see those longings as the *prime* drivers of our sinful behavior."<sup>1</sup>

In this section Morrison is evidently attempting to prove that Crabb's system is not dependent upon two motivating needs in the unconscious and therefore not dependent upon a Freudian/Adlerian model of man. But one cannot separate Crabb's doctrine of the sin of autonomy from his doctrine of an unconscious filled with motivating needs and unconscious thoughts. Furthermore, the very idea that psychological needs (the need for worth, divided into the needs for security and significance, and later relabeled "longings for relationship and impact") are "the effect of attributes which were part of Adam and Eve's existence before the fall, but which they lost when they sinned," is pure speculation.

To boil down the similarities, we will simplify to the bare bones. According to Freud, the id drives behavior, and what happens in the first five years of life (psychosexual stages of development) will shape the behavior. According to Adler what drives behavior is the need for worth (also referred to as striving for superiority) and what shapes behavior is what happens in a person's early life. In both Freud's and Adler's systems the drives and the early childhood experiences plus resulting misconceptions form the content of the unconscious. In Crabb's system, the needs or longings drive behavior and the early disappointments of not having the needs met (what Morrison identifies as the "individual's unique experience of deprivation of the things a normal human soul longs for"<sup>2</sup>) shape the thinking and behaving, and all of this is in the unconscious. In all three systems the person develops strategies to protect himself, identified by Freud as ego defense mechanisms, such as denial.

The main difference between Crabb and his psychological mentors is that Crabb contends that the essence of sin is when people attempt to meet these needs apart from God—thus the idea of autonomy as the essence of sin. Crabb's system is designed to reveal to people that they have unmet needs and that they have sinned in their wrong thoughts and strategies to meet those needs and to protect themselves from further pain. Thus, if only people can realize that God Himself meets those needs/longings, then they can recognize their dependence on him. And then they can overcome their sin of autonomy and have their unconscious needs/longings met. This is the essence of Crabb's system of psychological sanctification.

Thus Crabb is still teaching a need psychology/theology and his emphasis on the autonomy of man as being the essence of sin is still subservient to the humanistic lie that when people's needs are met (even by having the longings for relationship and impact met by God) they will be good, loving people. While it is absolutely true that God is our source and that autonomy is the essence of separation from God, God sent His Son to die for our sins which separated us from God and to live His own life in us to enable us to live pleasing to God. Crabb has imposed a psychological explanation for sin upon Scripture and added a psychological means of sanctification to the work of God in a person's life.

While Crabb seems to think that examination of the corpse (the old self) will lead to depending on God and overcoming sin, Paul taught that we are to reckon the old man dead

(powerless), put on the new man, and walk according to the Spirit. Those psychologists who look into a person's past to explain the present have nothing to offer but speculation about how the past has affected the present. They are unable to look at a child and then accurately predict what he will be like in the future. Psychological analysis is all postdictive, not predictive. Thus, Crabb is adding speculation to Scripture. We do not deny that everyone's story is different. Nevertheless, it is still "Christ in you the hope of glory," not psychological speculation as the hope of glory.

---

<sup>1</sup> Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32.

## THE LOSS OF MAN

In this section, Morrison mentions “a controversy which split the Christian Reformed Church of America in 1924.” Involved in this controversy is a man named Herman Hoeksema. According to Morrison, Hoeksema was teaching an error called “the loss of man.” Although Morrison sees a connection between Hoeksema’s “loss of man” and us, he gives no evidence to support it. Instead, what he seems to have done is to have dredged up another straw man called the “loss of man” error.<sup>1</sup>

Here is the quote from our book that he uses to accuse us of the “loss of man” error:

. . . . psychological theories look for reasons for unacceptable attitudes and behavior in circumstances outside of the person. That is why those kinds of answers are not found in the Bible. Even when Satan or other people may tempt one to sin, God says through his word that even then they are drawn into sin by their own lust (James 1:14). God holds people responsible for their own sin.<sup>2</sup>

He then calls this a false dichotomy. However, we will let the reader decide by reading the entire paragraph.

It may be interesting to look at the great variety of psychological opinions when dealing with what Crabb identifies as “legitimate questions.” But, the danger in looking for answers to such questions outside of the Bible is that psychological systems tend to place answers outside of the person himself. Because of the underlying philosophy that people are innately good and are corrupted by society, mainly parents, psychological theories look for reasons for unacceptable attitudes and behavior in circumstances outside of the person. That is why those kinds of answers are not found in the Bible. Even when Satan or other people may tempt one to sin, God says through his word that even then they are drawn into sin by their own lust (James 1:14). God holds people responsible for their own sin. Thus, according to the Bible itself, it is neither necessary nor profitable to go outside Scripture for answers. The Bible answers the truly crucial questions about the nature of man and why he behaves the way he does.<sup>3</sup>

We are not saying that external events have no bearing on a person’s conduct. What we are saying is that speculating about the relationship between past events and present behavior is unnecessary and possibly counterproductive in biblical counseling. It is one thing to see where one might have learned a habit; it is quite another thing to explain one’s behavior according to events in the past.

