



Journal of the Association
of Mormon Counselors
and Psychotherapists

July 1980 Vol.6/Issue 3

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.



Journal of the Association
of Mormon Counselors
and Psychotherapists

July 1980 Vol.6/Issue 3

Editor	Henry L. Isaksen Salem, Utah
Associate Editor	Roy H. Marlowe Ricks College
Editorial Board	Russell Crane Dept. of Home and Family Life Texas Tech. Univ. Louis A. Moench Salt Lake City, Utah

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 correspondence contact:

Richard W. Johnson
AMCAP Secretary-Treasurer
Counseling Center
C-273 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:

Henry L. Isaksen
AMCAP Journal Editor
Box 926
Salem Utah 84653

AMCAP JOURNAL/JULY 1980

EDITORIAL

In spite of our efforts the April issue was not delivered in April. In fact, it was later than ever, for which we apologize. As the July issue goes to press we have reason to believe that it will actually be in the mail (if not delivered) in July. Your editor now resides in Utah, much closer to headquarters, so the problem of coordinating the work of assembling and preparing materials and working with the printer should be reduced considerably. We have also changed to a different and hopefully more efficient and reliable printer so we think the problems that have resulted in delays in the past have been resolved. If you receive this issue in July or early August you will know that they have. If not, please be patient!

We are not alone in being late with our journal. Even as large and well established an organization as APGA has also had problems recently. We are hopeful that future issues will be delivered before or early in the month of each issue: January, April, July and October.

This issue contains a report of the April Semi-Annual Convention of AMCAP as well as one article based on a presentation made in October and one that was submitted directly. We hope you will enjoy reading them and that you will find them helpful.

Again we solicit your comments and urge you to send any material you have that you think would be of interest to the members of AMCAP. Be sure to note the new address.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Henry:

I think the January 1980 issue of the AMCAP Journal contains one of the finest groups of professional articles under one cover I have ever read! They were helpful, inspiring, and enjoyable.

I noticed that you are including a little poetry in the Journal, also, which I enjoy. I am enclosing a little thing which I put together a few years ago. . .

Sincerely,
Jim Baumgarten
Provo, Utah

Thanks, Jim! We are pleased to include your poem in this issue.

—Ed

Brother Isaksen:

I enjoyed the insight of the last Journal that included poetry. Enclosed is a poem. . . Thank you for making the Journal possible.

Sincerely,
Jaymes Helmstetler
Richfield, Utah

Thanks, Brother Helmstetler. Your poem is also included in this issue.

—Ed

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Letters to the Editor	1
However Faint the Light May Glow	
by Elder Vaughn J. Featherstone	2
“But to be Learned is Good If. . .”, a report of the April Convention	
E. Wayne Wright	7
Margaret Hoopes	12
Carlfred Broderick	14
Summary Session	16
Humility	
a poem by James N. Baumgarten	18
Scriptural Insights Into Human Behavior and the Facilitation of Behavior Change	
by Burton C. Kelly	19
Counseling the Divorced LDS Woman	
by E. Becky Morris	26
Introspection	
a poem by Jaymes Helmstetler	31

HOWEVER FAINT THE LIGHT MAY GLOW

By Vaughn J. Featherstone*

(Presented at the AMCAP Convention April 4, 1980)

I am delighted to be here. I have a son who is in Scotland, in fact just arrived in Scotland. I understand that over there on the golf courses they have a little sign as you drive in that says, "Please do not pick up any loose golf balls until they stop rolling."

I also heard recently about the young man who was dutifully, dullfully practicing the piano. A salesman came down the street, knocked on the door and said, "Young man, is your mother home?" The boy replied, "What do you think?" At this early hour we may be dutifully gathered, but I hope not dullfully.

I'm here this morning and I'd like to spend some time and share some things--a couple of philosophies. The first one is by President J. Reuben Clark, whom I admire. I suppose for sheer pleasure reading, I enjoy his writings. I've taken the title of this talk, "However Faint the Light May Glow" from his quote I will now give. You will find that it is packed with things that I think are very applicable to you in your profession.

Every human being is born with the light of faith kindled in his heart as on an altar and that light burns and the Lord sees that it burns, during the period before we are accountable. When accountability comes then each of us determines how we shall feed and care for that light. If we shall live righteously that light will glow until it suffuses the whole body, giving to it health and strength and spiritual light as well as bodily health. If we shall live unrighteously that light will dwindle and finally almost flicker out. Yet it is my hope and my belief that the Lord never permits the light of faith wholly to be extinguished in any human heart, however faint the light may glow. The Lord has provided that there shall be there a spark which, with teaching, with the spirit of righteousness, with love, with tenderness, with example, with living the Gospel, shall brighten and glow again, however darkened the mind may have been. And if we shall fail so to reach those among us of our own whose faith has dwindled low, we shall fail in one of the main things which the Lord expects at our hands.

As I have thought about this and thought about my own position, I think both in your profession and in our priesthood assignments we have received some pretty strong direction in these matters.

Joseph Addison, in a modern day parable, took the following ideas somewhat from the thoughts of Socrates. The parable is entitled "The Mountain of Miseries."

***Elder Featherstone is a member of the First Quorum of the Seventy, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.**

He had been pondering over the celebrated thought of Socrates that if all of the misfortunes of mankind were cast into a common stock and then equally distributed to everyone, those who now think themselves the most unfortunate would be even more miserable with their allotment of new troubles. Socrates contended that the hardships and misfortunes that so concern us now would be far more agreeable than those we would get if we traded with any other person.

Mr. Addison says that as he was turning this idea over in his mind he fell asleep and dreamed that Jupiter issued a great proclamation that every mortal should bring his griefs and calamities to a great plain appointed for this and throw them down together in a common pile. In his dream Mr. Addison was stationed in the center of the plain where he could observe everything that took place. His heart was melted as one by one he saw the whole human species marching by, groaning and moaning under their burden of griefs and miseries. Then in obedience to the decree and with great joy they threw down their various loads of care in the place appointed.

The resulting pile grew quickly into a prodigious mountain. One man threw down his poverty, another laid down his ill health, and another dropped his unsavory reputation. There was a multitude of old people who with great delight threw down their wrinkles and their aches and pains. Many put down disabling worries, haunting fears, and distracting guilt complexes. A most interesting part of this procedure, Mr. Addison observed, was that many of the problems disposed of by this vast throng were more imaginary than real. Some threw down occupations which they despised, and some used this opportunity to get rid of an incompatible spouse, a dominating parent, or a disobedient child.

Mr. Addison was greatly surprised to learn that the largest part of this growing mountain was made up of bodily deformities. In the pile were great heaps of red noses, large lips, rusty teeth, crooked backs, protruding stomachs, glass eyes, and wooden legs. But he was even more greatly astonished by the fact that there was not a single vice or folly thrown into the heap. He had assumed that everyone would take this opportunity to get rid of his passions, his prejudices, and his various moral frailties. One profligate fellow came loaded down with his crimes, but upon searching into his bundle it was found that instead of throwing away his

guilt, he had merely laid down his memory. Another worthless rogue flung away his conscience but hung onto his ignorance.

Mr. Addison tries to describe the delight with which each relieved himself of the burden that had so long oppressed him. There was another peculiar thing about this ordeal. When the sufferers were free from their own burdens they surveyed the heap of the miseries of others with great interest. When they discovered the kind of things that the others were discarding, they could not understand why the owners had looked upon these things as burdens or grievances at all. Each sufferer regarded his own miseries as immense and almost insufferable, though he usually felt that the problems of others were so much smaller in size that they were fairly insignificant.

But while this confusion of miseries and chaos of calamities was taking place, Jupiter issued a second proclamation in which it was ordered that each one should now pick up his exchange affliction and return to his habitation. A poor galley slave who had thrown down his chains now replaced them with a case of the gout. Some exchanged their sickness for poverty. Some traded their hunger for a lack of appetite. Some traded care for pain, and some traded pain for care.

The females in the group were busily engaged among themselves bartering for figures and features; one was exchanging her grey hair for a carbuncle; another was taking over a short waist for a pair of round shoulders; and a third was trading in a homely face for a bad reputation. But strangely enough as soon as the blemishes were in the possession of their new owners somehow they also became very unsatisfactory. The sufferers now seemed to think that their new misfortunes and calamities were more disagreeable than the old ones had been.

I would like to suggest to you that vanity may possibly be, and I'm talking outside of the Holy Ghost, the Church, and spirituality in our lives, the great motivator. For vanity's sake, people even have surgery performed which they feel will change their image. We deal with people in our professions and hopefully relieve them of their burdens. We've got to get right into the heart, soul, and character and change lives. You see, the thing that really makes a man with a poor self image happy, contented, and carefree, is service. We find in President Kimball the greatest example of service. When we talk about solving problems, I'm not sure we'll really solve anything for anyone unless they serve others. Dr. Carlton Malz talks about the great change that comes to patients who have plastic surgery, and that great change is in their confidence. When we really want to bring about a behavioral change, I believe it is through increasing integrity and strengthening character that we can help them obtain confidence.

As I mentioned, this is an extremely difficult group to whom we speak, because we realize you are very professional and talented. We wonder how we may add more to what you have done. As we think about you and your profession, there are some things that may deserve some counsel from those who walk in high places as we do. We do a great deal of counseling and suggest some things that might be important to you.

I would like to share three different verses with you. Please think of them not from the standpoint of listening to the rhyme or to the words, as they are all beautifully constructed, but listen to them from a counseling standpoint. In a very real sense the great musician, the great poet, the great writers are all dealing from a great depth of understanding of the needs of men and women. The first 100 pages of *Les Misérables* by Victor Hugo has been as powerful an influence for good in my life as anything outside of the scriptures. Although in most cases they do not have your professional backgrounds, the poets may have an insight to human nature and other things that may help in counseling and dealing with people. Rudyard Kipling has written a beautiful poem entitled "If."

If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or, being lied about, don't deal in lies,
Or, being hated, don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good, nor talk too wise;

If you can dream--and not make dreams your master;
If you can think--and not make thoughts your aim;
If you can meet triumph and disaster
And treat those two imposters just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to broken,
And stoop and build 'em up with worn out tools;

If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings
And never breathe a word about your loss;
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the Will which says to them: "Hold on!"

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings--nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run--
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And--which is more--you'll be a man, my son!

Now, from my point of view, every single line of that is great counsel and becomes a healing experience when put into practice. The second verse I would like to

discuss with you I share quite often. It is by Francis Loveland and is entitled "Opportunity."

Why do you walk through the field with gloves
Missing so much and so much?
Oh, thoughtless woman whom nobody loves,
Why do you walk through the field with gloves
When the grass is as soft as the breast of doves
And shivering sweet to the touch?
Why do you walk through the field with gloves
Missing so much and so much?

The first time I heard this I was deeply impressed. I analyzed my own life and the poet blessed me with her counsel. Last week a special birthday party was held in the tabernacle for President Kimball. As I sat there I was deeply impressed. When it finally concluded and President Kimball walked out we were all standing. It was impressive to me that no one hurried for the doors to leave. It also impressed me that everyone must have felt somewhat as I did, all of a sudden it was over and we didn't want it to end. It was really a great spiritual experience as well as being informative about President Kimball. Then the following night at the special evening prepared by the community leaders to honor President Kimball at the Hotel Utah we heard Norman Vincent Peale speak. He told a story that happened in the Chicago Airport. The planes had been grounded and a woman who had somehow missed her plane was trying to get another. She was many months pregnant and the doctor had told her not to carry her other child who was not very old. As she stood in the long line she just pushed her baby up with her foot as we often do with our bags. Mr. Peale said no one seemed to notice the plight of this poor woman. The baby was dirty and unkempt because of all the traveling. Finally, one man noticed her condition. Norman Vincent Peale said this man walked over and picked up the baby and held it. He then talked to the people in the line to see if this woman could move to the front of the line. They got to the front of the line and he assisted this woman in getting her tickets. He walked with her out to the gate and helped her get on the plane and then went about his business. That man was President Kimball. This touched me deeply. Mr. Peale was talking about President Kimball and all he represents.

This next verse went through my mind over and over again as I sat in the banquet for President Kimball. It is written by Ella Wheeler Wilcox and is entitled "Gethsemane."

All paths that have been, or should be
Pass somewhere through Gethsemane.
All those who journey, soon or late,
Must pass within the garden's gate;
Must kneel alone in darkness there,
And battle with some fierce despair.
God pity those who cannot say,
"Not mine, but thine," who only pray,
"Let this cup pass," and cannot see
The purpose in Gethsemane.

If someone had a heavy heart and was going through a trial in life, I think a wise thing would be to hand them a copy of a poem such as this. It may give them a little different perspective to life.

When we are dealing with problems on a constant basis, it may be easy to develop an attitude that most everyone has that problem to some greater or lesser degree. This may not be true. Someone said that if you walk with a lame man for a year you'll walk with a limp. I met a psychiatrist back east who was also on the high council. His wife wanted an interview with me and she asked, "How do you feel about masturbation?" I said, "What do you mean?" She said, "How serious is it in the Church?" I told her, "It is serious. The Spirit withdraws," and I went on to explain. She said, "I disagree with you and so does my husband. He's a psychiatrist and he says that most everyone does it." She must have been about fifty years old and she herself had been involved in the practice and she didn't feel one particle of guilt. Her husband came and I talked with them together. I asked him if this was the kind of counsel he was giving and he told me that it was. I said, "That is not according to the Church standards, let's talk about it." So, we talked about it. At that time I had not yet been a mission president, but later on when I was called to preside over a mission I saw that nearly 80 percent of the missionaries literally go through their entire mission and do not have the problem. Yet this woman and her husband would not think it possible. Maybe they were too close to those few who have the problem. Those that he interviewed, that came to his office, those he dealt with all day long were so involved with the problem that he "lost his perspective." Let me suggest to you that we ought to be careful when we start coming across problems in our counseling. As recent as last night, I heard someone talking about homosexuality and how rampant it is in the Church. Of course, there are far too many cases, but of all the men I've interviewed (and they ask us everytime we interview a bishop, high councilors, stake presidencies, or prospective stake presidents to ask that question), and all that we've interviewed to serve missions (approximately 30,000), few have ever been involved in homosexuality. If we went on that basis we would hardly find any in the Church. I realize there are a lot undercover and there are far, far too many in the Church, but there aren't as many as people would lead us to believe.

