



Journal of the Association  
of Mormon Counselors  
and Psychotherapists

**WINTER 1978 VOL. 4 / ISSUE 1**

<b>Editor</b>	Robert F. Stahmann Brigham Young University
<b>Associate Editor</b>	D. Russell Crane Brigham Young University
<b>Editorial Board</b>	Joseph L. Daly Colorado State University
	Barbara Fisher Purdue University
	Jayne Garside Brigham Young University-Hawaii
	James C. Hurst University of Texas

AMCAP supports the principles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; however, it is an independent, professional organization which is not sponsored by, nor does it speak for the Church or its leaders.

The ideas and opinions expressed by the authors are not necessarily those of the editors, association, or of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

---

## Subscriptions

Subscriptions to the *AMCAP Journal* are provided to AMCAP members. For information concerning membership, write to the secretary-treasurer at the address indicated below.

## Change of Address

AMCAP members anticipating a change in address should forward the new address to the secretary-treasurer to ensure the accurate delivery of the *AMCAP Journal* and other AMCAP correspondence. For change of address and all similar membership correspondence contact:

Richard Heaps  
AMCAP Secretary-Treasurer  
B-268 ASB  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, UT 84602

## Call For Manuscripts

The *AMCAP Journal* seeks manuscripts of interest to the broad interdisciplinary membership of the Association. Articles relating to the practice, research, or theory of counseling and psychotherapy are appropriate for the Journal. Manuscripts should generally not exceed twenty double-spaced typed pages. Style should follow the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2nd edition). Authors should keep a copy of their manuscripts to guard against loss. Three copies of the manuscripts should be sent to the editor:

Robert F. Stahmann  
AMCAP Journal Editor  
IONH-Brigham Young University  
Provo, UT 84602

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>In Behalf of a Revealed Approach to Counseling</b> Allen E. Bergin	3
<b>General Authority Address</b> Elder Marvin Ashton	10
<b>A Physician Looks at Treatment Strategies for Troubled LDS Marriages</b> McLaren Reusch	12
<b>A Marriage Counselor Looks at Treatment Strategies for Troubled LDS Marriages</b> Dean Hepworth	14
<b>A Lawyer Looks at Treatment Strategies for Troubled LDS Marriages</b> Christine Durham	18
<b>Useful Scriptures</b>	21
<b>Fear of Success</b> Kent M. Christensen	23

# In Behalf of a Revealed Approach to Counseling

**Allen E. Bergin, Ph.D.\***

\*Dr. Bergin is from the Institute for Studies in Values and Human Behavior and Department of Psychology, Brigham Young University. Address given at the AMCAP Convention, Salt Lake City, October, 1977.

It is a pleasure to address a group of LDS counselors and psycho-therapists. Some of you, who were present at APA just a few weeks ago, will recall that I attempted to say something about religion and psycho-therapy there and approached it with a great deal of trepidation (Bergin, 1977). Fortunately, it turned out fairly positively but I think there are things I can say to this group that I could not say quite so openly and frankly to them. And so I would like to speak frankly and personally and refer to my own feelings about where we are and, perhaps, where we might go as a group in the future.

I think it's exciting and thrilling to recognize the growth of our own society (AMCAP) and the importance that the Church is placing upon the role of the behavioral scientist in the helping field.

I said I'm going to be frank and I hope that you will take this in the spirit of friendliness which I present it in, applying it to myself as well as to the group.

The first assertion is that as a group we tend to be followers. We tend to be lead by the personal opinions and theories of others. We follow transactional analysis or Masters and Johnson or Wolpe or Rogers or Greenson, or whomever it may be. I think the time has come when that should change. I personally have great reservations about all of those approaches, even though each one has something to contribute. I feel that we've been followers for a reason.

The first reason, I would assert, is that we tend to be professionally insecure. The more secure we are, the less willing we are to follow whoever happens to be taking the ideological lead.

Secondly, I think we try to avoid the embarrassment that can follow from taking a position consonant with the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Third, I think often we are unoriginal and unable or unwilling to arrive at our own points of view.

Fourth, I think we tend to be followers because we believe in our professions. We believe in their ideologies and in the leaders and teachers of those professions.

Fifth, I think we tend to be followers because we lack conviction concerning the gospel's power for changing human beings. In this respect I would like to cite a few of the remarks that I delivered at APA in a symposium entitled, "Religion-based Counseling and Psychotherapy."

One of the things I argued there was that psychotherapy and the study of personality in particular were dominated by an ideology, an ideology which I call "naturalistic humanism." It dominates not only psychology, but the American and western civilization university system in general. That point of view is an ideology. It has no more empirical or rational support to uphold it than any other ideology and probably less than some others. That type of approach makes it impossible to deal, for example, with truths such as the one enunciated by Job when he said, "There is a spirit in man." I would suggest that that is a fact. There is a spirit in man. And secondly, that "the spirit of the Almighty giveth them understanding." If those two facts are true, then "naturalistic humanism" is false. If it is false, then why follow it in any respect?

It is my thesis that divine influence is an essential feature of human existence and that the study of man which omits the spiritual and religious will never succeed in explaining or understanding man. Neglecting them will be as ineffective as early theories of medicine which omitted the circulatory system.

Now, let me describe briefly from personal experience the things that have happened in my relationships with leaders of the field where we talked about religion and human behavior. It has been my good fortune to associate with many fine psychologists who are good men and women. But when we talk about the influence of spiritual factors on human behavior, we tend to part company.

One of my earlier experiences was with Albert Bandura who listened quietly to the things that I had to say and then slid off to a different subject. Another time, when I was assisting Robert Sears in a course on personality, we talked about free agency, following which he said to the large class assembled, "Forget that stuff, it's all mechanistic." I spent an hour over lunch with Carl Rogers when I was working with him, talking about the possible similarity between organismic valuing and the influence of revelation. Again, no success.

Similarly, with many colleagues at Columbia. I remember a visit by B. F. Skinner there. Someone in the audience asked him: "What do you think about God, etc." and he said, "Well, I'm an atheist." In a private discussion over lunch on another occasion he told me a very interesting story he had been reading that morning about an account of a carving that had been found in Central America. This carving was of an earring and in the earring was the Star of David. In the New York Times that morning there was an analysis of transmission of culture from the middle east to Central America and the American hemisphere. At lunch,

before me and three other professors, he asked whether we had read the article and what we thought about it. We discussed it somewhat and he said, "Well, you know the thesis presented in that article is what the *Book of Mormon* teaches." Everyone sat back and wondered what he was going to say next. All of them knew that I was a Mormon bishop at the time except him. He then said, "Wouldn't it really upset everybody if Joseph Smith actually was right?" No one laughed except him and me. So even though he said he was an atheist and I got nowhere talking to him about religion, he did have a tenderness and an openness to possibilities that he doesn't usually state in public.

Across the street one day in the cafeteria of the Union Theological Seminary I had lunch with Joseph Wolpe whom I was hosting for a workshop. We thoroughly got into my views of the issue of free will at which point Joe was astonished and said, "Allen, I can't believe this. What's wrong with you? We've got to have a long session together." We never did have that long session and we've had many disagreements since then.

One day when I was visiting Peter Lang at the University of Wisconsin and we talked about this issue, he said, "It's important to have two hats. One is your scientific hat, the other is your professional, or your personal hat, your humanistic or religious hat." He said, "Today I have my scientific hat on and I don't want to discuss things like this."

I suspect that you are like me in that you have tended to wear two hats most of the time. My own feeling is that I am not willing to do that anymore. I don't see how we can separate the truths that come by revelation from the truths that come by experiment. And, for that reason, I'm launched on an experience with colleagues at BYU and elsewhere in attempting to harmonize them and to generate new concepts. We are doing this within the Values Institute, the Comprehensive Clinic, and among many other individuals.

I referred to Bandura, Skinner, Sears, Rogers, and other friends, five of whom, by the way, have been presidents of the American Psychological Association, because I perceived, as I experienced my relationships with them, that they were conducting a hidden agenda by means of their behavioral professions. This agenda promoted a particular orientation to life, a belief system, or an ideology. Their theories, their therapies all originate with these privately held beliefs. These privately held beliefs are rarely printed or spoken in public.

I also, on reflection, realize that Carl Rogers, Rollo May and others of my friends had left the ministry for psychology. Their theories and approaches were an expression of a humanistic belief system.

Looking back, I have had very negative feelings about my experiences on the subject of religion with these people because I concluded that they were promoting something without being explicit and honest about it. They were implementing something through their professional work which people being influenced by them were unaware of. And it's only after reflection that we recognize that it isn't really a scientific theory so much as it is a personal philosophy being expressed in a language that sounds authoritative and scientific, but which is, in reality, when reduced to its elements, a personal belief system.

All of these things I shared at APA and then concluded, as I will with you, with my own conviction that Jesus Christ is divine and that I will henceforth be explicit about my value system and the implications that it has for psychology, for therapy, and for humanity as we attempt to intervene in the helping professions with respect to people who are suffering and seeking help. There is much more that one could say about that, about the deficiencies of the behavioral sciences, about the assumptions and how they are arrived at; but I will skip over that and turn to the fact that I think it is time for us, as a group, to overcome our own ambivalences and take a position that is straightforwardly oriented from the revelations concerning human behavior which have come from heaven.

I think it's important for us also to be humble in this effort, to follow the brethren and avoid professional snobbery by which we sometimes presume to know better than they the principles of successful living. I've come to feel that we would be better to see ourselves as servants rather than as leaders, as those who implement concepts of the good life that God himself has laid forth, rather than to originate those concepts.

It seems that within psychology it's legitimate today to acknowledge transcendent forces provided that you don't talk about Jesus Christ, a living god, or spiritual reality. It's OK to be humanistic, to be behavioristic, or psychoanalytic. It's OK to endorse eastern religion or Transcendental Meditation, to adopt the philosophies of native American mystics, anything but the whole truth of the gospel. It's as though everything is legitimate except one area that must be censored, tabooed and never spoken of. Well, I think at APA we broke that taboo in our symposium. I was delighted, and I would recommend to all of you who are members of the APA that you join Division 36 on Psychology and Religion. There is a rallying place, a forum, a group of people with distinction who share our attitudes about many of these things. If we don't do this, I think we are continually led into moral dilemmas and therapeutic *cul-de-sacs* by trying to decide issues of right and wrong that have already been decided. There are, of course, more than moral issues that are generated and influenced by taking such a position.

I would like to dwell on the moral issue for a moment and not so much on the theoretical and clinical techniques. Let's take the moral issues pertaining to sex, for example.

One of my graduate students at Columbia did a dissertation (Lilienfeld, 1965) in which she sampled the moral values of patients at Metropolitan Hospital, a Manhattan hospital, and the opinions of 19 experts in the walk-in clinic at that hospital. I would just like to cite to you her results on the values of the experts with respect to virginity, for example.

One out of 19 experts, this is in New York City, believe that virginity was important prior to marriage. I don't know what it would be in Salt Lake City or Los Angeles, but in New York City it was not a very impressive thing to be a virgin.

One of the other important areas was masturbation. Only one out of 19 thought masturbation was bad. I think this was the same person, by the way; the one out of 19 in both cases was a Catholic.

The third issue, however, everyone agreed upon, and this is in conflict somewhat with number one. It is that some premarital sexual experience is good. Nineteen out of 19 agreed with that statement.

In sampling the patients' opinions, they were almost diametrically opposite to those of the experts. The patients were primarily Spanish-speaking, Spanish Harlem residents whose backgrounds were Catholic.

I think we need to be clear that premarital sexuality is not acceptable, that it has consequences, and that we should be doing research to show what those consequences are. I think we also are morally ambivalent with respect to masturbation. Among our group are many who are ambivalent or indefinite upon this subject. For myself, I believe the brethren are correct in condemning masturbation and also, by implication, masturbation therapy.

