

Title: Defending Theophostic at CAPS Conference

June 19, 2005

Greetings all,

Finally getting around to sending a more detailed report regarding our trip to Texas in April. As many of you already know, one of the workshops at the Christian Association for Psychological Studies (CAPS) annual convention was a panel discussion/debate about Theophostic®. Bill Renn was defending Theophostic® in response to Dr. Monroe's theological concerns, and my job was to defend Theophostic® in response to Dr. Entwistle's clinical concerns. Our experience with Dr. Monroe at a previous CAPS conference where he presented critiques of Theophostic® was that he was triggered, and quite polarized and antagonistic towards Theophostic®, and my assessment from Dr. Entwistle's published articles critiquing Theophostic® was that he was also triggered, polarized, and antagonistic.

We specifically asked many of you to pray that the four panel members could dialogue in a friendly way – more working together to discuss concerns, as opposed to an adversarial debate. The Lord answered these prayers. I spent many, many hours preparing for this panel discussion/debate, including preparing possible responses to the many concerns raised in Dr. Entwistle's long and detailed articles in the CAPS journal critiquing Theophostic®. However, I did not need to use most of this preparation. Even better than having a fight and winning is not having a fight at all. It felt like all four panel participants were able to be considerate and respectful of each other, and Dr. Entwistle and Dr. Monroe each took some of their precious time to acknowledge that the newly released Basic Training Manual indicates that Dr. Smith has responded to a number of their previous concerns.

If Dr. Entwistle and Dr. Monroe had presented triggered, antagonistic, severe criticisms, *even if they were wrong, there would not have been time in the one-hour workshop to adequately refute their statements.* This would have left most of the audience with the “bottom line” message of: “some of our CAPS members think this approach has really serious problems, and we should steer clear of it until we have sorted out all of these concerns” (which may not happen for years). Instead, the overall feel of the panel discussion was “this is a valuable approach to emotional healing, but there are some concerns that are being discussed.”

Also, those in charge of the conference did not seem to perceive Theophostic® as being very important. The person organizing the workshop, and also Drs. Entwistle and Monroe, had asked for more time and more space, but the workshop had only been allotted a one-hour time slot and a small conference room. However, more than half the attendees from the whole conference packed into our room – using all the chairs that had been set up for the workshop, bringing in all the available extra chairs, and filling the standing room around the edges until finally some were actually turned away. This did not go unnoticed. The person who organized the panel later told us that one of the CAPS directors had commented to her about the attendance at our workshop, and suggested that CAPS actively pursue other options to provide

their members with more information regarding Theophostic®.

Overall, it felt like the Lord really blessed and protected the CAPS panel/debate. The one-day seminars that Charlotte and I did in Dallas, TX and Hesston, KS also went very well.

Again, we really want to thank those of you who were praying for our trip.

Blessings,

Dr. Lehman/Karl

Want to support the Lehman's Immanuel Approach work? Click here for more information:
<https://www.immanuelapproach.com/supporting-lehmans-immanuel-approach-work/>