When I was twelve I was ordained a deacon. My older brother was ordained a teacher. He was ordained first. I had come from a background, as many of you know, where my folks were inactive. My mom wasn't even a member of the Church and my dad was an alcoholic. I don't think we had prayer in our home until after I was eighteen. So, I went to the ordination

appointment. I had been involved in Primary and I felt like if ever a little kid of twelve was tempted, I was tempted. I thought there has been no one that has been as tempted as I have. I sat there and listened. The fellow that ordained my brother gave him a blessing and promised him that he would have the power to overcome temptation. That absolutely thrilled me. I plead in my heart, "Dear God, please give me the same power to overcome temptation." The man who ordained me did not say those words. I went home and thought, "Well, he was right, he really knows I do not deserve that blessing." I went through the next two or three years feeling that I might fall at any moment. At that age the problems were not all that serious, but later on it could have led to something really serious. Then I came across the verse by Paul, I don't remember whether someone quoted it to me or whether I just happened to read it, but I do remember it was just like clear, crystal water to parched earth. Paul said,

There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able . . . (1 Cor. 10:13)

I knew I was included in the deal. All of a sudden I realized that I had the power that God would never let Satan tempt me more than I could withstand. I can't tell you what that did for me. I guess because of that verse, whenever I bless someone, I always bless them with the power to overcome temptation, knowing that I have a right. I think it's important for us to know that, as Longfellow said, "Give what you have to give, for to someone it may be more important than you would ever dare to suppose." Now, if I could have had that assurance three years earlier it would have made a lot of difference. Thank goodness I understood when I did and not after I had committed some great transgression feeling that I didn't have enough will power to withstand the temptation.

We have impressions come to us. I interviewed a homosexual just this past week who is just beginning college and is living with a returned missionary. They have sexual relations three times a week. His father has been active in the Church. He came to me in agony and despair, having pled with the Lord literally for six months. He wondered if I would help them. I interviewed the young man for one hour and fifteen minutes. May I suggest to you that during the past six months I have not had more direct revelation than I did in this hour and fifteen minutes. I do not have the talents and skills you have, but I know that the God of heaven, because the father was doing everything he could, poured into my mind words and knowledge and understanding and rebuttals. I of myself do not have the ability to do or the knowledge to say what I said. I don't know whether we turned him around or not, but

at least I knew that all of the powers of heaven for that moment seemed to rest on me to try to bless him. We do have our free agency, that cannot be taken away from us. Worlds without end, free agency will not be taken from us. It is impressive to me how the Lord does bless us with revelation.

Now, to turn to your theme today, "Oh, that cunning plan of the evil one, oh the vainness and the frailties and the foolishness of men. When they are learned they think they are wise and they harken not to the counsels of God, for they set it aside supposing they know of themselves, wherefore their wisdom is foolishness and it profiteth them not and they shall perish." What a blessing when you meet together as you do and have the wisdom of the world along with the kind of power of which I have a testimony. When you combine those, professionalism and inspiration, then everything is right.

President Lee was in southern Utah some years ago, possibly in the early sixties or the late fifties. He went to a stake and they told him of an incident that occurred in their area. They had not had rain for months and they just had to have rain. So, the whole community, all of the members of the Church, came together and fasted and prayed on a particular Sunday. It was the whole objective of the stake and even of the community to pray for the needed water. They spent the whole day fasting and praying Sunday and the rain didn't come; and Monday, the rain didn't come; and Tuesday. So, the community leaders and some of the Church leaders got together and hired a plane and all of the facilities to seed the clouds. After they did that, the rains came. The stake president said to President Lee, "I don't know if the rain that came was the rain we prayed for or the rain we paid for." I wonder, too. I wonder just how much faith we really have. I wonder if they couldn't have just turned it over to the Lord and left it with Him, after all the fasting and prayer. The whole Church united in prayer for rain a couple of years back. The prayers and fasting were answered and before the year was over we had more rain than normal.

In Part II, Chapter XXII of Cervantes' *Don Quixote de la Mancha*, Sancho Panza has just listened to Quixote discuss the divinity of man. Now, I'm not very good at Spanish, but I want to use his words: "BIEN PREDICA QUIEN BIEN VIVE Y NO SE OTRAS TILOGIAS." A loose translation would be, "He teaches well who lives well."

This past week I've done some research and study so that this Sesquicentennial year will mean a little more to me. I want to share with you one incident that I have read. Edward Partridge had been taken into the town square and had been bedaubed with tar and feathers and ridiculed. He, along with five other men, had offered

themselves as a ransom for the Church. They had said they would give their lives for the Church and for the Prophet Joseph, anything to stop the cruel punishment the Church was receiving. "Leave our people alone, do with us as you may, punish us, take our lives, anything. We offer ourselves as ransom for the Church." I cannot tell you the feeling I had as I read that. I read it a second time and then closed the book to do some serious thinking. Elder Faust offered his life for two missionaries who had been kidnapped in Uruguay and taken across the border into the jungles of Paraguay. When the ransom note and letter from the kidnappers was received, Elder Faust and the mission president contacted these men and said, "Would you turn those two young men loose? They are just missionaries, let us take their place." They would have been willing to give their lives.

What I am saying is that this is a magnificent church, the teachings are true, and we are guided by a prophet. Again, the light is there in every single soul who is born into this life. The light is there through their early years until they are accountable. The Lord makes certain it does not go out during this time. When we are accountable we each are responsible for what we do with that light.

Think about President Kimball and his light and all that he has done in this life for you and for me with the service he renders. I don't think we even begin to understand it. The other night, following the conclusion of the special Tabernacle program honoring him, I thought about him. During the half an hour it takes me to drive home, I thought that I am a disciple of Christ. I love Him with every particle of my heart and soul. I thought about the great and noble thing Edward Partridge was willing to do for the Church. I am also a disciple of President Kimball. He has literally given his life for the Church in a different way. I would really like to be filled with the kind of love, care, and concern which he has. I am a disciple of President Tanner. I suppose no man I've ever met exemplified integrity like President Tanner does. I am a disciple of President Romney, who has the greatest faith. I've never known anyone, save the Prophet himself, with greater faith. I am a disciple of each one of the members of the Twelve. President Benson is a man of great courage, great conviction, and absolute humility.

God bless you that you will see things within the appropriate parameters that the Lord has set and follow those principles. When anyone gets outside of those boundaries, their counseling may be questionable. Someone questioned Elder McConkie the other day about a certain policy. He said, "If you will just follow the present practice of the Church, that is the interpretation of that scripture."

Again, know that I know with all my heart and soul

that this is the Lord's work. God bless you for the great care you have and the wonderful rehabilitation you give to heavy hearts, minds that are clouded and dimmed, and to those who really need. I believe you are in the most Christlike service, because yours is a healing service. In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

"BUT TO BE LEARNED IS GOOD IF . . ."

On Friday April fourth the second semi-annual spring convention of AMCAP was held at the LDS Institute at the University of Utah. The theme was taken from 2 Nephi 9:28-29: "O that cunning plan of the evil one! O the vainness, and the frailties, and the foolishness of men! When they are learned they think they are wise, and they hearken not unto the counsel of God, for they set it aside, supposing they know of themselves, wherefore, their wisdom is foolishness and it profiteth them not. And they shall perish. But to be learned is good if they hearken unto the counsels of God."

The single, three-hour program that followed Elder Featherstone's talk and breakfast focused on "Putting the two together -- professional and religious life." The three presenters were asked to "deal with the hard questions -- real cases with real dilemmas." Following are the edited transcripts of their talks.

Discussion groups were held following their presentations in which participants responded to the issues raised by the speakers, then the entire group reconvened for reports from the discussion groups and responses from the presenters. A brief summary of this session follows the transcriptions of the three talks.

We trust that this report of the "mini-convention" will help us all to deal more effectively with the hard questions, the real cases and the real dilemmas we face in our practice as Mormon counselors and psychotherapists and to remember that "to be learned is good if [we] hearken unto the counsels of God."

--Ed

E. Wayne Wright, Ed. D.*

This opportunity has mixed blessings today--both pleasurable and difficult. I have looked forward to the opportunity to share some of my experiences with you and with others of my colleagues--experiences in my professional practice and changes in my theoretical orientation about which I have come to feel much more strongly in the last seven or eight years, primarily as a result of my High Council assignment, as well as some unique professional experiences during these last several years. My High Council experiences have helped me become more cognizant of the spiritual aspect of our lives and the need for us to be aware of these more fully.

The difficulty I feel in today's presentation is three-fold: Aside from being the first of this panel to address a difficult topic, and having had Margaret Hoopes on our campus conducting some workshops which left our students all raving more about her more than about me--that's difficult. But also to be on this program with a fulltime, stand-up comic, Carlfred Broderick, who just happens to be a spiritual leader as a stake president, is equally if not more difficult. And then the assignment itself, about which I called Gary Carson the other day, because my greatest dilemma in this preparation was trying to fit my presentation into the program description printed in the convention brochure, i.e.:

Panelists will attempt to illustrate how we struggle to integrate our professional practice into a gospel-centered base, with actual cases where a solution consistent with the gospel and scripturally supported is not present.

I have two dilemmas regarding the program assignment as stated above. To begin with I don't struggle very much anymore trying to integrate these two roles. I used to, for many years; but experiences I have had in the last eight years have reduced this struggle to a minimal level for me. I will hope to clarify this for you as I bear my testimony about it. The other problem with the program description is that I could not think of any cases where "solutions consistent with the gospel were not really present." With each case I thought of for this presentation, the real dilemma has been trying to get people to do what the scriptures or the gospel tell us to do; but in my mind the answers to these problems have typically been found within gospel principles and/or scriptural contexts. It reminded me of several years ago when I had the privilege to invite Elder Hartman Rector to speak to AMCAP; and when I went to talk with Elder Rector about AMCAP he said:

I don't know anything about counseling but I do know that if I can diagnose the problem correctly, then I can tell people where to find the answers. . . The answers are in the scriptures. . . Sometimes it's difficult to diagnose the problem, but when I can get the diagnosis determined, then I know where to find the answers.

I hadn't thought about that very much until Elder Rector's comment. So today, I would like to group my comments into two relatively broad kinds of issues which I think some of us struggle with at times, or have struggled with, and then I will try to illustrate these issues with one or two case examples.

*Brother Wright is Professor of Psychology, Utah State University, and past president of AMCAP.

The first issue I would like to discuss is the possible need for us to make better differential diagnoses. That is, are we always dealing with mentally ill, neurotic, psychotic people, or are some really more spiritually sick--and in some cases even possessed by evil spirits? This is probably the most difficult professional-religious problem I struggle with in diagnosing problems within the context of the Church, particularly among LDS clients referred by priesthood leaders. The implications for treatment are obvious: that if, in fact, people are mentally ill and psychotic, then we prescribe counseling and psychotherapy for them. On the other hand, if they are spiritually sick then we may need to give them a priesthood blessing by anointing and laying on of hands. In some instances we may need to exorcise evil spirits or to rebuke the devil. All of these kinds of treatments are found in the scriptures. A brief discussion of one of my cases may illustrate this issue. Recently my bishop called me and said, "Wayne, I need your help. I want you to accept a personal assignment as a home teacher to a young woman who just moved into our ward. She is beyond my knowledge of how to help, although my counselor and I gave her a blessing last night under frightening circumstances. The counselor was so terrified because of the influence of the adversary in her home that he could hardly wait for us to get out of the house."

As soon as the bishop told me a few comments the girl had made to him, my thought was, "she is psychotic." Since I was now going to be this woman's home teacher (and my wife was to be my companion), I told my wife to gear up for a full-time crisis. And that was before I had met the young woman. That night my wife and I went to meet her, and while I was talking with her, she was obviously talking with other voices she appeared to be hearing--voices that were telling her things that were upsetting to her. On several occasions she shook her head, with a grimace on her face, and said quite loudly, "No, no! I can't do that!"

There is no way that my bishop can really understand psychosis or mental illness in this case, or believe anything other than that this woman was under the influence of Lucifer. My bishop is a man of true and complete faith. In his mind she was possessed by evil spirits. And I might add, I have had enough truly spiritual experiences with my bishop and know the power of his faith and priesthood, that I don't feel like questioning his diagnosis in favor of mine.

The bishop had previously told me that he could not think of a greater combination to save this young woman, temporally and spiritually, than to bring together, in full force, the combined strengths of my professional knowledge and training, "with complete faith in our Maker and the full power of the Holy Priesthood--to know how to help that girl and to have

the power to rebuke the evil influences that are controlling her life." There was no question in my mind, particularly as I came to know her background and the problems of her family, that her psychological problems include long-term spiritual problems and conflicts with her LDS values. Furthermore, I do believe that much of her own life situations, and the influences of the others in her immediate situation, involve "evil" in the true sense of the word. But at times like this I have difficulty having the kind of complete faith that my bishop does, and I wonder at times if this is a product of my professional training. Possibly I could experience the bishop's degree of faith if I were not a professionally trained mental health practitioner--a counselor, a psychologist. At the same time, I am a high counselor in the stake and I do have a strong testimony of the gospel and of the power of the priesthood. I have seen people healed by the priesthood and I have experienced it personally many times in my own life and with my family. So, I ask myself in cases like this, why not do what the bishop has faith in me to do, i.e., exorcise this girl and make her well (i.e. heal her) rather than thinking of her only from a professional viewpoint and seeing her as psychotic, since in the latter instance I then find myself trying to explain the nature of psychoses to the Bishop.