Homosexuality is another current issue where we must not yield on moral grounds and make it acceptable as an ideology or a life style.

Sex therapy for couples is another area where there are many moral dilemmas. Many of these approaches, I believe, lead to training in sensuality and the losing of any sense of spiritual and familial basis that undergird the revealed mold of sexual union.

We could go on for an entire lecture in the sexual or moral area alone. I would just like to give another personal experience in this field.

During my first few years at Columbia such issues came up frequently. We had a weekly case conference consisting of about 15 to 20 doctoral candidates who were fourth year post-internship students, all of the clinical psychology faculty, the school psychology faculty, the counseling psychology faculty, and approximately six practicing analysts from the city who were supervisors of the student therapy in addition to our supervision. I remember vividly having to take a position on some occasions in opposition to the moral values presented by those presenting the cases or those discussing them. I feel it's important for us to stand up, to be counted, and to make it clear that moral values are being presented in these case conferences.

For example, one of the therapists who was brought in to give a presentation told about a young woman in her early twenties with whom he had been doing therapy for a little less than a year. She was single, very quiet, retiring individual, one who had very few friendships. He had been successful in helping her blossom, to have a sense of identity and a feeling of selfhood. All of that was wonderful, I thought, but then he expressed the feeling that therapy would be marked as successful when she had successful intercourse with one of her dates and that if this could be experienced more than once it would be a real star for him as a therapist.

As soon as he said that, I raised my hand, being young and impetuous and still an Assistant Professor, and said, and by the way, a lot of people were agreeing with him, I couldn't see how a psychologist who had any sense of ethical standards could promote such a point of view, that there were consequences of such behavior for the person's life, and that he was promoting a style of living that was destructive to society. Well, I sounded off a little bit, or a lot. I didn't really anticipate what was going to happen because what did happen surprised me a great deal. Of the thirty or so people in the room, the majority spoke against me in very vigorous terms. No one spoke in my defense. After the case conference, two individuals came up to speak with me, no one else. Of these two, one said, "I sure don't agree with what you said, but I admire your courage." The other one said, "I agree with you," and walked off quietly. This was a young woman, a Catholic.

From then on, people were a little more careful about what they said in the case conferences, but it came up again when we discussed homosexual cases and it was argued that one should devote his or her therapy to becoming a well-adjusted homosexual. I disagreed with that and I still disagree with it; and I got into a lot of debates in seminars on subjects like this. But, again, I think there's a reason. As soon as we go from a technical matter to a moral issue, then we are in the dominant position and we should not pretend that we're not. We have the strongest position in the world on moral issues.

There is one thing Carl Rogers taught that I think is very true, and that is that you never feel really healthy unless you are congruent; that is, unless the way you function is in harmony with the way you are internally, unless you are an integrated human being who is not role playing. So I've given up role playing. I do not role play the academic, objective scientist anymore. I don't think such a thing exists. If we are truly congruent, I think our religious feelings, convictions and experiences are inevitably mingled with our helping procedures. And this brings me to the second major thesis of what I have to say, and that is that the helping process is primarily a personal matter rather than a technical one. I do not believe that psychotherapeutic helping is primarily technique dominated.

By way of background, let me say that I have been trained in behavior therapy, I've done a great deal of behavior therapy, I did work with Bandura, Sears, and others. I have been trained in humanistic types of therapy, having spent a year with Carl Rogers. In New York I got years of experience in the psychoanalytic approach, and since then in cognitive approaches. I'd like to argue against the notion that the therapist's technique makes more difference than personality and I'll argue that with some data.

First, let me refer to the second edition of the *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*, which has recently been completed. In that handbook, Mike Lambert and I have written a chapter on the Evaluation of Psychotherapy Outcome (Bergin & Lambert, 1978).

Our review of several hundred outcome studies suggests to us that the largest proportion of variance in client outcome is accounted for by personality variables in the client.

The second most powerful predictors of outcome are therapist personality variables, and, coming in a distant third, are technique variables. Now, I know that a lot of you will want to argue with me. You'll say desensitization is good for this and the squeeze technique is good for that and implosion does this, and so forth. Or, that contracting with a family is the technique that changes families. I respectfully disagree. I think techniques are the means by which personal influence is mediated and I don't think techniques have special qualities, except in rare instances.

I could give an example or two. Let's take one of the supposedly more technical methods, such as operant conditioning. It is supposed to be technological, the application of laboratory learning experiments. We applied it in an inpatient situation in a hospital in New Jersey. We did this on an adolescent ward of primarily black adolescents from Newark. As part of the token economy that was set up, one of the graduate students did a dissertation on what was going on in the personal experience of these young people. That was most revealing because for the group he obtained the usual kind of learning curves, although they are not

learning curves if you look at them. They're cognitive curves. In fact, they're not curves at all. They go at right angles. There are usually not very good acquisition curves in these token economies. What seems to happen is that patients figure out what the reward system is and then they decide to play along with it, so you get a big jump in acquisition of pro-social responses that you are counting the frequencies of. If you remove contingencies, you get a big drop. Now, right angle curves like that are not learning curves of the ordinary type. They represent cognitive types of learning, or, perhaps, it isn't even learning. It's, I think, conformity, a social psychological process. If you look at individuals, some become conforming and some don't. When you look at why, at least in this dissertation by Frank Bennett (1971), it was clear that in two cases that he studied intensively, the one who showed no acquisition perceived the token system as manipulative and the staff as aloof and cold, so that there was an interpersonal affective process going on that militated against the procedure. In the other case, a beautiful acquisition curve. He saw the system as benevolence, as an expression of warmth and interest on the part of the staff. So, the so-called learning in a token economy isn't necessarily what operant conditioners would say.

I had a similar experience treating a young woman, a young female homosexual, who had a very intense fear of men. I did desensitization and all the behavioral techniques with her, along with pro-social behavior reinforcement. She did very well. She got married and after a two-year follow-up was doing very well. But, as part of my work with her I did pre- and post-tests with a post-test evaluation. The post-test evaluation used Knight's criteria of therapy outcome and in it I had her rate how much she had improved in various categories. Then, I had her write a paragraph or two about what she felt were the most significant things that influenced the change in her personality and behavior. This was one of the early desensitization cases I did and I was most eager to see her response to the method.

In response to the question, "What part of the therapeutic method influenced you the most?" she said, "Your warm voice, your interest, the tone of your voice." There were all kinds of personal things described in about a half page, not once mentioning the relaxation technique, desensitization hierarchy, or anything related to the technique. It is interesting that people who have been in behavior therapy as a supposedly technological approach, who do give or are given the opportunity to give a personal report, which behavioral therapists often don't ask for, generally do give personal responses.

I thought it was most interesting when Arnold Lazarus surveyed 20 behavior therapists and asked them where they went for their own therapy that not one of them had gone to a behavior therapist. He asked them why and one said he'd thought he'd give the opposition a fair trial, another said that his analyst was a beautiful human being and that was more

important than any theory or technique, and a third declared that no matter what the research may say, if you have the money, psychoanalysis is still the treatment of choice.

So much for the notion that there is a behavioral technology applicable to psychotherapy. It's applicable, but it does not dominate the influence process.

Another evidence supporting the notion I'm arguing for is given by the failure to find differences in outcomes across techniques. Now you say, "Oh, that's crazy because the behavior techniques and other specific methods such as Masters and Johnson's have shown specific effects of specific techniques upon specific symptoms that are superior to other methods." That, I do not believe, has been demonstrated. You go all the way back to the early Peter Lang studies right up through current studies by Sloan, Strupp, and others which compare techniques, and it just does not hold water. Mike Lambert and I found this in our survey of outcome research. The comparative studies do not justify the notion that we can move toward the prescription of a technique for a problem. We had hoped that would be the case. I, personally, have been hoping that for years; but we are now, 15 years after Jerome Frank's book on *Persuasion and Healing* (1961, 1973), right back where he said we were, that the personal and the belief business governs the therapeutic change process.

Just to further support this notion, I have the current issue of the *American Psychologist* which contains an article by Smith and Glass (1977) where they review 400 controlled evaluations of psychotherapy. Formal treatment produces results on the order, they say, of 75% improvement. However, few important differences in effectiveness could be established among quite different types of therapy. Here's their general conclusion: Virtually no difference in effectiveness was observed between the class of all behavioral therapies, including systematic desensitization behavior modification, etc., and all non-behavioral therapies; that is, Rogerian, psychodynamic, rational emotive, transactional analysis, etc. Their study was a meta-analysis, that is, they took all criteria, reclassified them in terms of standard scores (deviation scores from means) so that estimates could be made across diverse criteria in terms of the amount of the standard deviation of change that occurred in the treatment group compared to the control group.

It will be interesting for you to read this article. There are a number of, I think, significant errors in the article, but the part I read to you was not in error.

Another interesting support at this point is Strupp's current study in which a small sample of expert therapists in the Nashville area were compared for effectiveness with a small group of college professors selected because students like to talk to them, but selected also because they had no training whatsoever in counseling or psychotherapy. They

each saw equal numbers of male students at Vanderbilt who were suffering identity crises, depressions, anxieties, etc. This is a very carefully done NIMH-sponsored outcome study, showing significant change in both therapy groups but no difference in the amount of change between the experts, carefully selected experts, and the charismatic college professors who were not in the behavioral science fields.

If personal qualities are important, which I think the data support, then I believe it's important for us to pay attention to them and to recognize that this whole spectrum of data supports the gospel notion that a loving relationship, inspiration, and the non-professional situation can be very powerful. I often ask myself why then has the Church turned as much as it has to LDS Social Services and other professionals? My own feeling is two-fold. One is that, as a church, we probably have not learned to live the gospel very well. Being a convert, and part of my militancy comes from that, I realize that the conversion process is a powerful change experience. But, it wears off after a while and one gradually comes down from the spiritual peak into being sort of a normal Latter-day Saint, which is, I think, somewhat terrestrial. That is, it's good, but not very, very good, and I think the body of the Saints make flashes up into the celestial and down into the terrestrial, but that, as a mass, we're moving at about the same level as the humanistic or behavioristic psychotherapies and we might as well turn to them if we can't use the gospel the way it ought to be. As I read the scriptures and as I've had experiences with individuals who have really chosen a spiritual approach to change, I begin to see powerful things happen that don't ordinarily happen in other situations. I think you and I know from our experiences that those things are real, that they could be understood better, and that they could be implemented in a systematic manner as a collaboration between us and the priesthood with the priesthood in charge.

It's interesting to me that other people are recognizing this possibility. Take a rigorous behavior researcher like Isaac Marks (1978), for example, at the University of London. Marks made a very interesting point of a case reported by David Barlow. Barlow, as a matter of fact, reported the case here at the University of Utah Psychiatry Department in their weekly grand rounds two or three years ago. This was a case of a transsexual who was changed in a short period of faith healing from a transsexual to a person with a complete masculine role identity and set of behaviors. There have been two and one-half years follow-up with this individual who had been in Barlow's program of behavior modification with transsexuals, which, as you know, is a very intensive, elaborate, and, I think, ingenious approach of trying to change a type of problem that has never been changed by psychotherapy. He reported two cases with moderate change via behavior modification and one with dramatic change through faith healing. Now, I'm not supporting necessarily that kind of faith healing, but Marks makes this point that I hope you'll remember, that whatever happened



to that fellow was like atomic power in comparison to what we usually do in therapy as being like dynamite. And he said if we ever find out what is really happening in that situation, what a power we will have!