An example of this can be seen in the response of two people who witnessed their families murdered during the attempted genocide of the Armenian people at the turn of the century. One says, “With all that evil, there must be a good God, or nothing makes sense.” Another says, “All that evil proves that there is no God.” Similar experience, opposite response. Can we say that it was experience that led to faith, or the mercy of God?

Morrison further declares:

They [the Bobgans] choose to build their doctrine and practice **only** on the Scriptures that make man into a sinful nobody. In doing so they dishonour the God who created man and whose Word teaches a different doctrine than theirs.<sup>4</sup> (Emphasis added.)

It is difficult to understand how Morrison came up with this. We suggest that he read our book *How to Counsel from Scripture*.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Trevor Morrison, "Misunderstanding People," unpublished paper, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Prophets of PsychoHeresy I* (Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, 1989), p. 117.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117.

<sup>4</sup> Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

<sup>5</sup> Martin and Deidre Bobgan, *How to Counsel from Scripture* (Moody, 1985).

---

Next: [Concluding Remarks](#)

Return to: [Contents](#)

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

There are at least four errors in Morrison's thought which have prevented him from coming to grips with an understanding of what Crabb is teaching. These errors are:

- (1) Morrison has a mistaken view of what the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture means;
- (2) Morrison has not thought through what it means to hold thoroughly Christian presuppositions about the nature of the world. If he had, he would not feel the need to accept any theory that would be contrary to Scripture and he would not count it *a priori* as a black mark against us when we do not listen to such people.
- (3) Morrison fails to see the connection between what Crabb says *drives* and *shapes* our sin and the Freudian/Adlerian unconscious. Therefore, Morrison wrongly believes Crabb's doctrine of sin is orthodox and avoids facing its Freudian/Adlerian roots.
- (4) Morrison fails to give proper weight to all that the Bible says about both God and man and yet elevates Freudian/Adlerian psychology to the level of the Bible. He is, to use an earlier expression, a "loser of man" and therefore a loser of God.

In paragraph after paragraph and section after section, Morrison misrepresents Adams, Rushdoony, and us; he even misrepresents Crabb. Morrison sacrifices intellect, reason and logic in an attempt to support his blind loyalty to Crabb. Even some of the most obvious statements made by Crabb and us are twisted to mean what they cannot mean.

It is unfortunate that Morrison did not check out his comments about logic with someone who had taken an introductory course in logic. Failing to do so exposes his ignorance of logic and his inability to see beyond his love of Crabb.

In conclusion, it seems obvious that Morrison should not be trusted in matters having to do with the Bible, his understanding of Crabb and his critiquing us. It grieves us to see the extent to which Morrison has gone in his attempt to support Crabb. Our prayer is that he might get his eyes off Crabb and onto Jesus, who is the author and finisher of our faith.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

There are at least four errors in Morrison's thought which have prevented him from coming to grips with an understanding of what Crabb is teaching. These errors are:

- (1) Morrison has a mistaken view of what the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture means;
- (2) Morrison has not thought through what it means to hold thoroughly Christian presuppositions about the nature of the world. If he had, he would not feel the need to accept any theory that would be contrary to Scripture and he would not count it *a priori* as a black mark against us when we do not listen to such people.
- (3) Morrison fails to see the connection between what Crabb says *drives* and *shapes* our sin and the Freudian/Adlerian unconscious. Therefore, Morrison wrongly believes Crabb's doctrine of sin is orthodox and avoids facing its Freudian/Adlerian roots.
- (4) Morrison fails to give proper weight to all that the Bible says about both God and man and yet elevates Freudian/Adlerian psychology to the level of the Bible. He is, to use an earlier expression, a "loser of man" and therefore a loser of God.

In paragraph after paragraph and section after section, Morrison misrepresents Adams, Rushdoony, and us; he even misrepresents Crabb. Morrison sacrifices intellect, reason and logic in an attempt to support his blind loyalty to Crabb. Even some of the most obvious statements made by Crabb and us are twisted to mean what they cannot mean.

It is unfortunate that Morrison did not check out his comments about logic with someone who had taken an introductory course in logic. Failing to do so exposes his ignorance of logic and his inability to see beyond his love of Crabb.

In conclusion, it seems obvious that Morrison should not be trusted in matters having to do with the Bible, his understanding of Crabb and his critiquing us. It grieves us to see the extent to which Morrison has gone in his attempt to support Crabb. Our prayer is that he might get his eyes off Crabb and onto Jesus, who is the author and finisher of our faith.