In this particular case, I told my wife to stay close to the woman the next two days and bring her to our home early the next morning because I knew, clinically, that the woman would likely be ready for the hospital within a day or two at the most. My wife did stay close to the woman throughout the following two days, during which she brought the woman and her two children to our home for meals and watchful companionship. By noon of the second day, the young woman was "splitting out"--shifting back and forth between two or three distinct personalities (as we view psychoses from our professional viewpoint). At that point my wife took the woman to the mental health center in Logan, where the woman had been seen in psychotherapy for quite a long time prior to my involvement as her home teacher. As soon as they saw her at the mental health center she was immediately hospitalized by her therapist. I was at the University at the time, but I knew my wife well enough to know that we then had two additional children, ages 5 and 7, in our care at home. And we did have these children for the next two months.

The **issue** in the above case is that the woman is being treated as if she is psychotic; and the **question** is whether, at what time, or in which kinds of instances or similar cases, may it be more appropriate (or helpful) for us to really have enough faith to rebuke evil spirits, as advocated by my bishop in this case?

There is considerable theoretical basis for this kind

of confusion and uncertainty about mental illness versus the influence of Satan. The Church has noted for a long time the tendency of professionals to rely more on professional training than on inspiration; and many of us in the professions have been critical of the Church's position on this. A number of Church leaders have said that we as professionals try to fit our religion into our professional training, and we therefore see some mistrust of "professionals" among some of the Brethren, who have encouraged us to try to fit our professional lives into the framework of the gospel rather than to explain gospel principles and/or Church concerns in terms of our professional training and perceptions of therapy. As I have been able (or willing) to subordinate my professional position to inspired priesthood authority and to utilize the gospel in my professional practice, more so in recent years than earlier in my career, it has been helpful to me personally and, I believe, to many of my clients. Long ago Carl Jung (1933) said:

It is safe to say that every one of my patients fell ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers. And none of them has really been healed who did not regain this spiritual outlook.

Much professional literature throughout our training has reminded us that we should not let our own values enter into our therapy with clients--that we should not try to influence others with our values or beliefs. Other literature, however, suggests the need for us to be "authentic" and "congruent" in helping relationships, and it becomes apparent to us that we cannot really keep our values out of an authentic, congruent relationship--a genuine, loving sincere one. So if we bear our testimonies at times to people we see in counseling, we are quite likely to reflect our values. Many counselors, particularly trainees and younger, less experienced practitioners, typically disagree with or at least react quite negatively to a definition of counseling that I learned from Alan Anderson a long time ago. He suggested that "counseling (or therapy) is a relationship in which we try to get people to do what we want them to do." I submit to you that this is more true than most counselors are willing to acknowledge. Or if we wish to modify this definition somewhat, we might say that "counseling is a relationship in which we try to get people to do what we think is best for them." Within such a framework and definition of counseling I have no trouble at all in asking people where they are with regard to the Church and in bearing my testimony about the healing powers of the gospel. I do believe, however, that while we typically **expose** our values to clients, we need not, and should not **impose** our values upon them. The imposition of values implies rejection, ridicule, disdain or some other form of withdrawal from those who do not accept our counsel or who do not think or

believe as we do. Obviously such a stance does not make for helping relationships. Bearing one's testimony about the healing process, however, is a different matter entirely--quite possibly a responsibility that we too often neglect or avoid completely.

In his book, *The Doctor and the Soul*, Victor Frankl (1955) said:

Today it appears more important to remind man that he has a spirit, that he is a spiritual being. Man lives in three dimensions--the somatic, the mental and the spiritual. The spiritual cannot be ignored for it is what makes us human. . . Proper diagnosis can be made only by someone who can see the spiritual side of man. (pp X, XVIII)

Frankl then goes on to talk about his concept of Logotherapy and discusses Logotherapy as a process of **healing** souls. He points out that dealing with this issue places professionals in a position where it becomes necessary for us to take a stand on the question of values and he suggests that we have a dual role--of being either in a "medical ministry" or of being "secular priests".

One of my former students who became interested in this concept of therapy through a number of discussions that we had about it has since written an article entitled, "Soul Searching in Psychotherapy" (Gettis, 1976). Gettis references Jerome Frank's book, **Persuasion and Healing**, in which Frank indicates that what is common with all persons seeking psychotherapy is that they are "demoralized", and in this sense Frank suggests that a "demoralized" person is deprived of the spirit, disheartened, bewildered or confused. Jourard (1964) proposes as a general proposition that;

Events, relationships, or transactions which give a person a sense of identity, or worth, of hope and of purpose of existence are 'inspiring,' while those that make a person feel unimportant, worthless, hopeless, low in self esteem, isolated and frustrated, and those that make him feel that existence is absurd are 'dispiriting'. The hypothesis is that dispiriting events render an organism vulnerable to the always present forces of illness while inspiring events mobilize the forces of wellness latent in all organisms. (page 76)

In a second article by Gettis (1976), entitled "Psychotherapy as Exorcism", Gettis discusses Jourard's notion in context with similar thoughts from other authors. I submit to you that as members of AMCAP, and as LDS practitioners trying to find a professional orientation consistent with LDS gospel teachings, I think we need to consider at appropriate times the kinds of differential diagnoses suggested above and thus being willing to risk possible ridicule of those who might think that we have "flipped out" if we suggest that we may at times be dealing with evil spirits rather than just plain mental illness, e.g. psychoses. I

personally am not so sure which is which at times because I have seen many of our spiritual leaders heal people through faith and priesthood blessings, and sometimes with individuals who have not been helped through extensive psychotherapy by professionals.

Further, I have many LDS clients who have come to me for counseling, referred by bishops, who have asked me for a priesthood blessing on some occasions rather than the usual counseling session. Thus, I am becoming more and more convinced that we cannot any longer ignore the difficult questions related to the diagnostic issue of mental illness versus spirit possession and the role and potential power of the priesthood in conjunction with our professional roles. I believe we must address these issues professionally but also from within our gospel-oriented values and beliefs. For too long now we have typically been unwilling to do so, at least openly within our professions, either because of our own uncertainty or disbelief, or out of the fear of professional ridicule. I am at the point in my own thinking at this time that we need to attend to this issue more directly and more openly than we have been willing to do in the past. With many of my cases (although I don't initiate it with every client), as my clients start to talk about or make some reference to church teachings or to things that let me know they are members of the Church--when I hear people talking about things that sound like guilt because they are not being what they feel they ought to be, and when they reference something related to the Church, then I say, "Where are you at this point with the Church?" When they tell me, I ask them if that is where they want to be, and then I try to help them to some extent by bearing my testimony about the healing influence of "getting straight with the Church." I have no hesitancy in these cases to say, "In my judgment your psychological problems are related to your spiritual problems and until you get spiritually well the psychological problems are likely to persist." Not all people hear this very well the first time, but I have become much more direct in saying it than I used to be.

The second major dilemma for me, which I had intended to present more adequately today than time will permit at this point, is the broad issue (and questions) regarding the extent to which we should extend our interventions beyond the typical therapy hour or normal contact in our office during a regular counseling session. At this time I will note the problem only briefly and hope there may be opportunity to respond to any questions about the issue if time permits later in the conference today. For me, this question gets into the dual role I have in being a professional psychologist and also being a high counselor in my stake and with the assignment for the Personal Welfare Services Program in the stake. In my latter role, all nine

bishops in our stake send their most difficult cases to me (ones that typically have the bishops "going under" themselves), and I then have a problem of getting inundated myself, and finding it difficult to not "go under" also from the heavy load of very time-consuming, bishop-referred cases--most of which are difficult, often very urgent situations. But I **do** have that dual role, and everyone of you here who has a similar role in the Church has such a dual role. To what extent, then, should we extend beyond the therapy hour or the therapy office? As I raise this question I am thinking of the following kinds of alternative interventions and extra-office involvements with clients and significant others: (1) trying to influence people to live the gospel as a way of getting better; (2) getting the clients permission to discuss their situation with their bishop or help facilitate their willingness to see their bishop; (3) getting their permission to involve another bishop, who may have to call someone in on church court; (4) discussing the concepts of sin and guilt, where appropriate, along with principles of repentance and forgiveness; (5) encouraging commitment to church activities and social involvement with potential friends in the church; (6) involving "significant others" as an adjunctive support system in the therapy process, etc.

I could tell you of several cases in which I am extensively involved outside of my office at the present time, but I will only have time for one particular case as an example. A young couple came to me, referred by a pediatrician to ask what to do about their four-year old daughter who had made a comment to her mother (and described in very graphic terms) about a situation she (the four year old) had experienced with her uncle--a situation which, if true as described by the little girl, obviously constituted child molesting, quite probably an act of sodomy upon the little girl by her mother's brother-in-law. My perception of the couple's presenting problem was that they had not come in for the purpose of reporting the uncle or to cause trouble for him. At least they did not indicate this in any of my three interviews with them. Their primary expressions of concern centered in wanting to know how to help their little girl and how to answer questions the little girl is now raising with them about the purported incident. They also wondered how this might impact upon the little girl as she gets older. I am reasonably convinced that they had no desire for vindictiveness in coming to me about the problem. They were not there to find out how to bring charges against the brother-in-law. This question did not arise.

During the first session I asked their permission to discuss the situation with their own bishop and for an introduction from their bishop to the brother-in-law's bishop, in order to also discuss the matter with the brother-in-law's bishop. I had the couple sign release-

of-information forms to this effect. We have not evidence of guilt, only what the little girl tells her parents, which I tend to believe. Also, I asked all six of my colleagues what they would be inclined to think if they were to hear this kind of graphic description from a four-year old little girl. All six of them said they would believe it, primarily because of the unique and specific description of the reported incident and the spontaneous manner in which the little girl had mentioned it. We also concurred in our general presumption of the relative honesty and innocence of four-year olds in matters like this.

I pursued the information I had with both bishops and the bishop of the girl's uncle subsequently called the man in for a personal interview regarding the report. The man (age 25) professed total innocence of any such incident with the little girl. His bishop and I had previously discussed the matter and had agreed that if the man did not confess any wrong doing to the bishop, that the bishop would refer the man to me and ask if he would be willing to see me on a voluntary basis. The man agreed to see me and showed no sign of malice or resistance in doing so. I subsequently saw the man (at no fee) and asked him if he would take the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). My invitation for him to take the test was at the end of an extensive session with him (2 1/2 hours). In my judgment the man's MMPI profile is "suspect," although it would probably not stand up in civil or criminal court action. Nevertheless, to me, the MMPI, along with my interview and "clinical intuition," led me to believe that there is a reasonably high possibility of the man's guilt.

During the first session I asked their permission to discuss the situation with their own bishop and for an introduction from their bishop to the brother-in-law's bishop, in order to also discuss the matter with the brother-in-law's bishop. I had the couple sign release-of-information forms to this effect. We have not evidence of guilt, only what the little girl tells her parents, which I tend to believe. Also, I asked all six of my colleagues what they would be inclined to think if they were to hear this kind of graphic description from a four-year old little girl. All six of them said they would believe it, primarily because of the unique and specific description of the reported incident and the spontaneous manner in which the little girl had mentioned it. We also concurred in our general presumption of the relative honesty and innocence of four-year olds in matters like this.

I pursued the information I had with both bishops and the bishop of the girl's uncle subsequently called the man in for a personal interview regarding the report. The man (age 25) professed total innocence of any such incident with the little girl. His bishop and I had

previously discussed the matter and had agreed that if the man did not confess any wrong doing to the bishop, that the bishop would refer the man to me and ask if he would be willing to see me on a voluntary basis. The man agreed to see me and showed no sign of malice or resistance in doing so. I subsequently saw the man (at no fee) and asked him if he would take the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). My invitation for him to take the test was at the end of an extensive session with him (2 1/2 hours). In my judgment the man's MMPI profile is "suspect," although it would probably not stand up in civil or criminal court action. Nevertheless, to me, the MMPI along with my interview and "clinical intuition" led me to believe that there is a reasonably high possibility of the man's guilt.

The man's bishop is now saying to me that since we have gone this far with the matter, it appears that someone is apparently lying and that we therefore cannot drop the matter unresolved. The bishop suggests that he and I get both couples together and confront all of them in a joint session. Obviously, this is far beyond the purpose for which the girl's mother and father came to see me initially, and my involvement at this point is on a moral and ethical level rather than merely a professional one. In other words, while the couple ostensibly came to me primarily to know how best to deal with concerns expressed by their young daughter, I felt very strongly that I should go beyond my professional role in this case, to involve and be involved with both bishops, not only because of the possibility of child molesting, but also because of the damaging effects the whole matter was having on the relationships among the parents, grandparents and inlaws of several families.

There are many other kinds of cases like this one which we all encounter, and in which I have found it helpful to reach out beyond the therapy hour, not only with the individuals who come for help, but where I ask them who else they are willing for me to involve, or who else they think it might be helpful to involve in seeking a solution to the problem. I am of the opinion that we can often maximize not only the potential of our professional expertise, but hopefully the inspiration of the Lord, also, in dealing with very difficult and troublesome issues like this, the answers to which are not always readily available or simple. I invite each of you to consider the extent to which you, or any of us, ought to go beyond the regular therapy process we conduct in our offices, or the extent to which we find ourselves at times **having** to do so out of a sense of moral conscience rather than merely performing our "professional role" and thus staying more comfortably apart and distant from the complex issues which arise in cases like the one I noted above.