Well, I think we know something about that power and that if we will be humble enough to turn to the family, to the priesthood, and to the Lord, we will find that already within our grasp are potential approaches for change that we have never dreamed of while we were reading the textbooks and getting our degrees and conforming to the approaches that are promoted by our friends with their hidden agendas. I would like to give you a case report in this respect which just happens to be reported in the September, 1977 *Ensign*. It's an interesting place to find information for counselors or psychotherapists, but, here is a woman who tells that she (Goates, 1977) has been to a child psychiatrist, apparently has had difficulty with her husband and with her church leaders. There is a whole story to it and I am going to quote fairly extensively. She finally decided to try the Lord. So, she went to the temple and, while waiting in the chapel, read the *Book of Mormon*. She read from page 141: "For the natural man is an enemy to God, and has been from the fall of Adam, and will be forever and ever, unless he yields to the enticings of the Holy Spirit and putteth off the natural man and becometh a saint," not a terrestrial saint but a true saint, "through the atonement of Christ the Lord, and becometh as a child, submissive, meek, humble, patient, full of love, willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him, even as a child doth submit to his father." (Mosiah 3:19)

She read it several times, she couldn't sleep, she thought about it some more. She prayed, but there were no answers. Quoting now, "it was not until a year later I realized the truth. The scripture dealt with repentance. The subject I needed most, but was least equipped to deal with. As I tried to listen to the enticings of the Spirit, and King Benjamin admonished, I felt impressed to concentrate on the temple ceremony." As she went through the temple ceremony, suddenly, midway through, "I felt I was experiencing what the Prophet Joseph Smith describes as 'pure intelligence' flowing into my mind and my heart. Only by living up to our commitments, I realized, with exactness and honor, was it possible to put off this natural man (and natural conditionings, if you wish, repressions). I then began to fathom something, what I would say, even more important, and that is the necessity of the atonement in my life. Without the Savior's help, I literally could not get rid of my mistakes. The Spirit bore witness to me that I needed to repent of disobedience." I'm not saying here that every psychopathology results from the individual's disobedience, but a lot of it does and if we recognize it, then we have a whole new approach to therapy.

She continued: "I felt deeply remorseful that I had not fully understood or lived the law of obedience more faith-

fully. This recognition of my own weakness was devastating. I was overwhelmed by remorse, consumed by a desire to be obedient. The Spirit had ripped through my protective armor," (not a psychodynamic interpretation, but the Spirit) "and I saw myself as I really was, for the first time in my life." (No argument there about the accuracy of the interpretation.) "Then I was so grateful to the Lord that He had not answered my prayers sooner, according to my specifications, for I could see now that it would have been a curse, not a blessing for Him to have accepted by pleadings." (I only read between the lines here that they pertain to her husband.) "Five years of turmoil was swallowed in joy at my new understanding and then I felt the great love He had for me."

This is something I tried to convey at the APA, that there is a spiritual essence that enters into a person's heart that you are not going to measure with the MMPI, even though it's more powerful than anything you can measure with the MMPI.

Continuing to describe her experience, and I think this is beautiful for the *Ensign*, congratulations to Jay Todd for putting this in there and for her courage in writing it.

"I then felt a great rushing warmth through my entire body, a peace, joy and contentment unlike anything I had before experienced. Uncontrollable tears of joy rolled down my cheeks. I felt the Savior's love for me spill over into love for others. My head no longer ached, my body was no longer feverish. I had been healed, both physically and spiritually."

I recognize that, as happened some months ago when I spoke at BYU along these lines, some of you will wonder if Allen has lost his marbles, or has given up his sense of devotion to professionalism, whether he's become a religious fanatic. I think all of those charges could be true and only time will tell. But, I'll say this on a very personal note that after more than 20 years of trying to help people change and seeing some change quite a bit in a variety of ways, I have more faith now in this personal process, that is undergirded and over-arched by the Savior's power, than I have in anything else as a means of reaching the hearts of people who really want to change and who are willing to do it through spiritual means, no matter how far they may be from it.

I believe that there are enough people like this, so many more than we think. I remember speaking along these lines to some extent at APA a year ago and having one of my Jewish therapist friends from New York in the audience; I didn't know it, but he came up afterwards and said, "Boy, this is what psychology needs!" I was astonished that this man, who sat in on the case conferences at Columbia, either had changed so much, or was now willing to come out of the closet and to declare himself as an advocate of a mode of change that takes all of the power that we have, both



**spiritual and empirical, reaching out with our hands to bring them along, as servants under the right guidance and influence.**

President Kimball, in the issue of the *Ensign* (Oct. 1977) which is devoted to missionary work, quotes the Savior as saying this: "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28:18) If we really understood that He has all power, then why spend our time creating substitutes for His power? Why not ally ourselves with His power, stand for it valiantly without equivocation, without embarrassment or shame, and be articulate about it, not defensive, but clear, and then, when somebody attacks us, make it clear what stand they are standing upon, what moral values their arguments rest upon, where they come from and what their relative power is compared to that which is declared in the Second Book of Corinthians: "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things are passed away and behold all things are to become new." (5:17) If we could do no more than be assistants to the brethren in teaching the Saints how to live the gospel, our lives would have been a great success, much more so than ever before. Perhaps that is our role, to be the technicians who show people how to implement those true principles of living that are already in the books of revelation that have been written. Then, continuing the quote from President Kimball: "We will receive help from the other side of the veil as the spiritual miracles occur. 'Whoso receiveth you, there I will be also, for I will go before you, I will be on your right hand and your left and my Spirit shall be in your heart and my angels about you.' "

Just a concluding word of caution. I'm not advocating free-lance faith healing or spiritual therapy cults, but I am advocating that we take another look at the gold mine we have within ourselves and among our people and stop looking so much for the gold in the books that come out, the seminars and workshops, and the conventions that are promoted by people who have a different goal than we do. And I say this twice to myself because in my own history I have been guilty of toying with the gospel and not taking it really seriously, compartmentalizing it and separating it from life, from the real warp and woof of the difficulties we face, whether it be in Spanish Harlem or in Asia or in Salt Lake City or wherever it may be.

I have a feeling if we're willing to do this that we will have the opportunity to formulate new conceptualizations and derive new techniques that are new only in the sense that they give us a way of handling and putting to work the principles that have been present since the beginning and which we have known most of our lives. Indeed, if we were to take one principle, such as love, for example, and really learn to be loving and teach how to do it, I think we would find that when people walked into a ward where people had so learned how to love, they would have such a feeling that they just wouldn't be able to leave it. It would be magnetic! It would be healing!

In conclusion, I would say that this means to those of us who are willing to take a personal change, it doesn't mean learning more theories, it doesn't mean taking more seminars. It means personal change. It doesn't mean personal psychoanalysis either. I think it means what this woman found after five years of turmoil. It is purification. It means feeling His love so powerfully that we turn then, in love, to everyone else.

I hope this may become so, that we will have the opportunity to participate together in it.

## REFERENCES

- Bennett, F. H. *Two case studies in an operant conditioning program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.
- Bergin, A. E. Conceptual basis for a religious approach to counseling and psychotherapy. Paper presented at a symposium: "Religion-based counseling and psychotherapy," American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, Sept., 1977.
- Bergin, A. E. and Lambert, M. J. The evaluation of therapeutic outcomes in S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.) *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*. New York: Wiley, 1978, in press.
- Frank, J. D. *Persuasion and Healing*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1961 and 1973.
- Goates, C. T. Converted after years of membership. *Ensign*, Sept., 1977, 7 (No. 9), 48-51.
- Kimball, President Spencer W. It becometh every man. *Ensign*, Oct., 1977, 7 (No. 10), 3-7.
- Lilienfeld, D.M. *The relationship between mental health information and moral values of lower class psychiatric clinic patients and psychiatric evaluation and disposition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1965.
- Marks, I. M. Behavioral psychotherapy of adult neurosis, in S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.) *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*. New York: Wiley, 1978, in press.
- Smith, M. L. and Glass, G. V. Meta-analysis of psychotherapy outcome studies, *American Psychologist*, 1977, 32, 752-760.

# General Authority Address

**Elder Marvin Ashton \***

\*Elder Ashton is a member of the Council of the Twelve Apostles of the Church. This address was given at the AM-CAP Convention, Salt Lake City, October, 1977.

I'm grateful to be with you tonight and to share in this worthy seminar. And I know that I'm being recorded and it's a little different for me than you have on the back of your brochure that "an independent professional organization which is not sponsored by, nor does it speak for the Church or its leaders." I wanted to put you on notice that I do not have that same freedom. I'm speaking for the Church, and I'm speaking for the leaders.

I commend you for this worthy program you have put together for today. I had wished that I had been able to attend the discussions. As I read the topics that are going to be presented tomorrow, I'm envious that you will be here and some of us will be trying to instruct the Regional Representatives from around the world. I want it to go on record as saying that I endorse your worthy reason for existence. I commend you for uniting in a cause that's worthy and a cause that's just, and uplifting as you associate with each other in a common bond of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. I hope that your association will not only endure, but fulfill the dreams and hopes that you have for it.

I've tried to think over the last number of weeks things that are in keeping with the current issues facing Mormon counselors and psychotherapists. Just for a few moments tonight I thought that I would share with you what I think is the greatest challenge that you and I have as we sit here tonight concerned with the profession that we are engaged in. However, I want to digress just long enough to say that we used to have a Welfare Program in the Church. It's been going now for forty years—a great welfare program concerned with the food and clothing needs of the membership of the Church. I hope that you have been impressed the last number of months that the name of the Welfare Program has been changed, and now we talk about Welfare Services which includes, if you please, the supplies and the skills for social and emotional difficulties, as much as it does for food, clothing, and shelter. And this is a great breakthrough for people in your profession. It wasn't too long ago that if someone had an emotional problem in the Church, we felt sorry for them or wondered about them, and then sent them on their way with nothing more tangible than "why don't you wake up or wise up, or get with it." Emotional problems are as real as physical problems and medical problems, and no one knows that more than I do. I'm glad for that experience,

and that conviction, and that knowledge. So I just wanted to say in passing that we do not have a Welfare Program in the Church today—we have Welfare Services that include treatment and commodities for the total person. And I'm happy to be a member of the Church, and one of the leaders in the Church that is so concerned about the total individual.

Now, back to the topic—I suppose that the greatest challenge that we have is to teach clients, friends, and families honesty. I think that's the greatest need that we have is to teach honesty—total honesty, and this can best be taught by individuals who are committed to the lofty principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

So first, I'd like to say a few words about honesty in our personal lives. The greatest resource, the greatest tool, the greatest weapon that you have in your power to thwart evil and conduct the truth is living an honest life, totally and completely, in your image, in your conduct, and in your daily example. What a disappointment it is to be counseled by someone who is unreal, untrue, and unfaithful.

Just the other day I was visiting with Warden Smith of the Utah State Prison, and he said: "One of the things we have to be constantly reminded of is the fact that we have rules here and then honestly enforce them." And then he said: "If we don't honestly enforce the regulations that are established all hell breaks loose." In prison or outside of prison, honesty is important even for people who do not believe in it. As you go forward as Latter-Day Saints first, and as professional people, counselors and psychotherapists second, the greatest thing you can do is to be honest in your personal lives and not appear to be something that you are not.

How can you know if you're accomplishing this? What are the guidelines? I love this scripture in the Doctrine and Covenants 124:15. I like to read what you have to be and what you have to do to have the Lord love you: "And again, verily I say unto you, blessed is my son Hyrum Smith; blessed is my servant Hyrum Smith, for I the Lord love him because of the integrity of his heart, and because he loveth that which is right before me, saith the Lord." Each time I read that, I'm more impressed with the fact that the Lord loves him because "... he loveth that which is right before me. . .", not that which is right before his client, or his supervisors, or his associates, but those things that are right before the Lord. What a guideline this should be for all of us.

