## EXHIBIT 51

## [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images

Albert Lamoureux, LMHC <u>lumencounseling at att.net</u>

Tue Jul 17 07:09:31 MDT 2012

- Previous message: [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images
- Next message: [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images
- Messages sorted by: [date] [thread] [subject] [author]

```
Joe,
This clarifies things for me. Thanks. I have no problem with this issue when
presented in this light.
Al Lamoureux, LMHC
----Original Message----
From: membersl-bounces at narth.com [mailto:membersl-bounces at narth.com] On
Behalf Of Joe N
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 8:55 PM
To: NARTH Clinical Listserve
Subject: Re: [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images
I should have made this clear. The therapist does not introduce the porn
material but only uses what the client brings in because he is disturbed by
its arousing effect..
Joseph Nicolosi, Ph.D.
www.josephnicolosi.com
From: "Robert L. Vazzo, LMFT" <healingtherapy at embarqmail.com>
To: NARTH Clinical Listserve < membersl at narth.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 5:27 PM
Subject: Re: [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images
I think perhaps that we are on the same page, Albert, as I too was not
advocating bringing in new material, only allowing a client to bring in
images that disturb him.
---- Original Message -----
Michelle,
You have summarized my position accurately. I also agree with the statement
about the re-wiring of pathways. Porn can also cause damage on many levels.
The older images are "what's done is done.", whereas introduction of new
images is adding "fuel to the fire."
Thanks.
Al Lamoureux, LMHC
----Original Message-----
From: membersl-bounces at narth.com [mailto:membersl-bounces at narth.com] On
Behalf Of Michelle Cretella
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 3:36 PM
To: NARTH Clinical Listserve
Subject: Re: [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images
Just my 2 cents as a practicing Catholic & someone who went through EMDR
for anxiety (which relies solely on recall):
```

I think that Phil & Al have it correct. It is morally licit - and therapeutically possible to use EMDR for SSA with solely "recalled" pornographic images by the patient (and still meet with success), but it is not morally licit to use homo-erotic images introduced by the therapist in order to attain a hetero outcome. One cannot use immoral means - actively use the image of a human person as an object thus degrading that person to achieve a good end.

brain pathways as well ... so perhaps another reason to stick w/ recall.

```
Also, on a tangential note, the viewing of porn has been shown to re-wire
Michelle
On Sat, Jul 14, 2012 at 1:51 PM, Philip Sutton
<<u>suttonphilip at gmail.com</u>>wrote:
> What I write is a preliminary response, and I am consulting others, more
> experienced than I with applying moral teaching prudently, to clarify my
> ideas. That said...
> Standard ethics teaches us that one may *not* do evil so that good may
> follow. Thus, as Joe has written in his "rationale for the use of porn in
> treatment", the intention to do good is not sufficient to justify using an
> immoral action to accomplish it.
> Since Joe, quoted the Catholic catechism I (as what we call a "practicing,
> devout, faithful" Catholic), will also. Under the section explaining the
> Catholic 6th Commandment ("Thous shall not commit adultery"), we read:
>
> *
> *
>
*2354<file:///C:/Users/Phil/Documents/Vatican/CCC%20on%20Gender%20and%20Chas
> Pornography consists in removing real or simulated sexual acts from the
> intimacy of the partners, in order to display them deliberately to third
> parties. It offends against chastity because it perverts the conjugal act,
> the intimate giving of spouses to each other. It does grave injury to the
> dignity of its participants (actors, vendors, the public), since each one
> becomes an object of base pleasure and illicit profit for others. It
> immerses all who are involved in the illusion of a fantasy world. It is a
> grave offense. Civil authorities should prevent the production and
> distribution of pornographic materials.*
> What I have shared with others in conversation and via email I share here.
> I think that using external "pornographic" images in therapy crosses the
> moral line, and that porn is an immoral "object" to use in therapy. (A
> similar example., although obviously more serious, would be the issue of
> abortion. While the intention of helping a pregnant woman, and her child's
> father, deal with intense emotional distress over an unwanted pregnancy is
> good, doing so through the intentional death of the unborn child- is never
> moral, as it is never moral to take innocent life.) Helping folks deal
> with internal - i.e., remembered - pornographic images, is another matter.
> As I mention above, I am consulting some pastoral and moral theologians on
> the use of porn in therapy. I will get back to you with what I learn.
> Phil
> On Sat, Jul 14, 2012 at 1:15 PM, Stacy L. Harp, M.S., MFTI <
> stacylharpms at qmail.com> wrote:
>> I find that sad, Dr. Nicolosi. I addressed this issue on my show
```

```
> > yesterday and helped clarify to my audience that reparative therapy and
> > other theories are completely compatible together.
                                                          Specifically I
> helped
> > my co-host understand the process of reducing anxiety and desensitizing
> > something using the images you use.
> >
> >
>> On Sat, Jul 14, 2012 at 6:21 AM, Joe N < intherapy at yahoo.com > wrote:
> >
> > > Michelle, you are correct. Before this became a public debate, I
> > privately
>> offered Alan or any member of his group eight free sessions to
> > demonstrate
> > > how EMDR works. He declined the invitation. I also sent him my
rational
> > for
>>> the use of porn in treatment from Catholic moral theological grounds.
> He
>>> never responded.
> > >
> > > Joseph Nicolosi, Ph.D.
> > > www.josephnicolosi.com
> > >
> > >
> > >
>>> From: Michelle Cretella <<u>drmcretella at gmail.com</u>>
>> > To: NARTH Clinical Listserve <membersl at narth.com>
> > Sent: Saturday, July 14, 2012 5:31 AM
>> > Subject: Re: [NARTH-MembersL] Re Re: Setting the record straight with
> > Alan
> > > Chambers
> > >
> > > Joe N. can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think he already offered
> Alan 8
>>> free EMDR sessions a couple of months ago, and Alan declined. Which is
> > not
> > > to say someone should not offer again at some point ...
> > > Michelle
> > >
> > >
> >
> Membersl mailing list
> Membersl at narth.com
> http://narth.com/mailman/listinfo/membersl_narth.com
Membersl mailing list
Membersl at narth.com
http://narth.com/mailman/listinfo/membersl narth.com
Membersl mailing list
Membersl at narth.com
http://narth.com/mailman/listinfo/membersl narth.com
Robert L. Vazzo, M.M.F.T.
Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist
CA #45530
```

Membersl mailing list Membersl at narth.com

## http://narth.com/mailman/listinfo/membersl\_narth.com

Membersl mailing list

Membersl at narth.com

http://narth.com/mailman/listinfo/membersl\_narth.com

- Previous message: [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images
- Next message: [NARTH-MembersL] EMDR recall vs. new erotic images
- Messages sorted by: [date] [thread] [subject] [author]

More information about the Membersl mailing list