One other brief comment and then I will stop. Another injunction (or thought) which I have shared freely with my clients the past several years came from Elder Hartman Rector when he visited our stake conference about three years ago. In our priesthood leadership meeting at that time Elder Rector told us that President Kimball had called the Brethren together and told them that "adultery is not cause for divorce". I did a "double take" in my mind for a moment, and then Elder Rector added, "adultery is cause for forgiveness and repentance. The person who has to repent may need to get outside the Church for a while to do it, but the one who must learn forgiveness also has an equally, if not more difficult task." I have had frequent occasion to present this notion to couples with whom I have worked over the years, but I have really done so only in the last few years as I have become more comfortable with and committed to the combining of my priesthood and professional roles--after Elder Rector's visit to our stake and his inspiring message to our priesthood leadership. So now, in the immediate case I discussed above, while I am pursuing the possible guilt of a man suspected of child molesting, I am also saying to the mother of the little girl, "If your brother-in-law is found guilty of molesting your daughter will you be able to learn the principle of forgiveness if he repents?" She looked shocked and said to me, "Will I have to do that? My response was, "If he repents, yes."

According to the teachings of President Kimball the same is true for a wife or husband whose spouse is unfaithful. As I encounter more and more potential divorce situations today, and when one spouse comes to me wanting a divorce because his or her partner has been unfaithful, I find myself quoting Elder Rector, saying "According to President Kimball, adultery is not cause for divorce. You can justify it, you may have adequate cause to take this action and your stake president or bishop will possibly go along with your decision, but learning forgiveness may be your task at this point, provided your spouse is willing to go the full route of repentance."

I have tried to present today some of my current thinking about a few issues--dilemmas--that are prominent for me. I invite your consideration of these issues and any questions you may want to raise, either

about the issues themselves or my discussion of them. I bear you my testimony that I personally have grown as I have been more willing to use the power and influence of my priesthood and testimony of the gospel within my professional practice, when doing so seems appropriate to a particular counseling situation and when I sense that it will be accepted, or at least heard by the client. I know, without any question in my mind or my heart, that as I am able to bear my testimony to those with whom I work, along with presenting my professional expertise as a psychologist--and if I convince my clients, in some degree, to believe what I am telling them, i.e. that living the gospel or scriptural principles will facilitate better solutions to life's problems, (which I believe is true in therapy situations for non-Mormons as well as Mormons)--then I feel that I help people better in that sense as a professional. From this view point, I have found that many processes we call "therapy" (and espouse as professionals) are not always therapeutic. Conversely, there are many other types of "helping" relationships and processes (including spiritual relationships and religious experiences) which are not "therapy," per se, but which can be, and very often are "therapeutic", i.e. **helpful** in the true sense of that term. I bear this personal testimony to you in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

References:

Jung, C.G. *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 1933.

Frankl, Viktor E. *The Doctor and the Soul: From Psychotherapy to Logotherapy*. Vintage Books, New York 1955, pp. X, XVII.

Gettis, Alan. "Soul Searching in Psychotherapy." *Religious Humanism*. Vol. X, No. 3, Summer 1976, 125-126.

Gettis, Alan. "Psychotherapy as Exorcism." *Journal of Religion and Health*. Vol. 15, No. 3, 1976, 187-190.

Jourard, Sidney M. *The Transparent Self: Self Disclosure and Well-Being*. D. VanNostrand Company, Inc. Princeton, New Jersey, 1964, p.g 76.

Margaret H. Hoopes, Ph. D.*

Many of the things Wayne just said I have thought

*Sister Hoopes is Associate Professor of Child Development and Family Relationships at BYU and former member of the AMCAP Governing Board.

about saying, and some of his dilemmas are also mine; but, I'm going to approach this assignment somewhat differently. Carlfred can ad lib from here as the three of us have not talked about what we are going to say.

As I thought about our topic and tried to select case

material I faced a dilemma immediately, that of confidentiality. As I look into your faces and see how many of you are my friends and how many of you know me in some role, I am very aware that the people with whom I do therapy, and from whom the case material would come, may possibly be known by you and may know you.

Let me illustrate my point. I have a teaching appointment at Brigham Young University. Consequently, I'm not paid to do therapy, but rather teach classes about therapy and supervise students in training while they do therapy. In order to keep my therapy skills current I carry three or four private cases. Usually the people who want to see me do not want to be in the Marriage and Family Therapy Clinic, nor do they want to be observed and known in any way. For example, a woman called last week and said that she needed to see me but that she was suspicious of therapists generally. She emphasized that she did not want to become case material in one of my classes. She indicated that I had been highly recommended by a friend, but she wanted assurance that I would not use her for case material. I assured her that I would not. As is often true I found that this woman is related to someone I know well. She exemplifies the dilemma of confidentiality in a Mormon community.

Thus the challenge facing me in this presentation. Minimize the political, religious, social, educational network we Mormons have. My task is to disguise information so that you won't recognize people or to have enough faith in you that if you do you will think not about the individuals, but only the examples given.

This dilemma of confidentiality faces me and my students continuously. What to do with all the information we have about people! Where does it fit? What do I do with it as a therapist, as a teacher, as a friend, as a spiritual leader, as a colleague?

My second dilemma has to do with training people to be therapists. In our training program we have returned missionaries, former bishops, former institute and seminary teachers, and members ranging widely in church experience and testimony. In addition we have non-member students with beliefs in God and various religious experiences. Some from both groups have established patterns of working with people correlated with mind sets about their relationship with God and their ability to help people change. My dilemma is how to teach them new information, new possibilities, without appearing to desire to move them away from the gospel or appear to be not gospel oriented myself.

The following example will demonstrate what I mean. I teach a graduate class, Introduction to Marriage and Family Therapy. The last objective deals with male and female roles and related issues and therapy. Several times teacher evaluations took place

immediately after this objective and before the end of class when we integrated all of the course material. A number of males in class rated me as having a low spiritual influence in class or of having little or no testimony. I learned to announce before we began the objective that my testimony was not going to change in two or three weeks as they read and discussed this objective.

I learned from this and several other experiences that if my behavior doesn't match the expectations of my students, and/or my clients, my motivations and my testimony may be questioned. As a teacher I value my role of raising questions, of bringing out issues, of looking at a situation from a number of different perspectives. I also value my testimony and my relationship to God. Yet, I find that I and my testimony will be questioned. It's a dilemma to me, not knowing when I'm going to be misread and questioned in this way. My understanding about dilemmas is that I may present them to you, but I don't have to solve them for you. So, I'll move on.

The third dilemma relates to one that Wayne talked about--is it a spiritual problem or is it a psychological one. For me the question is how does therapy fit with the gospel. Often we are taught to think in terms of black and white. To illustrate this point let me read from Brigham Young (Journal of Discourses, Volume 9, p. 121-125):

We are very apt, through our traditions, former associations, and notions of things and ideas, to attribute every act of man and every manifestation of mankind to an invisible source — the good or the evil. God is the author of all good; and yet, if you rightly understood yourselves, you would not directly attribute every good act you perform to our Father in heaven, nor to his Son Jesus Christ, nor to the Holy Ghost; neither would you attribute every evil act of a man or woman to the Devil or his spirits or influences; for man is organized by his Creator to act perfectly independently of all influences there are above or beneath. Those influences are always attending him, and are ready to dictate and direct — to lead him into truth or to lead him to destruction. But is he always guided by those influences in every act? He is not. It is ordained of God that we should act independently in and of ourselves, and the good is present when we need it. If we will ask for it, it is with us. If we yield to temptation, the evil is present, and nigh enough to lead every son and daughter of Adam to destruction, if they give way to it. **But it is the design of the Almighty that we should act independently. Then, when you see a person endowed by the Holy Ghost, you need not expect him to look and act precisely as you do.**

If we accept this as true then we need to teach therapists to act independently and yet present themselves in such a way that they can be open to the influence of the Spirit.

When I came out to BYU in 1970 controversy about how psychotherapy fits into the church was still

lively. I was disturbed by rumblings on campus manifesting distrust between religious leaders and psychologists. Add to that picture the fact that my non-LDS colleagues did not want me to move to BYU. They wondered what I could do there as a psychologist and thought my usefulness would be minimal.

As I listened to the rumblings on campus I began to wonder too. I decided to take the problem to the Lord. Essentially I said to him, "If what I have been taught to do and if who I am is useful to you, then you send me the people you want me to work with and direct me in what to do with them." I'm in a position in which I'm not reliant for a living on the number of clients I get or whether they can pay me for services. Once I made that offer I have had people sent to me by the Lord. I have known very clearly that this person or this family is who the Lord wants me to work with.

I remember very clearly the first time this happened to me. It was on a Monday after a weekend of introspection about being overloaded and overworked. I had resolved to limit the number of speaking engagements I accepted and to cut down on the number of clients I would see. I walked out of my class and there waiting for me was a young woman whom I had met that weekend at an informal gathering. She asked to talk to me for a moment. In my office she said that the reason she attended that gathering was to meet me. She indicated that through prayer she had been guided to me. Then she presented her problem and it was a sticky one. Though I was sympathetic I knew that I didn't want it, nor did it fit in with my new resolutions. I hastily thought about therapists who could handle her particular problem. I opened my mouth to tell her that I knew she needed help and that it was available through another therapist. That isn't what I said. I said I would help her. And at that moment I knew the Lord was directing her and he was directing me. I had no choice if I meant to keep my promise to the Lord. She was the

first of many.

Very often their problems seem insurmountable and I wonder how I will find the right direction. However, it is evident to me that I get additional help with them. I get stuck, as I do with other cases, but not for long, and sometimes the resolutions are startling. As Wayne mentioned, some cases don't fit the 50 minutes once a week in my office mold. I find myself in their homes, on a mountain side, or sitting on a sun deck. I spend two hours, eight hours, or a 24 hour marathon. I work with the entire family or with part.

One of the biggest differences is that I love them as friends, as my brothers and sisters. That's a dilemma for me. Are they friends? What's the difference between me and them? Do I just have some skills they don't have? How do I know when therapy is over? How do I shift my role into something else, and what should it be?

I'm not taking the time to share some of the events or directions these experiences have taken me. But, often those people are still special people in my life. We may be a part of a group and someone will ask me how I know so and so. While I'm gulping and wondering what to say the other person speaks right out. She/he explains that I was once her/his therapist and that he/she was directed by the Lord to me. I think this is one of the dilemmas in our culture. How do we—or do we always—separate friendship and therapy? I know that it's wise to do so for some clients. It has not been that way for me for those people who have been sent directly to me by the Lord.

These are the dilemmas I've chosen to share with you and to invite you to think about. I know that the faith I have in myself, in the Lord, and in people's ability to change lead me into and out of these dilemmas. I learn from each excursion and am grateful for them. I say these things in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

Carlfred B. Broderick, Ph. D.*

I really feel very vulnerable today because my dark fantasy is that most of you won't agree with how I dealt with this case or that those who do agree will do so for the wrong reasons. I don't see any way that I can win or you can win, it's a double bind for both of us. But it seemed like a good one to share because I can't believe that it's something that others don't run in to. Let me

*** Brother Broderick is Executive Director of the Human Relations Center and Director of the Marriage and Family Therapy Program at University of Southern California and member of The AMCAP Board of Governors.**

just say that the problem that I've encountered is that people don't come packaged right for me.

Recently I've been going around doing the White House Family Conference circuit and all too often I find that the people whose values I'm in favor of I don't like. When I run into people who seem to be my kind of people, people that I like, they turn out to be pro-abortion, etc. The dilemma I want to share with you is that kind of dilemma.

A year or so ago a couple came to me. Actually the wife was more or less dragged into this by her husband. He was a tall, good looking, dynamic, charismatic, successful, tanned, faithful Latter-day Saint, loyal to

the Church, from a long pioneer family background. He had married a girl that was younger than himself by ten or twelve years, not a member of the Church but he converted her, he swept her into the Church and into the marriage. And they were sealed in the temple, although according to her it never quite took with her. He insisted that's not true. He insisted that she was a good Latter-day Saint for 10 years then she had a romantic flirtation with someone which he dealt with by setting private detectives on her and tapping the telephone and confronting her with the tapes, and so on. It was always kind of a father-daughter relationship (except that they had a great sex life), but for the most part he trained her and he taught her. And it included some rebelliousness on the part of the "child." On his side he kept her on very short rein; he didn't give her much money for herself or the children or the house. She complained that they never had enough money to furnish the house because he was busy buying the boat and so forth. You can fill in the rest of her complaints. He was very critical of anything she did that wasn't right in the mode of the Mother-in-Zion syndrome. Well, when she got her children mostly raised (they had 5 kids) she went back to school and found she just thrived on it. She went into a professional field dominated by men. She was bright and she had good mathematical ability and she got A's and everybody looked up to her and thought she was a wonder and sort of courted her. It quite turned her head in some ways and she became again romantically involved and finally sexually involved with another student who was younger than she was by as much as she was younger than her husband but who made her feel wonderful, who looked up to her, who thought she was terrific in every way. She became his mentor and helped him through school. He adored her, didn't look down on her or treat her like a child or cut her allowance or try to tap her telephone, etc. She became sexually involved with him not so she could live with him because she didn't have any fantasies that that would work out but as a statement of her independence from her old life. She left her family and entered into a zestful, lusty, re-discovery of herself, rejecting the gospel and her family.

It was at this point that her husband brought her in for me to straighten out and bring back into the fold. He wasn't up to therapy for himself. He brought her in to be therapized. After 2 or 3 weeks we began to meet separately because joint sessions didn't work very well. He would sit there directing the session and I would get more and more resentful. In the separate session all he would talk about was how he and I could be co-conspirators to get her back into the gospel. He knew that I had to do that because I was a stake president and had no choice, so he could count on me as an ally.