Number two—honesty in responding and reporting. Are you honest in your counseling? Are you honest with your associates? You might say, if I've told my clients honestly and directly what they should hear, it would kill them. And I will say to you, don't tell them honest things that would kill them. Tell them honest things that will cure them. We have that choice, and we have that training.

Just two examples that honesty in reporting and responding is important. A boy 14 years of age. He said he went into a grove of trees to pray. And they said: "What happened, Joe?" He was just good old Joe in those days, not Joseph Smith, the Prophet. He was just a 14-year old boy. The reason Joseph Smith's story, the reason his vision is true—one of the reasons in my mind is because he honestly reported what had happened. Can you imagine anything as shocking as to come out of a grove and say: "I saw God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, personages." That takes honesty to report such a blasphemous thing—that God is separate. Jesus Christ is separate. They appeared to me, and that even though it costs me my life I'm going to be honest in reporting, because that is what I saw. I heard them. They spoke to me. And as the month went on and as things got a little more difficult, some of his friends came to him and said: "Joe, old buddy, you better give it up or it's going to cost you your life. They're moving in on you." And in total honesty, he said: "I don't care if they take my life. I've seen God and I know that I've seen God and His Son Jesus Christ, and though they take my life, I will never deny it." He put honesty in reporting ahead of life. I wish we could have a little bit of that.

I love President Kimball. I had the opportunity of spending seven hours with him today, and his counselors and the other eleven members of the Twelve who are all here for conference. President Kimball is honest. The other day after President Kimball had been ill because of an infection in his ear, he was out of the hospital on Thursday and was visiting with his counselors, and President Tanner said to him: "I don't think you better go to Canada Saturday. You're just out of the hospital. Why don't you listen to us? Sometimes it seems that you don't listen to us when we try to tell you what to do." President Kimball turned to him and said: "President Tanner and President Romney, I want you to know that I hear you. What time does the plane leave for Canada?" Totally and completely honest with his associates, with himself, and with his Heavenly Father.

The third item in honesty tonight that I just want to touch upon is honesty in interviewing, honesty in listening. I have a feeling that one of the main reasons that Joseph Smith's prayer was answered is because he said: "God, wherever you are, whoever you are, I have a problem. I don't know which church to join." And he honestly said: "Could you help me." It was the first time he had ever prayed. "I'm confused. I need answers." Honesty in interviewing, honesty in his pleas, honesty in the yearnings of his heart. Why was he prompted to go to a grove of trees? I suppose the only reason that he went there was because it was private, and how important that is in our interviewing and our listening to set the stage, so that we can listen and we can question. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it should be given him." I challenge you tonight that if you lack wisdom in your daily life and in your personal lives and in your professional lives that you ask God.

Honesty in interviewing—let me must give you an example of what I think is dishonesty in interviewing. Do we have any bishops here tonight? May I see your hands? Thank you. Do we have some chaplains here? Could I see your hands? Great. How many members of Stake Presidencies do we have here? Thank you. Quite a number. This is what I consider to be dishonest interviewing. Do you keep the Word of Wisdom? As somebody sits across the table and goes like this (nods yes). Do you sustain the General Authorities? (nods yes). Do you love your wife? (nods yes). Are you morally clean? (nods yes). So we conduct an interview, and all someone has to do is sit across the side of the table and nod six or seven times. Some people could say, "Well Elder Ashton, that's what it says on the interview sheet." Well of course we want those questions covered, but how much better for a counselor, for a bishop, for a stake presidency member, or for one of you to say: "What does it mean to you to pay a full tithing?" And then listen. You might learn. What does it mean to you to be morally clean? What does it mean to you to sustain the authorities of the Church? And then take the time to listen. I'm doing nothing more than recommending open-end questions that can't be answered with a nod or a yes or no. I hope I'm not misunderstood. When we interview we should give people an opportunity to honestly respond to honest questions.

Number four, honesty in counseling. We touched upon that. Help others in their goal setting. Give honest encouragement, honest reinforcement, and I say to you tonight: Are you courageous enough to counsel honestly? Share and recommend amounts and portions that are reasonable and possible.

I had the opportunity during the late days in July to go to Sacramento meeting. This is a rarity, because every weekend we go to a stake conference with the exception of a few weeks in July and a few weeks in December. After I attended this Sacramento meeting, I reported to some of my associates what had happened there.

After I reported the happenings, some of my associates said: "Why don't you write that up so that we can use it in one of the Church magazines." And so I wrote it up. I entitled the report: "After Six Years". It has to do with this point about honesty and counseling. I sat in the meeting with Sister Ashton and a member of the bishopric stood up and he introduced me in this peculiar and lengthy way. "Brothers and sisters, Elder Ashton is going to be disappointed in what I say now, because once I heard him say at the Utah State Prison to a group of prisoners, 'when you're released and go back into society, don't brag about being an ex-convict. Just go on from where you are.'" He paused and he then said: "You people in the congregation tonight don't know it, but I'm an ex-convict from the Utah State Prison. About six years ago when I first met Elder Ashton, he was in charge of the program at the prison. After I

became better acquainted with Elder Ashton on the second visit. I told him I was a pretty fair runner. I said to him, I wonder if you can arrange to get me out of prison so that I can run in the competition for the 24th of July Twenty-Five Mile Deseret News Marathon Race. Elder Ashton said to me, 'I'll see what I can do.' So Elder Ashton went to the warden and said, would you let XYZ out of prison?' (I have to say XYZ, because I'm going to say a little bit about confidences in a minute.) "Elder Ashton told me later that the warden said that you can have him out of prison for the marathon if you will guarantee that he won't run away. Elder Ashton took the responsibility for that. I was out of prison for a day, and I went up to the top of Immigration Canyon and started the race with three or four hundred others. I wanted to run but I wasn't in too good of shape because the only place I had to train was on free time running around the prison yard. But after I'd run about half the distance my legs were aching, my body was sore, there were blisters all over the soles of my feet, and I just felt that I couldn't go on any longer. I felt like I was entitled to quit. All of a sudden a thought came to my mind, 'you can't let Elder Ashton down, can you? You'd better keep going.' And with that impression, I ran the rest of the way and I made it to Liberty Park.

After the race was over, Elder Ashton told me that he was proud of me. He was happy to have me for a friend. For one of the few times of my life I want you to know that I was proud of myself, too. It's the first thing I'd ever done in my life that I started and finished. I went back to the prison that day and about six months later I was released from the prison. Two or three months after that I found a lovely young lady and about eight months later, we went to the Temple with Elder Ashton and he sealed my wife and me for time and all eternity in the temple. Now I'm a member of your bishopric." And his chin quivered and he said, "Now Elder Ashton will speak with you."

I just share that with you to let you know that if you're going to be honest with people in counseling, you have to become part of their lives. I suppose the bridge, the handle upon which this man and I could grasp and move forward together was the fact that both he and I like to run, and from that we've made a good friendship.

Number five. Honesty in keeping confidences! I wish that you could teach us as members of the Church the importance of keeping confidences and trust. Teach us this great value. Set the example for us. Help us to realize that loose words or loose comments are character assassination tools. Oh, that we could redeem those people who have been hurt because some people haven't had the judgement and the wisdom to maintain a confidence. Trust with ourselves, trust with our members, trust with our wives and our husbands and our children. It certainly is greater to be trusted than to be loved. It's a great compliment to be trusted, but what a responsibility.

Finally, confidence in facing current issues. Be honest enough to be up to date. Avoid the tendency and convenience of working with yesterday. I don't know how often it crossed your mind, but we have a gentleman 82 years of age, president of the greatest organization in the world, and Eldon Tanner, 79 years of age. A week ago Marion G. Romney was 80. What's that—about an 81-year average for a presidency? Eighty-one? Why do I mention this? They are successful because they are honest in facing current issues. They are up to date. Spencer W. Kimball isn't living in 1943. He tells us to lengthen and quicken our stride and every time we do he gets that much further ahead of us. I think it's a great virtue to face current issues in an honest way. Keep up to date with truth. Keep up to date with God. Honesty with self makes all of this possible.

I leave you my blessings, I bear you my witness that Jesus is the Christ, and the conference that we are going to hold Saturday and Sunday is not anything but a conference of the Church of Jesus Christ! It's His Church, it's His kingdom. That's a reality. It's not the church of Spencer W. Kimball, or David O. McKay. It's the Church of Jesus Christ. I was pleased to hear that Brother Bergin this morning had for this theme, "We Have The Truth." Let's not be ashamed or hesitant in sharing that. With all honesty of my heart and soul I bear special witness to you that Jesus is the Christ and that He lives, that He's aware of His kingdom, that He wants us to be honest with ourselves and honest with our associates and honest with Him.

These thoughts I leave you humbly and in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

## A Physician Looks at Treatment Strategies For Troubled LDS Marriages

McLaren Reusch, M.D.\*

\*Dr. Reusch is a medical doctor in private practice in Salt Lake City. A presentation made at the AMCAP Convention, Salt Lake City, October, 1977.

I feel a little bit at a loss speaking today because I am not a marriage counselor—at least not by choice. As a family physician, I intended when I left medical school to be a great healer and a great humanitarian, or as I frequently say to my wife, save lives and stamp out disease. It turned out that most of the disease I am not capable of stamping out, most of the lives I'm not capable of saving, and most of the problems that people present me with are emotional and

psychological problems, not physical problems at all. For this reason I have found myself in a position of being a reluctant and somewhat rebellious counselor and psychotherapist.

This is especially true in the field of marriage counseling. My training as a marriage counselor has been from the University of Hard Knocks and being married to a psychologist—and that's the toughest part of all! But I have to admit that the average family physician is not a good qualified marriage counselor. Training in counseling and guidance for us was minimal. True, we spent four years in certain lectures in the Department of Psychiatry and various psychiatric rounds and so on, and we had lectures from counselors and psychologists and so on, but you really didn't learn anything about interviewing and how to talk to people about their problems of a psychological nature.

Perhaps as a family physician, I see these marriages that are in trouble before a lot of other people; before even the people themselves realize that the marriage is in trouble. The most common situation is that the wife comes in (99 times out of 100, it's the wife) with a physical complaint of some kind. You know, she's having pelvic pains, she's having irregular menstrual problems, usually in association with some kind of gynecological complaint. Women may also come in with symptoms of depression, with headaches, tiredness, fatigue, lethargy, they can't sleep or they sleep all the time. We check them over and find nothing. Then we run all these tests and find nothing. Then after several visits (if they continue to come back and don't get discouraged and leave), we finally get down to what are the real problems and discover that she and her husband are involved in a relationship that's in trouble. They really haven't been aware of it, or if they have been aware of it, they haven't volunteered this information.

The topic today is treatment strategies for LDS families that are in trouble. Well, obviously, in my case, from the point of view of a family practitioner the first thing that we have to decide is that the marriage is in trouble. So let's assume that we've established that for one reason or another. The next thing you really need to find out is why is this marriage in trouble. What has caused it to go astray? What's the matter? I've written down a few things that I have seen as reasons that LDS marriages go astray, and a lot of times there are other reasons.

One of the first reasons that I believe that an LDS marriage becomes a troubled marriage is that one or both of the spouses are not converted to their religion. I think this is a big thing. I've seen it in many cases. In an area where we live where there are many, many mixed marriages. I mean mixed by LDS people marrying outside their own religion, or two LDS people one or both of whom have never been converted to their own religion. And you and I know that there are a lot of people that fall in this category. Right

along this same line is the almost certainly doomed marriage of that couple, one of whom joins the Church either to win the other over or to satisfy the in-law's because, "you can't marry that kid until he joins the Church" type thing. My experience with that has been almost universally poor. I don't see that kind of marriage having a chance.

Alcohol! Yes, there are many Mormons who drink alcohol. There are many Mormon alcoholics, and alcohol (I don't care whether it's an LDS home or not) is a very destructive force to marriage and very frequently dooms it to being a failure unless something is done about it.

Failure to communicate. How many people say one thing and mean something else? Of course, this is a big thing now. You can go to any bookstore and find 400 books right now on this very subject. How frequently we say one thing and mean something else. This happens in a lot of marriages, too.

Neuroses! Oh, boy! I'm not going to talk about the neuroses, but I've seen some good LDS marriages that I consider to be the rockiest marriages in the world because one or the other of the partners were neurotic about one thing or another.

Psychoses! I'm not going into detail on that but obviously the marriage is in serious trouble if one or more of the partners is psychotic.

Perversions of all kinds! Sadism! A lot of people are more sadistic than they would like to admit.

Homosexuality and various other sexual perversions. This produces a real problem.

Drug abuse! I could name you 100 good LDS women that are the worst drug addicts you've ever seen. Valium is the number one abused drug in the United States and there are just as many Mormon women hooked on valium as there are any other religion, and it's a very sad but true situation. Marriages can't survive. I don't think, with these people addicted to medications like this.

Adultery! Obviously a serious problem. Maybe it stems from one of the other problems that I've mentioned above.

Family interference! How many people, how many couples are broken up by their in-law's or, I might add, by their children? Not maybe their own children but their step-children. How many elderly marriages have had to break up because so-and-so's children are afraid that her children are going to get the inheritance?

And then, perhaps, the inability to really forgive and forget the minor things that transpire in a marriage.

Seen through the eyes of the average family practitioner, what does he do about these kinds of problems? Does he handle them himself? Does he punt? I'd rather punt on some of them myself, but many of these people won't go see another counselor so I'm forced against my will. Sometimes I'm forced to learn to cope with some of these problems to learn how to help these people come to a realization that they have a problem, and then what the problem is, and hopefully be able to get on top of it before it gets too severe and winds up in the divorce court or worse.

Some of the things that come to mind as suggestions for these people obviously are specific. If there's an alcohol problem, try and get to the root for the reason for it. Try and help the alcoholic partner. Try and help the alcoholic partner to realize that there is a problem and what may be the basis for it. See if something can be done about that specific problem, and then help the spouse to cope with the situation. It requires a lot of counseling. Very frequently, very frequently, much, much more time than the average family practitioner can provide. Now television and Marcus Welby would lead us all to believe that the average general practitioner spends approximately two, three, four days with each patient. You know, drives out to the farm and sees them and chauffeurs them around and takes them to lunch and meets them at the lobby of the hospital and, you know, all this stuff. Well, that's not really true. The average family practitioner doesn't have that much time, and he doesn't really have enough time, in my opinion, to do an adequate job of counseling. I think if most of us who are forced into this position from time to time were really honest, and some of us try to be, that we have to admit that we do not do first-rate jobs of counseling. It's only a stop-gap measure until these people can get better help, hopefully from people like you who are trained in counseling as a primary function.

We can encourage these people to seek the root of the problem and to learn to communicate with each other, and to do things together. Boy, there's just a pile of families including good LDS families where the husband and wife don't do anything together. You know, the Church institutes a program called "Family Home Evening" and everybody says what a wonderful program it is, and about 20% of the families in the Church actually do it. How about a program called "Couple Evening"? The husband could take a little time and spend it communicating with his wife—not with a whole herd of kids, not with the family, but just with his wife. I think this would be great therapy. There are a lot of physical things they can do together. They can ski, they can bowl, they can square dance, they can back pack, they can bicycle, they can even jog (if you can stand the boring nature of jogging).

Brothers and sisters, if you will notice that my first thing on the list was that people are not living their religion. I believe that's the most important thing of all because the religion that these people claim to believe in espouses the ideas of togetherness, of communication, of openness, of

honesty, of chastity, of faithfulness, and everything. All these things that tend to break up a marriage would not exist if these people were living their religion the way that they know they should.

I would like to convey my testimony to you that Jesus is the Christ and that the Church He has caused to be re-established on the earth at this time has the answers that are necessary, and I say this in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

---

## **A Marriage Counselor Looks At Treatment Strategies For Troubled LDS Marriages**

**Dean Hepworth, Ph.D. \***

\*Dr. Hepworth is a professor and associate dean in the graduate school of Social Work at the University of Utah. This presentation was given at the AMCAP Convention, Salt Lake City, October, 1977.

As I pondered the topic assigned me, "Treatment Strategies for LDS Marriage", my immediate thoughts were that marital difficulties presented by LDS couples are not unlike those of non-LDS couples. My experience, in fact, has been that the needs of marital partners, the factors that block or facilitate the reciprocal gratification of those needs are strikingly similar irrespective of a couple's religious orientation. My treatment strategies for LDS couples, therefore, are essentially the same as for other couples. Because certain LDS religious beliefs concerning marriage, marital roles, and the nature of the family relationships, define and determine certain aspects of the marital relationship, there are certain factors which the marital therapist should have a keen awareness of and must possess effective strategies to guide his or her interventions. Moreover, the behavior in marital therapy of the LDS therapist will be shaped in one way or another by the interaction and perhaps in some instances, even collision between his or her religious and professional beliefs and values. Potential dilemmas, to be sure, exist and to the extent the marital therapist has owned, faced, and resolved these dilemmas she or he will avoid the inherent pitfalls when the therapeutic arena includes role ambiguities resulting from uncertainties or lack of awareness of the therapist's part as to whether he or she is or should be wearing a professional, religious or some type of a "hybrid" hat.



I will attempt in the next few minutes to highlight some of the potential dilemmas and to describe counter strategies that I've developed in my practice. Before proceeding, however, I should like to acknowledge openly that the strategies rest on nothing more solid than one man's subjective opinion. I do not purport to possess the only therapeutic truths and am not advocating that you should wear the hat that fits me reasonably well—a hat that I must admit sometimes blows off in the wind.

The first dilemma encountered in work with LDS couples often involves the question, "Are you LDS?" How one responds to this question may have vital consequences in enhancing or diminishing receptivity of one or both partners to the therapist's influence. Many assume that sharing the same religion with the clients will facilitate trust and communication, and therefore will accelerate the development of effective helping relationship. To be sure, this is often the case where it is inconceivable to many LDS couples that a non-LDS therapist could understand their difficulties and be helpful to them. Moreover, other LDS clients believe that a non-LDS therapist would attempt to dissuade them from their LDS beliefs. Although there may be partial truth to both of these views, it is erroneous to assume that revealing one's religion will necessarily expedite the therapeutic process. Such a disclosure, in fact, may have the opposite effect. One or both partners, for example, may experience religious conflicts and be wary of or threatened by an LDS therapist because of a presumption—erroneous or not—that an LDS counselor will attempt to impose his or her religious views upon them. The likelihood of such an untoward cognitive set is substantially greater if the marriage involves an active Mormon and a non-member of the Church. The non-member in such instances often sees entering marital counseling with an LDS counselor as playing with a stacked deck consisting of a coalition between the LDS partner and the marital therapist with the plan of converting him or her into the Church. Certainly, opposition to therapy under such circumstances is understandable and resistance is a normal and perhaps a healthy response.

Disclosure of one's religion may also activate another cognitive set that may diminish the interpersonal attractiveness of the LDS therapist. Some LDS marital partners may have committed serious moral infractions and may therefore be extremely apprehensive about revealing their behavior to an LDS therapist because of the fear of being condemned or perceived as evil. These fears, of course, are often soon dispelled as the therapist responds consistently in an accepting and non-judgemental manner. The point, of course, is that the fears may be less of an impeding factor initially if the client is not aware of the therapist's religion. It could be argued, of course, that the ultimate potential benefit to a client under such circumstances is even greater if he or she can obtain a feeling of acceptance and of being valued by the therapist of the same religion.

The strategy I have used to deal with questions posed by LDS marital partners as to my religion is to answer the question as I often do only after I have first ascertained the impact that my answering the question is likely to have. In assessing the probable impact, I utilize what I regard as the work horse of effective therapy, namely, empathic communication. Thus, I endeavor to attune myself to the cues as to the feelings that motivated the client's question. I have found that empathic responses, as for example, "I gather that it's important to you to know if I can understand and accept your religious views. Could you share with me your concerns in that regard," often draw out the concerns of the client and lead to productive dialogue that diminishes the resistance.

Gentle probing may also be used in tandem with empathic communication to elicit feelings that underlie the client's question. With a male non-member, for example, one might comment, "You know, it occurs to me that you want to be sure your wife and I aren't going to be ganging up on you. I'd be interested in hearing any feelings you might be having about that." By bringing possible resistant feelings into the light of discussion, apprehension can be allayed and misconceptions clarified. By responding empathically to resistant feelings and concerns, the therapist in effect conveys support, acceptance and understanding, all of which tend to counter the ill, the negative cognitive set, and to foster a therapeutic alliance. When resistant feelings are handled in this manner, it has been my experience that the client usually pursues the question as to my religion no further and manifests a readiness to plunge into the exploration of the marital difficulties.

If a client's motivation for asking about my religion appears to consist of simply wondering if I can understand aspects of the difficulties related to religion, as is more often the case, I often simply respond that I've worked with numerous LDS couples and am knowledgeable about their religion. Often this assurance is all that is needed to free them to proceed in disclosing their difficulties.

When the client enters the initial interview with previous knowledge of the therapist's religion, as when one practices under the Church's auspices or when referral is made by an officer of the Church, the LDS marital therapist must still be sensitive to and deal with possible consequence—adverse psychological effects associated with this foreknowledge. A case in point involved a recent interview I had with a man referred to me by a bishop. The man and his wife were both converts of approximately two years, but the husband had reverted soon thereafter to his preconversion behavior of smoking, drinking, and behaving somewhat irresponsibly. He also announced to his wife that he did not accept Mormonism as true though he was a strong advocate of what it stood for in family life and in other respects. There were referred by the bishop because the wife had seen another counselor who had recommended divorce and the bishop



had recommended that she get another opinion. During the course of the interview, I used the word share with the husband in the sense of conveying certain troubled feelings with his wife. He responded unexpectedly by observing that share is a Mormon word and implied critically that my use of the word indicated I was counseling from a Mormon perspective. I replied that share was a term employed in my field for many years, but irrespective of that, I could see that he had some strong concerns about being counseled by an LDS person. He acknowledged such concerns and expressed misgiving about seeing a "Mormon shrink". He had his own beliefs and did not want anyone tampering with them. I responded by validating his right to his own beliefs and explained that although I was LDS, I entertained no aspirations of dissuading him from his belief system or of converting him to my own. I asserted that among the highest of my values was a belief that others had a right to believe as they saw fit, and that I saw my role not as seeking to change his beliefs but rather as assisting him and his wife to find solutions to their difficulties that made sense to them. I had no preconceived ideas as to what was best for them. He was assuaged by my explanation and continued to participate actively in the interview.

From my discussion to this point, it should be evident that I choose to wear a professional rather than ecclesiastical hat in my therapeutic work. I've made this choice, not because of lack of testimony, eschew missionary work, or minimize the spiritual aspect of man. The rationale for my choice is purely pragmatic. I feel comfortable with a clearly defined role and my clients do not have to suffer possible detrimental effects associated with role blurring or role confusion. If clients ask me the position of the Church on certain issues, I explain that I would be happy to refer them to a Church officer or to some relevant literature, but that I do not believe that I can serve them best by functioning as an authority on religious matters. On certain rare occasions that I will discuss later, however, I may take the lead by referring to relevant Church publications if I believe one partner is perverting the meaning of the scripture, a doctrine, or a principle to justify being exploitive with the other.