But it seemed to me that he did terrible things. For

example, he broke into her house and hid (he wouldn't tell me where--under the bed or in the closet) and witnessed one of their love making scenes and taped it and played it back to her. He was constantly peeking in windows when she was with her boyfriend.

She, on the other hand, was a person who was in some ways a model client. She was in some pain because although she was really enjoying her freedom and her new found sense of worth and so on, her children with their father and everybody else in the Church had renounced her and wouldn't have anything to do with her. Her initial tactic was to tough all of this out but she had a lot of pain underneath (I'm good at getting at people's pain). So for me she was a great client. She worked hard trying to figure out who she was and what she was doing and what she wanted.

From time to time he would get her to come back for a while (they were sexually great together) and then he would do something outrageous. Eventually, as you can see, I became counted as her therapist and his adversary. I became her strength to deal with his strength. As a result, he came to feel, I think still feels, that I ought to be hauled before a court, a church court and/or a civil court or both or perhaps a mafia contract would be nice. From a therapeutic point of view she is doing very well. That is, she feels stronger, she's making better choices, she's no longer promiscuous in her sexual activity, she's taking better care of herself, she's back in contact with her children, she's re-established one by one her contact with them. But she's still living a life that isn't close to the Church. I've not borne my testimony to her although she knows very well where I stand. She's very grateful for the therapy she's received and she thinks of me as someone who helped her in a time of need and really saved her.

On the other hand, of course, he's mad at me and feels that I have sustained her and supported her in her immoral life style, that I have irreversibly blown the opportunity that I've had to bring her back into the fold. In fact, from his point of view I've strengthened her in resisting the efforts he has made to bring her back in. And that's the dilemma. I like her; I don't like him and I don't know if I could convince a church court that I did the right thing.

Now I feel the need to add that I'm really not a bad stake president. I love the Lord and there are times when the Spirit of the Lord is very powerfully present. Even in my practice I have told people they need blessings in the worst way. Since I can't charge for those sessions it costs me \$60 everytime I give somebody a blessing. And I consider that a small thing.

In any case, the point is I feel the Lord uses me as an instrument in many instances. Did he use me as an instrument in this instance or was I acting out of some set of transferences or counter-transferences that have

nothing to do with that? Was I simply weak and unable to do the things that a good Latter-day Saint, a courageous Latter-day Saint, would have done--busting through her defenses with the Spirit, dragging her kicking and screaming back into the fold? I have a sense of peace about that myself but I have no idea if anybody else in the world except her would ever agree.

And that is the dilemma that I am trusting might correspond to some of your own experiences. I do want to bear witness, though, that I know that this is the true Church and that the gospel is of infinite value to everyone. It's just that sometimes that doesn't seem to be the only issue that I'm dealing with. I leave that dilemma with you and hope that you'll come up with charitable evaluations.

SUMMARY SESSION

Because of time limitations, only two people were invited to give reports of group discussions: Steven R. Covey and Glen Grygla. Brother Covey indicated that in his group they focused primarily on the case reported by Brother Broderick. They felt that it was a very good case, in that it represented the dilemma very well--the idealism of Gospel standards vs. the realism of bigotry and adultery. He reported (with tongue in cheek) that they didn't know who to excommunicate: the bigot or the adulteress. They finally decided to excommunicate Carlfred for loving the adulteress and hating the bigot!

In a more serious vein, he reported the feelings of the members of his group to the effect that ultimately the dilemma of integrating our religious convictions with our professional practice is a personal one which we face in our homes as well as in our professional lives and that each of us must resolve it personally. There is a "comfort zone" within which we operate which is transferred to our role as counselors. This comfort zone is a big factor in dealing with these cases. The resolution of the dilemma involves an effort to work closely with the Spirit. The more a person works on his relationship with the Savior, the more power he/she has to be open, to separate the person from the person's deed, to love both the bigot and the adulteress unconditionally and to come up with a far more accurate diagnosis of the situation.

Brother Grygla raised five questions that were formulated by his group for the panelists:

1. Would you have treated your clients differently if you had not been a stake president or a high councilor? Why has therapy changed for you since you received your priesthood calling?
2. Was the case of sodomy reported? When do we decide to report or refer?
3. Do we ever release information without permission?
4. Who has stewardship to determine what therapy is to be given? The client, the counselor, or the bishop? May we, as counselors, ever counsel the bishop?
5. Regarding becoming a friend to our clients, how far should we go?

He then invited Brothers Broderick and Wright to respond to the first question.

Brother Broderick: I get into a lot of trouble by not being a different person in different roles. My goal is to be integrated, to be the same in all my roles. I've learned a lot from the Lord in my role as stake president. I am forced into the presence of the Lord. I have changed as a person. We don't work as hard to get the Spirit in our private lives as we do in our appointed lives. When you have the Spirit with you it radiates. That is enhanced by my calling. My prayer is that I'll find a way after I am released to keep that Spirit with me.

Brother Wright: I don't ever raise the question of religion until I hear it coming through from them. If they don't raise the issue, it never comes up. My therapy hasn't changed drastically. I still teach my students not to impose their values on their clients, but it's alright to expose them. My testimony has grown and I have become more open and willing to make statements when they give me clues that they are receptive. For example, I recently received a letter from a woman who thanked me for telling her (as she remembered it) that she would never be mentally well until she healed herself spiritually. She said that she thought at the time that I was a fool, but now she realizes that I was right. She reported that she is making good progress in both areas now. To me that is a testimony.

Sister Hoopes responded by invitation to Question #5: When clients get to the point where they no longer want to take but to give, we need to learn how to accept. But it is still a dilemma for me. I need to increase my capacity to love, to receive. I not only give therapy, I am in therapy--if you know what I mean. I used to tell my groups as we terminated that I loved them and that I wanted to have contact with them. But then my telephone would start to ring and with all my other responsibilities I couldn't handle it. My first impulse was to not get close, to not let people in, not to give and not to receive. But then I decided no, that's not what I wanted--I wanted to live each moment with each person

for whatever I could give and for whatever I could get. That's what earth life is all about. We're here to partake of whatever is here at the moment. So I would tell them, "I want you to know that I love you and that I value what you've given me and I do want to have contact with you but it's impossible for me to do that and continue to do what I'm doing." In some way that's still the same dilemma that I have. How much contact am I going to have with this person who is now a part of me and I'm a part of them? If you can resolve it, good luck.

The following responses were given to Questions #2 and #3:

Brother Wright: The Church is very specific about the importance of keeping confidences. I would not go to a stake president or a bishop with anything without the permission of the client. We must honor and respect the confidences of the client. That's absolute.

Brother Broderick: As ecclesiastic authorities we are not required by law to report to civil authorities. A recent letter from the First Presidency instructs us not to reveal confidences.

Limitations of time precluded further comments or responses to the questions. Readers are invited to submit their comments about these and/or related questions either to the Journal or to the members of the panel.

HUMILITY

**Humility before God
Is the beginning of Faith**

**Humility for Humanity
Is the beginning of Understanding**

**Humility toward Life
Is the beginning of Gratitude**

**Humility with Responsibility
Is the beginning of Liberty**

**Humility over Weakness
Is the beginning of Wisdom**

**But Self-Respect
Is the beginning of Humility**

James N. Baumgarten

SCRIPTURAL INSIGHTS INTO HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND THE FACILITATION OF BEHAVIOR CHANGE

By Burton C. Kelly, Ph. D.*

(Based on a presentation made at the October 1979 AMCAP Convention)

Following the Savior's famous challenging and somewhat abstract sermon on the bread of life, "... many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." (John 6:66.) Then Jesus turned to the Twelve and asked, "Will ye also go away?" (John 6:67.) Simon Peter, serving as spokesman for his brethren, gave a most illuminating and direct answer to this query. "... Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the Living God." (John 6:68-69.) Jesus is the Christ and does have the words of eternal life. If his words are sufficient to bring us eternal life, should they not also be sufficient and have the power to bring us the happiness and joy we seek in this life? Despite the assertions of some who have stated that the scriptures are not designed to answer social and psychological questions but rather to teach doctrine and moral principles, I submit that the scriptures serve as a meaningful foundation for all helping relationships. The rationale for this assertion follows:

Rationale for Using the Scriptures in Helping Relationships

1. They teach pure and correct principles.

President Heber C. Kimball, President Spencer W. Kimball's grandfather, many years ago gave this thought provoking statement. "... we become degenerate by receiving principles that are less pure and perfect than the principles of God." (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 4, p. 222.) Accepting this statement as true, false and inadequate principles are not just harmless but harmful. It suggests that pragmatic principles are not adequate just because they work. They also need to be true. There have been various therapeutic techniques that have been found to "work" at least for the moment which subsequently have been found to have deleterious effects in a person's life.

2. Reason two is a corollary of reason one, i.e. the scriptures contain the truths to prevent and correct the bases of psychogenic psychopathology. (Please keep in mind that throughout these comments I am not talking about psychopathology due to physiological trauma, hormonal imbalances, etc., but due to psychological factors.) I submit, that the bases of psychogenic

psychopathology are (1) violations of laws of thought and/or action by self, and perhaps others; (2) disruption of healthy, loving relationships.

Although there are those who may state that there are psychological problems caused entirely by the behavior of others, I believe this view is not supported by reason nor by most current professional thinking, especially by cognitive theorists. We don't really get into trouble nor have problems by knowing and living the truth. We get into trouble when we don't know the truth or know it and don't live it--either in thought and/or action. The Savior stated, "... If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples in deed; and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:31-32.) It is important to distinguish between challenges and problems. We all experience various challenges probably every day of our lives. Oftentimes these challenges are largely due to the behavior of others and other circumstances often beyond our control. These challenges, however, do not become problems to us as long as we face them openly and follow correct principles of thought and action in dealing with them. The problems result when we try to hide from our challenges, deny or project our responsibilities, or in other ways seek to deal with challenges by avoiding and/or distorting truth and reality. For example, a person may be berated, ridiculed, castigated, etc., but until he internalizes these negative comments and responds with bitterness, resentment, anger, non-forgiveness, or the like, he does not have a problem--a challenge, yes, but a problem, no.

Both clinical experience and empirical research unequivocally have found that persons suffering from emotional disorders have experienced a disruption of healthy, loving relationships. The scriptures contain the basic principles essential for, and of, healthy, loving relationships.

3. Reason three is that the scriptures offer fundamental insights into each of the three basic elements of counseling relationships: (1) identification of the problem(s); (2) determination of the desired outcome(s); (3) a behavior change process. These three elements are found in all counseling relationships and usually in each interview thereof. The professional behavioral sciences do make significant contributions in each of these three areas. However, I submit that the contributions thereof are neither adequately validated nor sufficient.

*Brother Kelly is Professor of Educational Psychology and a counselor at BYU.

It is well known that therapists of different theoretical persuasions and even within the same persuasion not only define problems differently but some therapists see given behaviors as problems while others do not. To illustrate, Dr. Louis A. Moench in his session earlier this morning indicated that he would rather have been in either of the other sessions than his own. For one, he would like to have been in the session on the treatment of masturbation, remarking that this was the only group that he knew of that treated masturbation as an illness rather than a treatment. Among the many other examples that could be given are homosexuality and anger. As you may know, various of the professional organizations have defined homosexuality as no longer a problem, very much contrary to the teachings of the prophets. Many therapists would be satisfied with helping people to learn how to express their anger constructively and not suppress it. Others, such as myself, believe that with most people the elimination of anger and dealing with the causes thereof is more important and see anger itself as a problem.

While obviously the definition of the problem helps determine the target(s) of therapy, even with similar problem definitions different outcome targets might be selected. Both the determination of what the problem is and the determination of an appropriate target are based on a value system. Every therapeutic system and every theory thus involves a value system, though there may still be a few professionals who claim that they don't. For example, nearly all therapy systems have two basic philosophical assumptions that I believe are false. One of them is hedonism, or that which gives the individual the greatest pleasure and the least pain is best for him. The second is relativity of values--every person's values are as good as everybody else's and there is no such thing as an absolute value system. Everything is relative. Ethics are situational. Perry London (*The Modes and Morals of Psychotherapy*. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1946, pp. 6 and 173) rightly stated that psychotherapy is a "moral enterprise." There is in reality only one true set of values and where two values differ, while both may be wrong, only one can be true and correct. That true set of values is contained in the scriptures and teachings of the prophets.

It is in the third element, that of the behavior change process, that I think our professions have the most to offer. But I submit that to the degree that we understand what the scriptures teach, we find within them the most fundamental behavior change processes both in general and specific terms. All change involves the principle and process of repentance (recognition of undesired behavior, remorse for such, restitution where appropriate, and reformation), a principle of growth

and change which is described nowhere else as well as in the scriptures.

To recapitulate, I find that the scriptures have answers in each of the three basic elements cited, and that generally the answers given in the scriptures are superior to most of what I have been taught professionally. It was the finding of a plethora of confusing and contradictory ideas both in theory and research that primarily led me to accept the scriptures many years ago, while studying at the University of Chicago, as the standard by which I would judge those things read and experienced pertaining to helping relationships. Experiences and learning through these many intervening years have supported this early decision that the gospel and the scriptures do contain the answers that we need.

A fourth reason for using the scriptures, in this instance directly and not just indirectly, was that **with active Latter-day Saints having an abiding faith in the scriptures, such use helps them to have the necessary confidence in us and the methods we use** that enables us to be of help to them. Without meaningful confidence in us and our approaches as being helpful, we have very little chance of really being helpful to others. For an inactive Latter-day Saint who has only limited, if any, faith in the scriptures, and may be fighting against the Church, the direct use of the scriptures may very frankly have opposite results.