Before changing to another topic, I would like to acknowledge that there are sharp differences between marital therapy in an ecclesiastical setting and in a secular setting. In the former, the expectations are that counseling be conducted within a spiritual framework and the hat that one wears thus is fabricated from a blend of professional and spiritual threads. Effective therapy in such a setting is possible because of the selection factor and the referral process is sure that the client is aware of and accepts to some degree the duality of the therapist's role. I have no ecclesiastical experience base from which to draw, but I am sure that a substantial number of you prefer counseling in such a setting and would take exception to some of my preceding remarks. I would conjecture, however, that many of you have experienced role conflicts and have had to deal with therapeutic impasses related to your dual role.

Another situation encountered with LDS marital partners involves those who have received ecclesiastical counseling from and been referred by bishops or stake presidents or other Church officers. It has been my experience that some of these couples are perplexed and feel guilty or resentful because they were unable to resolve their marital difficulties by following the bishop's counsel, to repent, to be more loving, to pray together, to hold family home evening, read scriptures together, to pay their tithing, in short to live the gospel. Unfortunately, some wonder if they are evil or unworthy of the Lord's blessings or been forsaken for some obscure reason because following the counsel to the best of their abilities did not produce resolutions to marital difficulties.

The stance I have taken with these couples is that their ability to resolve these difficulties is not an unworthiness on their part or poor counsel by their bishop, but rather that the principles that they have been admonished to follow specify behavior only on a relatively high level of abstraction, whereas following the gospel principles consists of being able to behave in very specific ways in very specific situations. Another way of saying this, which I do not recommend saying to clients, is that gospel principles are expressed on a high level but their application in daily living is on a molecular level. I recall an article I read a few years ago and I think the title expressed it very well, and it was this: "He who would do good to another must do it in minute particulars." What we will be seeking to accomplish in marital therapy will be learning specific behaviors that they have not yet mastered—behaviors that are entirely consistent with gospel principles. Mastery of these new behaviors will involved learning to express love more effectively, learning to understand their own and their partner's needs through communicating more effectively, learning to work together in solving problems, and other related functional marital behaviors. Thus, my strategy is to affirm the validity of ecclesiastical counsel, to mitigate inappropriate guilt by reframing the reason for their unsuccessful problem solving efforts, and to motivate them to work on their difficulties from a fresh perspective. This strategy has worked well for me and has appealed to the bishops and stake presidents in my stake with whom I met monthly for about a year in providing training to bishops, some of whom were floundering in their role as a counselor to their ward members and were most receptive to learning to counsel more effectively.

Still another potential dilemma involved in work with LDS couples involves the attitude of the therapist and of the marital partners concerning divorce. Divorce is often, if not usually, a major concern to LDS couples in difficulty, especially those who have married in the temple for eternity, a concern that often emerges in the first interview. Attitudes of marital partners towards divorce are by no means uniform, and range from openness to unequivocal opposition. Those of the latter cognitive set may be extremely threatened and resistant to marital therapy if the therapist

even mildly suggests that divorce is one alternative. By contrast, others enter marital therapy only tentatively until they have ascertained that the therapist regards divorce as a viable alternative to their difficulties.

Interestingly, some people have the mistaken belief that irrespective of circumstances, marriage counselors are interested only in preserving marriages. Perhaps that belief is not mistaken if some marital therapists originally oppose a divorce, as indeed a bishop usually must. In my stake at least, bishops do not have the option of recommending divorce except under extraordinary circumstances. When they have referred couples to me, it has appeared because they knew I do not counsel from an ecclesiastical perspective and am, therefore, free to help one or both partners consider that option. In actuality, however, I can remember few instances in which I have recommended divorce.

My strategy has been to explain from the outset that I have no preconceived idea as to what is best for a couple. My role is not to apprise them what to do but rather to help them reach their own decision after they have thoroughly explored their relationship together. I often add that my goal is to assist couples to preserve and strengthen their marriages whenever possible, but in some instances couples decide that they are mismatched or otherwise lack the ingredients for a successful marriage. For them divorce may be preferable to remaining in a relationship that is destructive and unfulfilling to both.

During the past year I have adopted the approach advocated by my colleague Richard Stuart who tells couples that the best way they can determine if their marriage is viable is to invest themselves totally in it for at least a few weeks. To do so requires a total commitment to the partner in the most positive ways possible, relating on an as is basis as though theirs were a happy marriage and each loved the other deeply.

If, after such a trial period, they remain miserable, they will be in a better position to reach a sound decision. Interestingly, if each partner makes and follows through with the commitment, both tend to experience caring from the partner that motivates them to see their marriage in a more positive way and to choose to sustain the relationship.

From the foregoing it should be evident that for both moral and strategic reasons, I adopt a neutral stand towards divorce. Please do not construe this to mean that I favor divorce. Like all of you, I deplore the alarming escalation of divorce in our state and nation. I fail to see merit, however, in two people being bound together legally and spiritually to the detriment of them and their children, and I would add parenthetically that I think in some instances preserving the marriage is to the detriment of the children. I might add that I likewise do not see the virtue of perpetuating for eternity a relationship that brings misery to the participants, a view that I have expressed to a limited number of couples who have

struggled valiantly but unsuccessfully to keep afloat a ship of marriage constructed of poorly fitted and rotted timber.

The last issue I should like to discuss concerns strategies in dealing therapeutically with struggles between LDS marital partners who are attempting to carve out mutually acceptable husband and wife role definitions. This is a particularly thorny topic—one deserving a more extended discussion than is possible in the time that I have today. As you are well aware, major social ferment involving the rights of women has occurred in the recent years, particularly in the last decade. Traditional male/female roles have been vigorously challenged and the effects of the Women's Lib movement have pervaded LDS family life in varying degrees. In some instances the impact of the movement has been minimal. Many LDS women indeed have been vigorous in their efforts to preserve traditional family roles. In other instances, LDS women have assertedly sought to achieve more of a balance of power in the marital relationship, rebelling against what they perceive as the traditional super-ordinate male role.

In my opinion, the increased assertiveness of some LDS women cannot directly be attributed solely to the women's liberation movement for I encountered similar, though less frequent, conflicts in marital therapy with LDS couples well in advance of women's lib. Women's lib, it seems to me, has played a catalytic role in bringing more to the level of overt action resentful feelings that have been festering in some LDS women for a long time—feelings that were often expressed only indirectly but they caused conflicts nevertheless.

Before undertaking marital therapy involving role conflicts manifested by women's desires to fulfill some of their needs through employment or civic activities or expecting that their husbands assume greater responsibility in housekeeping chores and caring for the children and/or other related expectations, the marital therapist must first have come to terms with her or his own related potential value conflicts. Otherwise his or her therapeutic efforts may be guided by unresolved biases that result in forming an alliance with one partner and attempting to impose his or her values upon the other. Should this occur, the therapist is likely to alienate one partner and to exacerbate rather than ameliorate the marital difficulties.

As one seeks to explore his or her own stance regarding marital roles, it is important to consider the views and dilemmas that may confront some marital partners in our Church. Consider, for example, the dilemma in reconciling the position, on one hand, that men and women are equal but different, and the women's temple vows, on the other hand, to be obedient to their husbands, a vow that defines a subordinate rather than equal role. Consider also the fact that the male holds the priesthood and occupies thereby the ascribed role of head of the household. Again, defining his

role not only as different but of greater power. It is not my intent to magnify nor to resolve this seeming contradiction, and indeed, lesson 11 of the Family Relations Course addresses this issue in a most satisfactory manner. Rather, I simply wish to emphasize that this matter is a very real issue in the minds of some LDS women.

In working with gender type role conflicts, my strategy has been to divert couples from futile and damaging role power struggles by redefining the conflict as reflecting the need to evolve an effective partnership based on mutual respect, commitment to understand, and to work towards the fulfillment of each other's needs and potentialities. In my office I have an impressive poster that displays a brilliant Monarch butterfly alighting on a delicate flower. Under this beautiful scene are the words of the Swiss psychologist, Carl Gustave Jung: "Where love rules, there is no will to power." To this powerful message might be added, "But in love the power is to produce growth in both partners and in their relationship." In marital therapy with LDS couples and others, I've often had occasion to refer to this choice poster and its profound message. If their marriage is to progress toward perfection, I emphasize each must become highly aware of, sensitive to, and responsive to the needs of the other. Each will include the other in decisions and plans. Not of necessity, but of love and a wish to affirm behaviorly the fact that the partner is important, cherished, and deeply loved. To settle for less than this is to settle, at best, for mediocrity and at worst for competitiveness, resentment, and hostility rather than unity and harmony.

In a few instances in which a husband has used his role as priesthood bearer and head of the household to justify dominating and abusing his wife, I have referred them to Lesson 11 of the Family Relations manual which is concerned with the patriarchal principle in marriage. This lesson refers to the scripture from the Doctrine and Covenants that declares "no power of influence can or ought to be maintained by virtue of the priesthood, only by persuasion, by long suffering, by gentleness and meekness, and by love unfeigned." This and related scriptures cited in this lesson may be used judiciously to counter the contentions of those who pervert to personal advantage the meaning of other scriptures concerning the role of the head of the household.

In closing, I will briefly describe a potent strategy of dislodging a heretical partner from clining tenaciously to domineering and controlling patterns of behavior. This strategy highlights the self-defeating nature of tyrannical behavior and places the person in an therapeutic bind by defining continuation of the behavior as an admission, as lack of commitment to making constructive changes in the relationship. To illustrate, let us consider the not too rare situation of a husband who stubbornly persists, despite remedial efforts by the therapist, to exclude his wife from knowledge of the family's finances and from planning as to how the income should be used. The effect of his behavior

has been to engender resentment, alienation and a sense of futility in the wife. In using this strategy termed a therapeutic bind, the therapist might comment, "You know, over and over your behavior seems to be saying that it's more important to you to be boss than to have your wife's love and respect and to improve you marriage. It's apparent that you can't have both and you appear to have decided the power is more important to you." The only way out of this therapeutic bind is for the husband to disprove the therapist by modifying the dysfunctional behavior. To be used only sparingly, this strategy is tantamount to resorting to the use of heavy artillery, but then defenders in well fortified positions rarely yield to infantrymen armed with B-B guns.

---

## **A Lawyer Looks At Treatment Strategies For Troubled LDS Marriages**

**Christine Durham, J.D. \***

\*Dr. Durham is an attorney in private practice in Salt Lake City. This presentation was given at the AMCAP Convention, Salt Lake City, October, 1977.

If Dr. Reusch tends to see marriages in trouble very easily, I tend to see them very late—sometimes too late. There is a certain amount of anomaly involved in even asking a lawyer to come and talk to you, especially about the treatment of marriages in trouble. By definition, lawyers don't treat. Not only don't they treat, but they don't know how to treat. You've given me a soap box today and I'm going to take advantage of it.

For those of you who are involved in counseling LDS marriages in trouble, I think it's a very good thing for you to have some perspective on the skills and abilities of the other professionals who tend to get involved in marriages in trouble, including the family practitioner, the physician, the lawyer, and others. Lawyers are trained and taught, and presumably qualified, to do the following kinds of things. To gather information and analyze facts; to apply substantive legal doctrines to those facts; to research the law when they don't know what it is; to represent their client. The "Hired gun syndrome" is still very much alive and well in the legal profession in the processes of negotiation, litigation, the adversary context of going to court, and in the settlement and compromise process.

I probably don't need to say too much more about the adversary system except to recall for you that the whole context of a lawyer's training and approach to a problem is the adversary context. The lawyer is taught that aside from his generalized ethical duties as an officer of the court and a

citizen of society, that his primary loyalty runs to his client. Well, there's no way you can have a marriage for a client, just as in a piece of litigation there's no way you can represent both parties. You have to have a single individual or single entity. Sometimes you can represent a corporation, but you represent a corporation with its conflicts or disputes with another entity. In a marriage there is no such clear-cut distinction between the client. In many cases, the real client, the real entity in need of treatment and help and representation is the marriage itself, especially when there are children involved, but lawyers aren't taught to think that way and they are certainly not trained to deal with that dichotomy.

What about some of the things that they are expected to do that people come to them hoping that they will do and can do, and which, sometimes, wisely, foolishly, brilliantly, or miserably, they actually do? To gather information about highly subjective, emotionally charged human relationships and feelings; to analyze and assess the relative value, worth, stability, and viability of those relationships; to provide moral and psychological counsel and support to persons who are frequently in the midst of emotional crisis; to assist in some cases those persons in radically altering their life styles, or I think we could say learning to live their religion in many cases; or in some cases, and lawyers do this, to convince people not to radically alter their lifestyles. In some cases they are expected and asked to help people put the pieces back together in order to cope with the demands of daily living. The hand-holding phenomenon, as any lawyer with any experience in domestic work will tell you, is not at all an uncommon expectation of a lawyer working with a troubled marriage.

I hope the contrast between that second list and the first list is as startling to you as it is troubling to lawyers. The expectations that a lawyer may encounter in counseling a client with marital difficulties may give you a sense of empathy. I certainly hope, if nothing else, I can accomplish that this morning. Like Dr. Reusch, I find myself almost always reluctant and very frequently rebellious when I am asked to undertake these roles. I am not prepared by my training, and I'm not sure by my inclination, to do a good job. By the way, I forgot to have my most important qualifications for this speech mentioned this morning and that's being the veteran of a ten year—what I see as one of the more successful marriages I've ever encountered and four children which has been the biggest stress on that marriage that I've ever encountered!

The lawyer, like the family practitioner, is often a first line of contact outside the marriage itself for the couple having trouble. This tends, in my experience, to be less true, however, for the LDS marriage. The LDS couple frequently has more lines of assistance available to them. They will very frequently seek the assistance of a physician, especially if he or she happens to be a close family friend, or particularly where there is priesthood leadership available at the ward or

stake level that also provides some kind of empathetic listening. How bishops and stake presidents and counselors and elder's quorums and Relief Society presidents manage to survive the burdens that they are frequently asked to bear for their parishioners is beyond me many times, but it is true and it is perhaps a good thing towards training and preparing our Church leaders to handle some of the problems that they see whether they will or not want to on a daily basis, to teach, to give them more skills to make their handling of those problems more adequate. Nevertheless, the fact that this does occur, whether it's done well or not in the LDS context, means that lawyers tend, I think, to see LDS marriages that are really in trouble because they tend to be more of a last line of resort.

When a lawyer is the first contact, however, he runs into the same problems that have already been alluded to this morning. He's expected, notwithstanding the fact that nothing in his training has prepared him to do this, to perform what the doctors call a triage function; that is, to make some assessment, some screening assessment, about what needs to be done in a particular situation. He or she is faced with the kind of earth shaking decisions if she or he is willing to make them about, for example, who needs a divorce, who needs professional help and what kind, and who's best suited in the community or the Church Social Service structure to give it. Who needs to be ignored long enough to work through this particular phase and put the pieces back together themselves? The presenting problems are numerous and may frequently be in the nature of a red flag. I really like what Dr. Reusch had to say about listening to what's inside the marriage and trying to share what's really being said rather than what may be being verbally expressed. Many times a young wife, for example, will come to me and say, "I want a divorce," and after twenty minutes of conversation, it's perfectly obvious to me that she doesn't really want a divorce but she wants her husband. She wants to scare the pants off her husband—she wants to say to him, "Something is drastically, radically, horribly wrong with this marriage. Do something about it. We've got to do something about it." Frequently that will have occurred after months of pleading and working on the part of one or the other members of the marriage to do something about it. I can think of very few disturbed marriages that I've encountered in my law practice, that have not involved one spouse who has been sending up flares and waving red flags for months, sometimes even years, saying, "Let's travel together once in a while. Let's get away from the kids once in a while. Let's go to a communication seminar, let's see a marriage counselor, let's talk to the bishop about our problems." And the other spouse, many times, out of insecurity which masquerades as pride and self-complacency, will say, "We don't need that. I don't need some half-cocked counselor telling me how to run my marriage."

This is a real problem. I think one of the ways to approach that problem as experts in the field is for you as counselors

and professionals to do a little bit better job of educating among LDS, especially young people, about the benefits your profession has to offer, about the ways in which you can assist people over troubled times and help people in working out very real problems. Most of us, if a pipe breaks in our basement, are perfectly willing to call a plumber, but if a line of communication is shut off in a marriage, few are very willing to seek the help of a therapist.

There are some other things that also handicap the lawyer when he or she attempts to treat a marriage. By virtue of our training, we are taught to be non-judgmental and a lot of people see this as a callousness. But if you believe as I do, in our system of law and justice, then you have to believe that everyone's point of view deserves a fair and adequate hearing before a duly constituted authority whose role it is to determine the worth and value of that point of view. In other words, I can't, as a lawyer, say, "I can say what you want to do is legal or it's not legal, but I don't really have the right as a lawyer to tell you whether it's right or wrong". Now there are clearly limits to that philosophy and I do feel very strongly that there are limits, but in general, it's my duty to represent the point of view of my client to a tribunal, maybe an administrative body or in the case of divorce, a court and a judge. Because of that approach to the problem, it becomes very difficult for me to say, for example, when a client says, "I want divorce," "No, you really don't want a divorce. Divorce is a bad thing. Divorce is the wrong thing, an immoral thing." Sometimes I feel that very strongly, particularly when children are involved. I also feel very strongly that one of the greatest existing gaps in the lawyer's approach to troubled marriages now-a-days and to all of our approaches to troubled marriages is the lack of representation of the interest of the children. The fact that very rarely do children have standing to oppose the divorce proceeding in court, and yet who more than anyone else stand to suffer damage and sometimes destruction in the process of divorce than the children? So I do think that notwithstanding our non-judgemental training and of the injunctions we've received all of our professional lives not to judge our clients, we lawyers do have a responsibility at least to try to raise the consciousnesses of our clients about the wider implications of troubled marriages and about the damage that may be done to the social system of the family and home, and to the individuals involved, and to the children.

Again, frequently, we lawyers see things too late for that kind of consciousness raising to do any good. People are very frequently so desperate and so determined by the time they get to us there is little that we can do. Some lawyers, however, especially those many who specialize in domestic practice and divorce work, will refuse to represent a client in a divorce action until the client has sought some form of counseling outside the lawyer's purview—a professional counselor, a psychotherapist, a psychiatrist, a psychiatric social worker, a marriage counselor—someone who is

specifically trained to analyze the marital situation. I think that's a very good idea and it behooves your profession to make yourselves available and to encourage the development in your communities of low cost, easy access, analytical treatment of this kind.

In trying to isolate out of my experience those things which make LDS marriage different from other marriages, it's been a somewhat interesting experience. I notice that Dr. Reusch's comments isolated factors which by and large are applicable to LDS or non-LDS marriages—alcohol, in-law problems, lack of communication—all of those things occur across the board. I tried to isolate some factors which I saw as being of particular significance in LDS marriages. One thing that I am aware of is that frequently there are fewer stresses on the non-LDS marriage which is having problems. The kind of stresses I am talking about that apply, I think, more particularly to LDS marriages are those from peer group pressure. For example, one of the reasons that one member of a couple will refuse to seek counseling is that that spouse will see counseling as an acknowledgment of failure and defeat, and will assume that you acknowledge that a marriage in trouble will result in an automatic label that he is not living his religion.

Now, my attitude to that is that it is living your religion to solve problems in the most constructive and effective way available, but a lot of the subtle pressures that people in the Church feel don't give them that message. The message is, if you are living the gospel, you don't have problems; not, if you are living the gospel you seek to work out your problems in a sensible and intelligent way.

In the LDS marriages that I have observed there's a strong reliance on denial as a mechanism for treating marital problems. I am sure all of you as professionals know just how effective that is. There is a tendency to ignore the problem in the hope that it will go away. Again, the results from the stigma that many people assume, rightly or wrongly, is placed upon people whose marriages are having difficulty.

Also, I think that a marriage crisis may precipitate an overall identity crisis and a religious crisis because people feel that when their marriages are in trouble, they are not living their religion. In the sense that Dr. Reusch talked about, that's true, but it is also true that to live your religion is to seek to make your marriage work in every available fashion, one of which includes counseling. Sometimes radical therapy may be necessary to put a marriage back together.

We get a lot of subtle messages when we grow and are raised in the Church and are faithful and active members of the Church. Some of those messages I think are double messages and cause LDS couples a great deal of difficulty. The first and foremost of those is "get married; married; marriage." I saw a very painful situation a couple of years ago where a young, intelligent, well educated woman in her early thirties had literally been pressured by her bishop, her

parents, her home teachers, and other priesthood leaders and her friends into marrying a young man about whom she had real reservations. Now these people were so desperate that she should get married they didn't listen to what she was saying about what she needed in a marriage. Her reservations, unfortunately, proved to be very true. The man was unfit for a Latter-Day Saint marriage and the whole situation hurt a great many people, herself included. Now she was wrong in that. She didn't listen to what her own instincts told her, she didn't listen to what her own prayers told her in that case, but I think that there were others who overstepped the bounds of their authority to counsel her in a priesthood context. Marriage alone in and of itself is not always the answer.

Members of the Church are also encouraged to marry young, to marry quickly as soon as economically feasible and sometimes before, to have many children quickly. Now I'm not talking about these messages over the pulpit or something that a bishop or bishop's handbook may tell him to preach. These are subtle messages that occur in Mutual classes and in conversations and in the neighborhood contact. Never turn down a Church call, be successful in your career, make money, achieve recognition, be a super mom, convert your neighbors, do good in the community, you know, we are bombarded constantly by these subtle messages to achieve, to improve ourselves, and sometimes we don't recognize the stress or the burden of trying to do all of that simultaneously will put on our marriages.

One thing that ties in again with what I have been trying to say about the stresses that LDS marriages may feel peculiarly and in distinction or counter-distinction to non-LDS marriages is the feeling that faithfulness in the gospel immunizes your marriage from difficulty and from the tragedy of disintegration. I think we need to be more careful, and as a Church, as professionals, as teachers, and in every capacity that we fulfill in our Church activity and in our communities to teach our young people that there's no free lunch, that you don't live happily ever after by luck. We need to better prepare our young single people and our young married people and a lot of our older married people for the struggles, the sacrifice, and the process that is marriage. Too many young people, even now, even in the 1970's believe that if they only get married, and especially in our culture—if they only get married in the temple, that they've got a free ticket to ride. It just ain't so! You and I know it isn't so, and we need to be more honest I think when we have an opportunity to teach.

We need to be more honest with our young people, that there's a lot of hard work involved and that's where living your religion comes in. Living your religion isn't a free lunch either, and many of us raised in the Church tend to think that if we attain the ordinances, if we follow the rules, if we can answer all of the temple recommend questions straightforwardly, then we're home free, and when we think about it, we've got to realize that that is only the beginning, that is only a base at which we all begin to progress. We can't begin

progressing until we've achieved that base, but after that, all of the work is left to be done in terms of growth and development, and eventually exaltation.

I'd like to steal something from the doctors for my parting shot which I think applies to lawyers as well as the counselors of all types including Church counselors, bishops, elders quorum presidents, Relief Society presidents, all of us who are called upon for help and assistance. It's the injunction to the physician as part of the oath which is frequently administered after the medical degree is conferred and it says, "Above all do no harm." Now for many lawyers that will frequently mean doing nothing for we are not trained, are not qualified to counsel. My experience is leading me to believe more and more that the ability to counsel wisely is as much a gift and a matter of fortune and prayer, I should put prayer first, than a matter of training. I have seen individuals with very little or no formal training who have the gift of discernment and who can hear and understand and guide people in trouble. There are others of us who could train until we were blue in the face and might still not achieve that gift of discernment. It may also be something you can learn and so I suspect it's something that must be learned on one's knees and not in the library.