After carefully reviewing and evaluating studies of therapeutic outcomes, Allen Bergin and Michael Lambert have concluded that while the primary determining factor of psychotherapy outcome(s) is pre-existent client factors, the second largest factor accounting for change is **the characteristics of the therapist**--with technique variables coming in a distant third (Bergin, Allen E. and Lambert, Michael J. "The Evaluation of Therapeutic Outcome," in *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*, 2nd Ed. edited by Garfield, Sol L. and Bergin, Allen E., 1978, p. 180.) Also since therapy is largely a teaching process and probably in all teaching the first and last thing we teach is ourselves, it seems not discordant with reason to concur that the personality of the therapist is critical. From my own personal experience I have come to believe that, as we immerse ourselves deeply in the scriptures, daily make them a part of our lives, and not only read them but meditate and ponder upon them, we do become like the teachings found in the scriptures. Yes, "as [a man] thinketh in his heart, so is he. . . ." (Prov. 23:7.) We are commanded to read the scriptures not only to strengthen our faith and testimonies and to gain additional understanding of the gospel, but perhaps more fundamentally that we might become as the scriptures teach. I believe for this commandment, and virtually if not all other commandments, we come

to know the personal reason(s) thereof only after we've lived the commandment and not before. You will recall that as Adam was offering sacrifices unto the Lord an angel came to him and asked him, "Adam, why dost thou offer sacrifices unto the Lord?" and Adam responded, "I know not, save the Lord commanded me." (Moses 5:6) Then the angel told him the why of the commandment.

Although I am committed to the belief that the scriptures form a meaningful foundation for all helping relationships, there are **some necessary cautions**. The Savior said that his word was a two-edged sword, and the scriptures can be a two-edged sword. I think they must be used with as much emphatic sensitivity, if not more, than other tools and aids in therapy. We must not only be very sensitive as to how to use them but very sensitive as to the individual's ability to profit from them and be led by the Spirit in using God's word. The scriptures also need to be used with love and warmth, not with coercion nor to induce fear. I believe these elements are contrary to the principles of the scriptures and the gospel. We also need to keep in mind the 13th Article of Faith, "If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report or praiseworthy, we seek after these things." There are teachings and principles in our professional backgrounds and training that are virtuous, lovely, of good report, and praiseworthy, so that I am not suggesting we forget everything that we have learned professionally, but that the scriptures serve as our standard and guide and as a basis for our therapeutic endeavors. Further, the scriptures are used sometimes I think to create dependence, a very inappropriate use of the scriptures. They can and ought to be used to foster self-reliance.

If you have watched some of my interviews, you might say, "Well, you never used the scriptures once, you never quoted them, you never cited them, you never read them with the client, you never referred the client to them." That would be true for a lot of my interview sessions—that I never quoted, cited, read, nor referred to a single scripture. Even though they may not be quoted or cited, I do use the scriptures to help me identify the true problem, to help the client to determine a truly helpful outcome and determine effective and appropriate behavioral change procedures; so while there are many different ways to effectively and directly use the scriptures with some clients, I always use them indirectly and endorse their indirect if not direct use.

Some "Hidden Treasures"

Now to look at some "hidden treasures" within the scriptures. In the promises at the conclusion of the Word of Wisdom the Lord stated, "And all saints who remember to keep and do these things, [and note especially] walking in obedience to the commandments. . .

shall find wisdom and great treasures of knowledge, even hidden treasures . . ." (D&C 89:18-19.) With what study I have done, I testify that there are many "hidden treasures" in the scriptures pertaining to human behavior and behavior change, and that often it's these "hidden treasures" that are most helpful in helping others to grow therapeutically. I share with you a few of those treasures which have been hidden to me until this more intensive study. Perhaps some of them are "hidden treasures" to you also and will hopefully be helpful to you.

The Savior stated, "**Love your enemies,**" (Matt. 5:44.) This commandment has often appeared to be an impossible challenge, an horrendous task, and many have asked, "How do you do it?" Recall Nephi's classical statement (1 Ne. 3:7) ". . . I will go and do the things which the Lord has commanded, for I know that the Lord giveth no commandments unto the children of men, save he shall prepare a way for them that they may accomplish the thing which he commanded them." Now recall what the Savior said in the same verse immediately following the commandment, "**Love your enemy.**" ". . . **bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you.** . . ." (Bold added) Thus, with the commandment, the Savior did give the answer to how to obey it.

Although I have a great deal of respect for rational behavior therapy and use a number of the principles thereof, the adequacy of one of the **criteria of rational thought** that Dr. Maxie Maultsby gives is seriously questioned by a statement from Jacob 4:13: referring to the Spirit, Jacob said, ". . . it speaketh of **things as they really are, and of things as they really will be . . .**" (Bold added) Dr. Maultsby's related criterion is, is the thought in question concordant with objective reality? I submit that the present "objective reality" is often not sufficient but that we must have an awareness of situations not only as they appear to be, but as they really are and as they really will be. Without that knowledge, many thoughts and behaviors, as evidenced by a review of several of Dr. Maultsby's cases, will be determined to be rational and healthy when in fact, in accordance with the scriptures, they are not. For further thoughts on Jacob's statement, I suggest you read Elder Neal A Maxwell's talk given at our October AMCAP conference, 1978, which is contained in the AMCAP Journal, Vol. 5, Issue one.

Questions regarding the why and purpose of **human suffering and trials** in life have been raised and discussed from antiquity. There are many beautiful statements in the scriptures giving the reasons for such, but note this one from Alma (7:11:13). Referring to the son of God, he stated, "He shall go forth, suffering pains and afflictions and temptations of every kind. . . and he will

take upon him their infirmities, that his bowels may be filled with mercy, according to the flesh, that he may know according to the flesh how to succor his people according to their infirmities. . . .” (Cf. Heb. 2:16-18 and D&C 62:1.) Thus it appears that even the Savior had to experience trials and difficulties in order to develop empathic sensitivities to know how to best assist others. When I think of some of my most difficult and challenging experiences, I likewise note that I am better able to understand and help others because of them.

A rationale for the use of specific words and the importance of the words we use is given in the Doctrine and covenants 19:6-7. “. . . but it is written **endless torment**. Again, it is written **eternal damnation**; wherefore it is more express than other scriptures, that it might work upon the hearts of the children of men, altogether for my name’s glory.” Yes, often the specific words that we use do make a great deal of difference.

The true place and contribution of the helper is expressed in 3 Ne. 18:32 wherein the Nephite saints were commanded regarding those that may be excommunicated from them. “. . . ye shall not cast them out of your synagogues, nor your places of worship, for unto such shall you continue to minister; for ye know not but what they shall return and repent, and come unto me with full purpose of heart, and **I shall heal them**; and ye shall be the means of bringing salvation unto them.” (Bold added) Yes, one of the necessary prerequisites of a fully functioning helper is humility and an appropriate recognition of his/her strengths and limitations in the helping process and how and by whom the healing actually occurs. This scripture places these factors in proper perspective.

We need various **guidelines** to help us in determining whose counsel we follow, what leaders we select, and **whom we support**. Recall the council in heaven where Satan came and presented his plan. Note the striking contrast in the words of his proposal to the Father to save mankind and that of the Savior. “. . . he [Satan] came before me, saying--Behold, here am I, send **me**, I will be thy son, and I will redeem all mankind, that one soul shall not be lost, and surely I will do it; wherefore give **me** thine honor. But, behold, my Beloved son, which was my Beloved and Chosen from the beginning, said unto me--Father, **thy** will be done and the glory be **thine** forever.” (Moses 4:1-2, Bold added) Note the accent on personal pronouns and self-seeking by the Adversary. He used six personal pronouns in that one short proposal statement whereas the Savior used none. Now this is not to say that the Savior never used the personal pronoun I, for He did, such as “I am the way, the truth, and the life” (John 14:6), but He used it in a very different way. It wasn’t in a self-glorifying, self-aggrandizing sense. (I suggest the “I” criterion as an excellent one to use in our efforts

to not be deceived.)

The development of self-reliance in ourselves and clients is one of the most important goals of therapy and life in general. Let’s examine how the Savior taught self-reliance. First, keep in mind what He says in Doctrine and Covenants 58:27-28. “Verily I say, men should be anxiously engaged in a good cause, and do many things of their own free will, and bring to pass much righteousness; **for the power is in them**, wherein they are agents unto themselves.” (Bold added) Yes, even with the most seriously disturbed, there is power to make some steps in a positive direction. Note what the Savior said in speaking to the Twelve in 3 Ne. 28:1. “**What is it that you desire of me**, after that I am gone to the Father?” (Bold added) He placed the responsibility squarely on them to do their own thinking, to exercise their own initiative, to sort out their own values. Also in 3 Ne. 27:2, as he spoke to his disciples he said, “What will ye that I shall give unto you?” Although he knew not only what they needed but what they wanted, he did not tell them. He was concerned about developing self-reliance. Note also the illustration of the Brother of Jared in the second chapter of Ether. The Lord said unto the Brother of Jared after he had constructed his vessels to cross the ocean, “What will ye that I should do that ye may have light in your vessels? . . .” Then after Socratically questioning Jared, he said, “. . . therefore what will ye that I should prepare for you that ye may have light when ye are swallowed up in the depths of the sea?” (Ether 2:23 and 25) No, the Lord didn’t tell him how to light the vessels, although he no doubt knew many ways. The Brother of Jared went and thought about his situation and then came back to the Lord with a solution and asked the Lord to light the stones that he had prepared. Yes, the Savior effectively taught and practiced the principle of self-reliance.

Coping Successfully with Stress

Let’s now look at the application of gospel principles to a significant psychological problem, perhaps the most significant, that of unhealthy psychological stress. Stress obviously lies behind all anxiety reaction, underlies depression, and is probably involved with every emotional difficulty we deal with. Let’s look very briefly at 12 principles which I accept as being true and that are either derived from or supported by the scriptures. (Following each principle, I list a few of the key scriptures pertaining thereto.)

1. **I will not let my heart be troubled; as I think in my heart, so am I; I will think truths.** (Prov. 23:7 and John 14:1 and 27) As the writer of Proverbs indicated, we are as we think in our hearts. As we think truths, we reap the fruits thereof; as we think irrational, unhealthy, untrue ideas, we reap the fruits of those.

Note carefully the Savior's blessing of peace found in the 14th chapter of John. "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. **Let** not your heart be troubled, neither **let** it be afraid." (Bold added) This could be very threatening to think that in order to be troubled or afraid I have to **let** myself be troubled or afraid, yet it is very comforting also, for it suggest that I have the power within me to modify my feeling. I am in control. As I think, so am I. The next principle is a direct corollary.

2. I create my own stresses; therefore, I can uncreate and prevent them by living the laws of peace. (Luke 2:13-14, John 10:10, D&C 130:20-21) Again, this is potentially an extremely threatening statement, but also a most comforting one. While pressures may come from the outside, internal stress is caused by how we receive and interpret those pressures, and they can be either a curse or a blessing to us. The mission of the Savior and the gospel is to bring us peace and an abundant life. This is derived by obedience to the specific laws pertaining to peace. Note that in D&C 130:20-21 the Lord states, "There is a law, irrevocably decreed in heaven before the foundations of this world, upon which all blessings are predicated and when we obtain any blessing from God, it is by obedience to that law upon which it is predicated." Contrariwise, we can't become anxiety laden without obeying the laws of anxiety. You, no doubt, have had people say to you, "I pay a full tithing, pay my fast offerings, go to church every Sunday, accept and try to magnify my callings, and therefore why am I depressed? [anxious, or whatever the problem may be] Is the gospel not true?" This fallacious interpretation results from not noting carefully what the scripture states--that every blessing is obtained by obedience to **that law** upon which it is based. I've developed a gross and perhaps somewhat dumb analogy to emphasize this point. Suppose we have a person who's had no previous experience with gardens decide to follow the counsel of the Prophet and plant a garden. It being late in the season, he doesn't take the necessary time to learn about the various seeds. To save money, he buys in bulk rather than by package. His family really loves corn so they plant a lot of corn, presumably. After three weeks or so he invites one of the neighbors over to look at his beautiful corn crop. The neighbor makes no response and after feeling additional pressure to respond, embarrassedly states, "Well, John, I'm sorry to say this, but that isn't corn at all. That's watermelon." The neophyte gardener then says, "Well, how could that be? I'm an active member of the church, I'm following the counsel of the prophet, I'm as obedient as I know how to be to the Gospel. How could the Lord allow that?"

Well, my family and I will fast and pray this weekend that the Lord will change that watermelon to corn." Please do not take this as being sacrilegious or overly facetious about a sacred principle. Yes, the Lord could change that watermelon to corn if he wanted to, but ordinarily he doesn't and won't. Why? Because he wants us to learn the specific laws and be obedient to the laws. If he lifted from us all of our depressed moments, our anxiety reactions, etc. when we prayed and fasted for such, he'd be doing us a great disservice. We would not learn the laws of peace and happiness. He allows us to take consequences in order that we might learn more effectively. I think our prayers and fasting would be more effective if we asked the Lord to help us to know the laws which we need to follow in order to have the peace that we desire.

3. I will prepare myself well for my responsibilities, including spiritual preparation, so that I shall not fear. (D&C 38:30, Isaiah 57:20-21) Yes, the Lord promises us that we shall not fear if we are prepared. My experience suggests that we must not only be prepared to deliver a talk, to perform a given act, but also must have our hearts and spirits right, must be speaking and serving for the sake and blessing of others rather than to obtain adulation and glory. If we are truly prepared spiritually and for the specific task at hand, I submit we shall not fear.

4. I will develop increasing love for others and myself and let virtue garnish my thoughts unceasingly that my confidence shall wax strong. (D&C 121:45-46, Matt. 22:36-40, Romans 14:22, Moroni 8:16) Perhaps the best key that I know of to having healthy self-confidence is "Let thy bowels also be full of charity toward all men, and to the household of faith, and let virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy confidence wax strong in the presence of God. . ." And may I suggest also, self-confidence in the presence of others. Yes, perfect charity does cast out all fears, (Moroni 8:16) and, as Paul told the Roman saints, we are to have faith in ourselves not condemn ourselves. (Romans 24:22)

5. I can do no better today than my today's best; my best tomorrow will be better. (2 Nephi 28:30) The Lord does give us line upon line and precept upon precept. We often act as if we should have been able to make the decisions of yesterday with the knowledge that we received today or should have been able to perform yesterday's skill with the skill that we have developed today. In the process of so thinking we berate ourselves and suffer anxiety. If only we would remember that the best we can do today is in accordance with our present knowledge and skills of today.

6. I believe in becoming perfect; I also believe in the law of eternal progression (President Joseph Fielding Smith quote from McConkie, Bruce R., *Doctrines of*

Salvation, 1955, Vol. 2, pp. 18-19) I have often startled and quickly obtained the full attention of some devoted Latter-day Saints by asking them why they didn't believe in the gospel. Both perplexed and somewhat irritated, they ask, "What do you mean?" I respond that they have been telling me in nearly every sentence that they believed that they had to be perfect today and since they weren't, they were worthless, but that they didn't really believe in the law of eternal progression. If they really believed in that law in a functional rather than in an abstract sense, they wouldn't have the problems they had just cited to me. I then cite the quote of President Joseph Fielding Smith from the reference above. "I believe the Lord meant just what he said: that we should be perfect, as our Father in Heaven is perfect. That will not come all at once, but line upon line, precept upon precept, example upon example, and even then not as long as we live in this mortal life, for we will have to go even beyond the grave before we reach that perfection and shall be like God. But here we lay the foundation. . . It is our duty to be better today than we were yesterday, and better tomorrow than we are today. . . If we are keeping the commandments of the Lord, we are on that road to perfection, and that can only come through obedience and the desire in our hearts to overcome the world."

7. **I will do all things in order and be diligent, but not attempt to run faster nor labor more than I have strength.** (Mosiah 4:27, D&C 10:4, Luke 10:39-42) Yes, in order to achieve the prize, we must be diligent, but it is not requisite nor desirable, in fact it is undesirable, that we should run faster than we have strength. However, "all things must be done in order." I have repeatedly reminded myself of that verse and continue to do so as needed. Note also the Savior's counsel to Martha regarding Mary's work in Luke 10:39-42.

8. **I will have Godly sorrow for my sins that leads to repentance, not the sorrow of the world; I will keep my eye on the next time, not the last time.** (II Cor. 7:10) This statement of Paul to the Corinthians is a most beautiful one. Probably most of the people who come to us are initially expressing the sorrow of the world rather than godly sorrow. A good way to distinguish between the two is that in godly sorrow we look only at the past long enough to learn how to do better the next time, and our focus is on the next time rather than the last time. This focus strengthens us and helps us to do better in the future while worldly sorrow, focusing on the last time, keeps us in the failures of the past. It is like driving too fast over a bad road, hitting a chuckhole and then continuing to drive forward while looking backward through the rearview mirror saying, "Oh, that was a horrible chuckhole I hit. I wonder if my springs were damaged, my axle cracked. I should have been driving slower," etc. What's likely to happen. Of

course, a more serious accident and more problems. Similarly, our emotional lives get more troubled and problem ridden with worldly sorrow.

9. **I will remember to live by "want to" rather than "have to."** (2 Nephi 2:26-27, Helaman 14:30-31, D&C 58:26-29) Yes, we do have our free agency, we really do, and the power is in us to do many things of our own free will. As we examine carefully what we do, we see that we really do live by "want to's." Everything you and I do is because we want to do it. There isn't anything we do that we have to. While you may question that, think about it. For example, even if you are a bishop, you don't have to go to church on Sunday--no, you don't. If you want to **remain** a bishop, you need to go to church on Sunday, but you don't **have** to go to church unless you want to remain a bishop. That is, we do what we do because we want the consequences of those actions. Yes, lots of times we would like to be able to do other things and get the desired consequences, but we do what we want to because we prefer the consequences we get or think we'll get by following a given course of action. Just telling ourselves regularly, particularly when in a stressful situation, "I'm doing what I am because I want to rather than because I have to" gives a whole different feeling about what we're doing and dramatically reduces stress. This is not just a play on words; it has significant impact.

10. **I am responsible for my behavior but I cannot or will not attempt to control the agentive behavior of others.** (D&C 121:41, Moses 4:1-2, Ezekial 18:4, 14-20, 33:7-9) Many of our problems result from thinking, at least at a subconscious level, that we can control the behavior of others and, being in control of others' behavior, we are fully responsible for their behavior rather than realizing that they had at least some responsibility for their own behavior. It is true that in certain instances we can physically control the behavior of others by physically moving them, particularly children, but we cannot control the agentive behavior of others, what they think and feel, and hence, how they act. We can **influence** others' behavior, however, and are responsible for that influence, and hence, are responsible for our behavior. Note carefully what the Lord said, "No power or 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. . . ." (D&C 121:41) There is only one way that we **can**, let alone ought to, maintain an influence on the behavior of others.

11. **I will live the spirit of the Word of Wisdom.** (D&C 89, 88:124, Luke 2:52) Yes, only if we get proper rest, eat properly, exercise appropriately, etc. do we enjoy the necessary physical health essential to emotional well-being and peace. We are promised that we will be able to "run and not be weary." (D&C 89:20)

Just a question to ponder—if we don't run, how do we know if that promise will be fulfilled?

12. **I will focus my life on the Savior, learn of Him, become "meek and lowly of heart,"** and I shall have peace in Him.(D&C 19:23, Matt. 11:28-30) I believe that herein is the key to the heart of the gospel. We do need to focus our lives on the Savior and learn of Him. For many months I have quoted Matt. 11:28-30 to myself at least once a day--because I have needed it! "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." To take the Savior's yoke upon us, or to be fully and unreservedly committed to obey His commandments and follow the counsel of His leaders is critical. To learn of Him and to understand and obtain His meekness and lowliness of heart is likewise critical. When I am being criticized, when do I get uptight, angry, or upset at my critic? Only when I am not meek and lowly in heart. When my total desire is to grow and to help others grow, when my total desire is to learn and help others to learn, then when I desire to be the greatest blessing in the lives of others, I am not defensive. I am not uptight. I do not get angry. It is when I want others to think certain things about me such as how great I am or to really like me and my ideas, etc., and when I don't want to think about changing and growing, that anxiety and other negative feelings arise.

(I have used the above "peace" principles with a number of individuals with marked success. In the process I have found that these principles, like others, are effective to the degree that they are internalized. To help effect internalization, I have requested that the principles be read and pondered upon each day, preferably twice—morning and evening—for 30 days or more.)

In Conclusion

From this very brief and cursory review, I hope that I have been able to convey why I believe that the words of Christ (from the scriptures, the prophets, and personal revelation) do tell us all things that we should know.(Cf. II Ne. 32:3) Hopefully, it is also evident, as Nephi stated, that in order to know these things, we must "feast upon the words of Christ," not just "nibble upon them occasionally" as Elder Neal A Maxwell has stated. I conclude as I began with the response of Peter to the Savior in answer to the Savior's query if the Twelve would also go away. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the son of the living God." That is my testimony to you, my brothers and sisters, that the Savior has the words of eternal life **and** emotional well-being in this life and that Jesus is truly the Christ, the Son of the living God. May He bless each of us to be his worthy helping servants, I ask in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

COUNSELING THE DIVORCED LDS WOMAN

By Becky Morris, Ed. D.*

Research confirms that women who undergo the trauma of the breakup of their marriage react in certain identifiable ways and go through similar stages before they succeed in adjusting to a new role. It is well for Church counselors to examine these stages and their resultant behaviors so as to foresee and perhaps forestall activity which might curtail LDS divorcees in their growth and development as daughters of God.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is an organization which values highly the family concept. Great emphasis is placed on the necessity and desirability of temple marriage and sealings, the priesthood holder as the recognized head of the family unit, the very real responsibility of teaching children the precepts of the Gospel, and the sanctity of the family unit which continues throughout eternity. With such emphasis on the family relationship, it is conceivable that, to an LDS woman, marriage failure may be even more shattering than it would be to one not so wedded to these concepts. Although most women in the Church are aware that experiencing trouble and pain is part of their reason for having come to earth, the actual facing of marital dissolution is often extremely difficult, especially if there has been a temple marriage.

Paul of Tarsus said, "The woman is not without the man in the Lord," and this statement is taken literally by LDS people. Such a belief so firmly entrenched in the minds of LDS women, almost negates the probability of severing the marriage relationship, so that when it does happen, the shock to her must be acute, and she will be in need of immediate help if she is to escape the pitfalls that generally accompany such an experience. True, some LDS women have been able, through their faith, to survive the shock, pick up the pieces of their shattered lives, and go on living productively without outside help. But there are many who cannot. Counselors and others who want to help should recognize the probable results of such trauma and attempt to give immediate and long-range assistance to these women.

There are stages of reaction which divorced women in general go through and counselors in the Church should know them. Then they can prepare for the kind of counseling necessary to avert these usual reactions.

***Sister Morris is a counselor at Countryside High School in Clearwater, Florida and also engages in a private counseling practice.**

The first stage of reaction following divorce or separation is one of disbelief. There may be, at first, a feeling of relief if the tension in the relationship has been pronounced, but at the same time, there is an element of unreality and disbelief, especially if the marriage has lasted ten or more years. No matter what problems have existed, no matter the severity of the arguments, the actuality of being left alone to fend for oneself emotionally, if not economically, is at first not real. This stage may last days, weeks, or even months, but sooner or later, the individual must face the unpleasant facts. When she does, the most usual reaction is anger. This emotion may not be overtly expressed, but it most certainly is there. That she should have been put into this particular situation, which she feels she does not deserve and which means she must make some sweeping changes in her lifestyle, invokes rebellion. No one really enjoys forced change, for change means venturing into the unknown. The divorcee's anger may not be directed upon the real situation, for often it is displaced, projected upon other people or things: children or the lack of them; the Church; his or her parents, individuals or friends; his or her job. Any of these may become the focus of her anger. During this time then she needs to have someone to whom she can pour out her anger, someone she can trust not to misunderstand and condemn her, especially if this anger is toward the Church or some of its members. Later, she will recognize that this was just a stage she had to go through, but if her anger has been vented publicly, she will find it difficult to return to the Church or again accept the friendship of those to whom she has directed her anger initially. If the counselor to whom she has talked understands her reaction symptoms, she can be helped to control and overcome her anger.

Anger soon dissipates or at least diminishes, especially if she has had the advantage of counseling during this period. The next stage is usually characterized by self-doubt and recrimination. If she is conscientious, she may examine the past minutely to see what action she might have taken to avert the immediate events. She may blame herself for not having "done something" to prevent the breakup in her marriage. She may rehearse over and over in her mind little memories of things done or undone which might have changed the course of events. She may needlessly

punish herself for her "failure" as a wife, love partner, companion, or mother. Now is the time for the counselor to help her resolve these doubts in a positive fashion by allowing her to work out the real areas of failure and do something about them, if something can be done, or at least to realize that, given another chance for marriage, she will not repeat undesirable behavior and/or thoughts. In some cases she may come to realize that there was nothing at all she could have done to "save" her husband from having taken the road he is now following. Ultimately, each individual is responsible for his own actions, and another can help only if allowed to do so. But, of course, during this stage, the woman is not rational, and she will need help to understand the real cause of her breakup.

From this self-punishing stage, the woman who is not able to make the transition to her new role successfully at this point, whether she has been counseled or not, often takes one of several final resolutions of her problem, none of which are healthy spiritually or emotionally. If the previously stated steps have not been given or if they have not been successful in making her understand herself and the relationship she has had in the past, then we can expect one of the following to occur:

(1) The woman withdraws almost completely from social contacts, most especially from those which involve meeting and mingling with men who might be potential marital candidates. This woman gives herself and her energies entirely to her family, her job, and/or her church work. This may be a conscious or an unconscious desire to punish herself or men in general because one has failed her.

(2) The woman focuses on the necessity of proving her desirability. Such a woman's experiences both during her marriage and as a result of its breakup have diminished her self-concept entirely. Her overt action may be to change her appearance by wearing a different kind of apparel, changing the color and/or style of her hair, using more and more expertly applied make-up, or, conversely, making no attempt at all to be attractive physically, to see if she can attract members of the opposite sex. Other overt action may even extend itself into physical sexual experiences with one or more male partners. Various studies have shown that this kind of behavior in a divorced woman is not at all unique.

(3) The woman may resort to using her sex-appeal to tempt or tease the male, only to reject his advances with a "How can you be so dirty-minded!" kind of attitude when she is taken up on her implied invitations. Such experiences serve to reinforce her unrealistic concept that "all men are beasts," and damages her ability to make the changes in thinking necessary for her to resume a normal, satisfying way of life.

(4) Another less prevalent behavior is that of fantasy. In this action the woman creates a phantom lover, embodying all the virtues the woman wants to find in man, and this image is projected in her imagination until he becomes so real that to her he actually exists. This woman can become so skillful in creating her lover that she convinces not only herself but her friends of his existence. She may send herself flowers from her non-existent suitor and describe him in detail to her friends along with her pleasurable activities with him. The reason he is never able to come to any social events or church functions or meetings with her is that he travels a good deal of the time. She will disclose accounts of phone calls from exotic, far away places from which he has called to declare his devotion and exciting future plans. Admittedly, this type of bizarre behavior is not common, but it does occur.