Thank you for the soap box. I leave these things with you in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

## Useful Scriptures in Therapy

(Editor's Note) The following scriptures have been identified by L.D.S. counselors as being useful in counseling or for personal preparation and study related to counseling.

Scriptural Reference	Explanation and/or Situation Where Useful
<i>Old Testament</i>	
Gen. 1:26-28	Marriage
Gen. 2:18	Marriage
Exodus 18:13-24	Deals with the issue of stewardship. Good for the training of volunteer counselors.
Numbers 11:11-15	Depression-suicide
II Sam. 11:2-5	For clients who have yielded to sexual temptation. Helps them see the steps of temptation more clearly.
II Kings 5:9-13	Use when an individual is hesitant to follow the prescribed counsel.
Proverbs 13:1	Parent-child relations
Proverbs 22:6	Parent-child relations
Amos 3:7	For the psychotic client who feels the Lord has been giving him visions, commandments, etc.



<i>New Testament</i>		Alma 37:6	Importance of the little things.
Matt. 7:1-8	Judge not.	Alma 39:3-5	Marriage.
Matt. 7:12	Why counsel?	Alma 39:7-9	Responsibility
Matt. 18:15-17	Resolving conflicts	Helaman 13:27-29	A summary of modern psychology and psychiatry.
Matt. 25:40	Why counsel?		Two kinds of sorrow.
Luke 15:11-32	For the parent who has given up on his child and is bitter and unforgiving of the child.	Mormon 2:13-14	The result of personal apostasy.
	The behavioral approach to solving problems; i.e., do first, then you'll know the truth of the principle.	Mormon 2:26	Our weaknesses can become our strengths if proper principles are applied. Repentance.
John 7:17	The strong should help the weak.	Ether 12:27	For the homosexual client who says God made him that way, therefore, it must not be evil.
Romans 15:1	Patriarchal principles in marriage.	Moroni 7:12-14	The way to measure alternatives
I Cor. 10:13	Marriage	Moroni 7:12-17	How to rid to fear.
I Cor. 11:11-12	Repentance	Moroni 8:16	Gives hope to the suicidal client.
II Cor. 7:10	The purpose of weaknesses.	Moroni 9:25	
II Cor. 12:7-10	Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.		
Ephesians 4:26	Patriarchal principle in marriage.		
I Tim. 3:5	Responsibility		
James 1:13-15	The importance of being able to listen.		
James 1:19-20	God giveth grace to the humble.		
I Peter 5:5			
<i>Book of Mormon</i>		<i>Doctrine and Covenants</i>	
I Nephi 3:7	When the client feels his problem is worse than anyone else's, or that it can't be solved.	D&C 1:31-33	Repentance.
	Enduring to the end.	D&C 6:7	Repentance
I Nephi 3:7		D&C 6:16	Depression. Devil's limitations. He can't know our thoughts, therefore, we can control our thoughts.
D&C 61:9		D&C 9	How to get Lord's direction for client help—self-reliance and responsibility
D&C 50:35		D&C 9:7-9	Process by which personal revelation may be obtained
D&C 61:9			Purpose of counseling
II Nephi 2:15-16	Importance of alternatives.	D&C 18:10-13	Importance of repentance
II Nephi 2:26-27	Free agency	D&C 19:15-19	Repentance
II Nephi 4:16-35	Helpful in dealing with depression	D&C 19:15-21	Helps dominant and/or overbearing women understand their role in relationship to the priesthood.
II Nephi 28:31	Special instructions which may apply to L.D.S. Social Service workers.	D&C 25	Importance of alternatives
Mosiah 23:14			How to get rid of fear
D&C 31:10		D&C 29:35-39	Importance of personal worthiness
Jacob 2:9-11	A great counseling technique.	D&C 38:30	Marriage
Jacob 2:17-19	Principles regarding money.	D&C 42	Marriage
Enos 3:6	Prayer; struggle; forgiveness	D&C 42:24-26	Use the good sense God gave you
Mosiah 2:7	Why counsel?	D&C 49:15-17	For the client who feels that he has sinned too frequently and too severely, and that there is no hope for him. Repentance.
Alma 4:19	A great counseling technique—bearing down in pure testimony	D&C 58:26-29	Importance of getting rid of resentment
	The etiology of much suffering.	D&C 58:42	For those who won't let go of resentments and grudges
Alma 15:3	The healing process.		How to get rid of fear
Alma 15:6-10	Faith and hope.		Parent-child relations
Alma 32	Repentance	D&C 64:8-11	Importance of feedback—getting rid of our "blind spots"
Alma 34:32	Help for depressed persons.		
Alma 36:3	Suicide	D&C 64—9-10	
Alma 36:15	How to talk to your children.		
Alma 37:1-20		D&C 67:3	
Alma 38:1-2		D&C 68:25	
Alma 39:1-5		D&C 76:94	
Alma 40:1-6			
Alma 42:1-4			



D&C 86:6	Importance of learning how to with-
D&C 101:5	stand "chastisement" and the trials
D&C 136:31	of this life
D&C 89:10-21	
D&C 93:29-32	Free agency
D&C 95:1	Knowing how to chasten, and what
D&C 111:1-11	a folly is.
D&C 100:15	Gives hope to the discouraged
D&C 121:14-44	Priesthood
D&C 121:34-40	Responsibility
D&C 121:36-44	Patriarchal principle in marriage.
	You can't force someone to change,
	but you may be able to have indirect
	influence if your own life is in order
D&C 121:43	Reproof
D&C 121:45-46	A formula for perfect happiness
D&C 131:1-4	Marriage
D&C 136:31-33	All must be tried
<i>Pearl of Great Price</i>	
Moses 1:1-23	Teaching who we are—building self-
	esteem.
Moses 2:36	How a person withdraws from the
	spirit.
Moses 4:3	The process of obtaining joy.
Moses 5:2-8	The Lord's healing process.
Moses 7:23-44	Shows God loves his children and
	weeps when they fall.
Moses 7:28-44	How we can gain empathy for others
	by knowing how God does and
	Enoch did.

## Fear of Success

Kent M. Christensen, Ph.D. \*

\*Dr. Christensen is Associate Professor of Education and Direction of Student Services, Arizona State University, Tempe.

"Two weeks more and Karen's friend would be baptized. The time seemed to pass slowly for Karen. Yet, the expectation of an intensified relationship with her roommate and the anticipated happiness they would share made waiting worthwhile."

"But just before that special time arrived, Karen's hopes were shattered when her roommate announced that she intended not to be baptized, not to continue the missionary lessons, and not to engage further in any church-related discussions or activities. Serenity surrendered to sadness as Karen searched for a reason for the sudden withdrawal of interest. Was she at fault? Was her example negative? Were the lessons improper? Could the situation be reversed? More importantly, could she correct matters to avoid subsequent disappointments of this kind?"

Similar experiences have probably occurred to others who have had golden contacts unexpectedly refuse to proceed any further. It's only a natural inclination to wonder what precipitated the dramatic change in attitude. Unfortunately, there is no simple formula which can reliably explain the makeup of such a decision.

According to some human behaviorists, however, one reason for the sudden change might be attributed to a relatively new phenomenon which has been simply dubbed "fear of success". This idea has received considerable publicity recently in popular periodicals such as *Harper's Bazaar*, *Seventeen*, *Mademoiselle*, and *Vogue* as well as numerous professionally-oriented journals. The general notion is that some people are so frightened of attaining success that they sabotage themselves just as they are about to achieve the desired goal they are pursuing. That is, they avoid behavior which would lead to success.

The concept fear of success was first characterized by Martina Horner (1968:1972) and grew out of an effort to define achievement for women as a theory. She believed that fear of success was acquired, that it inhibited performance, restricted level of aspiration, and was an expression consistent with the developed self-concept. According to the Harvard psychologist, the motive to avoid success was a psychological barrier.

Pappo offers a more formal definition by saying fear of success is "a psychological state which leads to withdrawal in the presence of a consciously understood, subjective or objective goal which is perceived by the individual in the moment of withdrawal." (Pappo, 1972, page 3.)

It seems for some individuals the probability of success causes internal tension. The tension is aroused because demands and role expectations are assumed (which are incidental to the success) and when the possibility exists that they will succeed certain reactions occur, one of which might be withdrawal or repudiation (Meggert, 1976).

## Fear of Success vs. Fear of Failure

There seems to be a fine distinction between fear of success and fear of failure. People who possess a dominant fear of failure will not subject themselves to achievement activities. They are unwilling to engage in activities where the outcome may be doubtful. Fear of failure happens when people have the feeling they will never achieve because of the impossible goals or that they will never measure up to the standards because they generally perform badly anyway.

People with a dominant fear of success are achievement oriented, but when goal is probable, they begin to participate in self-defeating behavior designed to protect themselves from expectations. If individuals are about to suc-

ceed, they believe untenable things will happen. Thus conditioned to fear success, they actually inhibit the opportunity to succeed. To them, the outcome associated with the success is more stressful than a less-prized alternative.

In general, then, fear of failure evokes refusal to participate, or perhaps a perfunctory performance, while fear of success motivates striving and participation with intensity, but substitutes self-imposed detours in response to stress. A distinguishing characteristic between the two forms of motivation is the perceived personal reason for repudiation of competence.

This is not to suggest that the answer has now been found describing why people divorce themselves from an esteemed objective. But it is a possible factor to consider when dealing with human behavior. Such a proposition runs counter to the general notion that everyone is inclined to strive for success. Nevertheless, there is growing evidence that people sometimes preempt their propelling movement toward favorable outcomes, the likelihood of which is fearful (Hoffman, 1974; Mettee, 1971; Curtis, Zanna and Campbell, 1974).

## Implications for Latter-Day Saints

Interpreting these findings for the Latter-Day Saint population suggests that the expected demands for people may be traumatic whenever new roles are perceived to be at variance with their self-concept. Recognizing that people could feel a personal discomfort relative to opportunities may provide keener insight as to why some investigators who seemingly know the Church is true still refuse to accept its teachings, why some singles prefer to remain single, why some teachers teach less than capably, and why some potential never quite reaches its promise.

Success-avoidance doesn't imply a true fear of success, per se, but rather fear of the things that will happen. It seems to conjure in the mind the possibility of unwanted values, unpopular paths, rejection of friends, great demands, etc.

Since the gospel touches all aspects of life, it's crucial to recognize that certain people may unwittingly inhibit their own potential for growth and development. Persons who thus behave "inappropriately" may actually be unable to tolerate what success might foster. The existence of this incongruity poses the immense challenge to help people perform well in spite of themselves.

## References

- Curtis, R. C., Zanna, M. P. and Campbell, Jr. "Sex, Fear of Success, and the Perceptions and Performance of Law School Students." *American Educational Research Journal*, 1975, 12, 287-297.
- Hoffman, L. W. "Fear of Success in Males and Females, 1965 and 1971." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1974, 42, 353-358.
- Horner, M. S. "Sex Differences in Achievement Motivation and Performance in Competitive and Noncompetitive Situations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.
- Horner, M. S. "Toward an Understanding of Achievement Related Conflicts in Women." *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, 28, 157-175.
- Meggert, S. S. "The Socialization of Doctoral Students: Role Expectation and Fear of Success." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1976.
- Mettee, D. R. "Rejection of Unexpected Success as a Function of the Negative Consequences of Accepting Success." *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 1971, 17, 332-341.
- Pappo, M. "Fear of Success: A Theoretical Analysis and the Construction and Validation of a Measuring Instrument." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.