(5) The woman too quickly finds another man to take her husband's place. She remarries in haste to prove to herself and to her friends that she is desirable. Often the newly acquired husband has not been considered worthy of love, but rather has been regarded solely as an ego bolsterer. Such a marriage is rarely successful.

(6) The woman finds herself faced with her husbands renewed attentions. He cannot leave her alone, but he does not want to accept the responsibility of being her husband. This often leads to renewed sexual activity between them, more exciting perhaps than for a long long time, but, of course, frustrating and anxiety producing. Even if they do remarry, which is unlikely, a resolution of the real problems in the marriage has not occurred; indeed, they may be intensified and the final break even more devastating than the original one.

It is easy to see that none of these behavior patterns is a satisfactory solution to the woman's emotional problems. Some are obviously wrong, for they involve sexual indiscretions contrary to Gospel teachings and to her happiness and in opposition to her growth as a responsible individual. Others, less easily recognized, are equally destructive to spiritual and emotional growth.

Latter Day Saint women have a unique problem. They recognize themselves as beginningless, hence everlasting. They realize that they are co-eternal with God and that there is no escape from life no matter how much that might seem desirable at the time, for to be alive means to have always existed. Further, they have been taught that physical birth into mortality is not totally at the initiative of God the Father. It is, at least in part, an individual decision made in the pre-mortal existence to allow them to pursue exaltation in the eternal worlds to come. Truman Madsen, in his book, *Eternal Man*, says:

Your conscious and purpose existence is guaranteed forever. Through stages of either growth or degeneration, selfhood remains. Both utter extinction and permanent regression to a prior state are impossibilities. (8:p. 15)

Necessarily then everyone is enmeshed in a never-ending series of personal and interpersonal relationships daily so it is important that competence, knowledge, and skills in forming meaningful and personally satisfying relationships be perfected. Growth in personality occurs as a consequence of meeting conflicts and impasses head on and reconciling them. For the LDS divorcee this is particularly important.

Since individual responsibility then for one's own life and actions is the keynote of Mormon faith, it might be well for the LDS counselor to acquaint himself/herself with the ideas of some psychological theories whose ideas are compatible with LDS thought. Glasser's reality oriented approach to counseling would be especially helpful in counseling the woman who indulges in teasing, withdrawal, or fantasy. The following points describe Glasser's view:

1. Working in the present and toward the future, we do not get involved with the patient's history because we neither can change what happened to him nor accept the fact that he is limited by his past.
2. We do not look for unconscious conflicts or the reason for them. A patient cannot become involved with us by excusing his behavior on the basis of unconscious motivations.
3. We emphasize the morality of behavior. We face the issue of right and wrong which we believe solidifies the involvement.
4. We teach the patients better ways to fulfill their needs. (4:pp. 44-45)

Glasser believes that answers to problems lie not in any outside agency, but rather within the individual. Since all individuals are constantly trying to fulfill their needs, at any time in their lives when they are unsuccessful in doing so they are behaving unrealistically. By accepting the idea that irresponsibility is the keynote for the deviant behavior, the client is led to develop the strength to take the responsibility to fulfill her needs in a more satisfactory manner. Glasser stresses that there is a difference in being "cured of an illness" and helping oneself. As long as the woman views herself as "ill" rather than irresponsible, she cannot be helped. Without denying that the client has had an unsatisfactory experience, Glasser feels that it does no good to look for what went wrong before, but rather the therapist must help the client to become involved in learning new ways of behavior. The therapist must insist that the woman face her present behavior and acknowledge that it does not

fulfill her needs, that morality is important, even necessary. The woman is confronted with her total behavior and asked to judge its quality. Unless she does judge it, she will not change. The person who can help her to face the cause of her behavior, do something about it, and resume her adult responsibility towards her family and her own life can make a real contribution to that person's life and development. Asking the divorcee, "Are you taking the responsible course? are you doing right or wrong?" is not out of line, for when a person knows that someone really cares but that there are standards of behavior which she must follow, she can be helped. To do otherwise would only allow her to become more comfortable with her irresponsibility but would in time curtail her ultimate growth.

(4) Another less prevalent behavior is that of fantasy. In this action the woman creates a phantom lover, embodying all the virtues the woman wants to find in man, and this image is projected in her imagination until he becomes so real that to her he actually exists. This woman can become so skillful in creating her lover that she convinces not only herself but her friends of his existence. She may send herself flowers from her non-existent suitor and describe him in detail to her friends along with her pleasurable activities with him. The reason he is never able to come to any social events or church functions or meetings with her is that he travels a good deal of the time. She will disclose accounts of phone calls from exotic, far away places from which he has called to declare his devotion and exciting future plans. Admittedly, this type of bizarre behavior is not common, but it does occur.

Sidney Jourard is another theorist whose ideas are typical of LDS standards. Jourard believes that it is healthy to (a) want affection, (b) be able to accept it without anxiety when it is genuinely offered, (c) be able to behave toward others in a way which will elicit affection, (d) be able to give affection, and (e) be able to choose rationally between affection and other values (6:p. 298). Jourard agrees that a person who has been deprived of affection may be unable to choose the correct behavior patterns. His views would be particularly effective with the woman who indulges in sexual promiscuity or who is returning to sexual experiences with her former husband. It is necessary for her to learn that all adults are dependent upon others for many vital satisfactions and they need the help and responsiveness of others in order to cope with life's problems and maintain a sense of security, self-esteem, and identity. She must also learn that armoring herself with self-defeating, rigid interpersonal behavior patterns serves only to hide her real self from the gaze of others and from herself. The inability to enter into and sustain personal relationships with others contributes to emotional illness. The solution to the problem is first to

come to know one's own self, then to go beyond her own problems to help others. Her concern for the happiness of another person will be good insurance for her own happiness. She will also learn that in a healthy relationship each partner must respect the other's right to be autonomous. This will involve pain, for to respect and value another's individuality means that one actually sees and acknowledges the other's unique qualities, good or bad as he may consider them. To allow another to be **what** he is does not necessarily mean that one must **like** all that the other is and does, but it does mean that he respects the other person as an individual with rights and privileges of his or her own. When a counselor listens, reflects, and interprets the counselee to herself and rewards healthy behavior (sometimes by simply not being judgmental when the counselee does not exhibit it), the counselee is encouraged to say whatever she spontaneously wishes to say, knowing that she will not be censured. When this respect is given and when she is encouraged and permitted free emotional expression, self-understanding is also promoted. Another tactic is interpreting the behavior the counselee is exhibiting at various stages of treatment. As the client is treated in this manner, she can at least begin to hope that she is a worthy person and thus respect others as such. Such concepts are those of Sidney Jourard as explained in his two very thought provoking books (6 & 7).

Frankl's Logotherapy sees destiny as the "ultimate testing ground for human freedom." (2:p. 94). Frankl says that the way handicaps and barriers are meaningfully incorporated into a person's life determines what he ultimately becomes:

The destiny a person suffers is to be shaped where possible and to be endured where necessary. Responsibility to life is assumed by responding to the situations which it presents.

(1:p. 134)

Frankl believes a person cannot be allowed to blame environmental influences for determining his destiny, for such a practice is a way of avoiding responsibility. "Destiny, like death, is a part of life," he says. "If a person quarrels with destiny, he is overlooking its meaning." (1:p. 74). For Frankl the spiritual aspect is a separate dimension of man. Frankl subordinates the self-enhancement or self-actualization goal of other schools of therapy to that of achievement of meaning. The center of Frankl's approach is concern with values and goals, freedom and responsibility. He believes only neurotics fear the tensions of unhappy, unrequited love, and that such persons must be re-educated to be ready and receptive, to wait for the single, happy love which may follow nine unhappy ones. He believes that sometimes it is necessary for growth and maturation of an individual that he be made

capable of suffering, for there are situations where men and women can fulfill themselves only in genuine suffering. Such an idea is completely compatible with Joseph Smith's explanation of the place of evil and suffering in life.

In this world, often through pain, we are awakened in our spirit to the Christ who really was and is. The warm and overwhelming miracle is this: the more we approach Him and His likeness, the more we come to love as he loves and the less we suffer needlessly. (8:p. 60).

The Existential idea that a human being is not a static entity, but rather is in a constant state of transition, emerging, becoming, evolving, is definitely Mormon theology. The Church teaches that man works out his own destiny by interacting with others in the world of things and events and that what he does determines in great measure what he is. Truman Madsen states in his book, *Eternal Man*, that "physical losses and tribulations, if endured in His name, have their limits and are refining; . . . The awful tragedy of this life is not suffering but suffering in vain." All losses will be made up in the resurrection provided one continues faithful. Freedom is possible only when we ask ourselves what we want to be. God the Father and God the Son cannot break their eternal covenants. This is not because they are not free to do so, but because they have chosen directions which allow mortals the privilege of total freedom to choose which way they wish to go. Since the destiny of LDS people is not union with the Divine but in re-union with them, their search for meaning in life is facilitated by knowledge gained through the teachings of the Church and personal revelation. Anyone who represses his natural impulse to reach toward and embrace Light and Truth eventually falls victim to psychosomatic illnesses and misery (8:pp. 72-74). Such a philosophy as this cannot help but have a salutary effect upon the LDS divorcee when it is made known to her along with true concern, empathy and interest in her well-being.

Although one hopes that the Gospel and its teachings in-and-of themselves will curtail break-ups in LDS homes, the fact remains that a certain percentage of LDS women will suffer such an experience. The theorists presented in this paper have evolved ways of understanding and helping such distressed women which are compatible with the teachings of the Church. It is hoped that those who attempt to counsel them will find the ideas and suggestions in this paper helpful.

REFERENCES

1. Frankl, Viktor E. *The Doctor and the Soul*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.
2. Frankl, Viktor E. *Man's Search for Meaning*. New York: Beacon Press, 1963.
3. Friedenburgh, Franz A. *The Psychology of Personality and Adjustment*. Menlo Park, Ca.: Cummings Publishing Company, 1971.
4. Glasser, William. *Reality Therapy*. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1965.
5. Harper, Robert A. *Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959.
6. Jourard, Sidney M. *Personal Adjustment*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1967.
7. Jourard, Sidney M. *Transparent Self*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1970.
8. Madsen, Truman G. *Eternal Man*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1966.
9. McConkie, Bruce. *Mormon Doctrine*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1969.
10. Patterson, C. H. *Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy*. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1966.

Poetry, to me (and I suspect to many of us), is like a second language—like “speaking in tongues.” We are told that the ability to speak with tongues is a gift (D&C 46:24), as is the ability to interpret what is said (D&C 46:25). We are also told that we should “study and learn, and become acquainted with. . . tongues. . . ” (D&C 90:15). In an effort to help us achieve this purpose and appreciate his gift, I invited Brother Helmstetler to submit an interpretation of his poem, the meaning of which was too obscure for me to grasp without his help. Here is the poem, with references. His commentary follows on page 32. Your comments are invited.

—Ed

INTROSPECTION:
an investigation into
light seen in the flesh¹

by Jaymes Helmstetler

1. A darkened sun² is upon the spiritual and temporal dead³
or considered so from below.
But, the lee⁴ congregation,⁵ high in dream,⁶ pierces the
tempestuous fumes belching
from the Ulcer of the
bottomless pit.⁷ They
ear the endless⁸ veil,⁹ having received the scalpel¹⁰
to liberate jailed pain¹¹ of the epidermal world,¹²
to see life
in its likeness
perceiving and knowing¹³
as they IS.¹⁴
2. In clear¹⁵ pattern,¹⁶ Selene,¹⁷ typically glorified,¹⁸ progresses
expediently¹⁹
from
paradise²⁰
to
plasmic station:²¹ the fruitious²²
macro-genetic
type fallen²³
to order
as anon, crimson courses the vein of man,²⁴ his earthly kingdom
in forebodic quake²⁵
as stellar tears
descend.²⁶
3. Awake! Rise and shine!²⁷

Dark Mourning,²⁸ from east to west,²⁹ disarms the nightgown of grief³⁰
to arrest real joy³¹
basked in the vermillion robe³²
of the
SECOND SUN!³³

1. Job 19:26
2. D&C 45:42
3. Alma 42:7-9
4. *lee*, meaning the sheltered or protected side; in keeping with the metaphor of the sun, the lee side or part protected from rays, the north side hence.
5. Ps. 48:2; Isa. 14:13
6. 1 Nephi 8:4, 7, 23
7. Rev. 9:1, 2
8. D&C 19:6
9. D&C 38:8; 67:10; 110:1
10. Rev. 1:18
11. Ps. 85:11; Jn. 8:32
12. D&C 76:81
13. 1 Jn. 3:2; 1 Cor. 13:12
14. "Flower in the Crannied Wall," A.L. Tennyson
15. D&C 105:31
16. D&C 52:14
17. the moon
18. D&C 128:12 "that one principle might accord with the other" to answer to a likeness
19. Moses 5:11
20. D&C 76:97
21. Alma 42:10; D&C 88:75, 87
22. Moses 4:18
23. Alma 42:6
24. *Doctrines of Salvation*, Joseph Fielding Smith, Deseret Book (paperback edition) 1979, p. 77.
25. JS 1:29
26. D&C 88:87
27. Isa. 60:1, 2; 26:19; D&C 43:18
28. Isa. 60:20
29. JS 1:26
30. D&C 45:44
31. D&C 76:97
32. Isa. 63:2
33. D&C 34:6

Commentary

by Jaymes Helmstetler

The first stanza deals with signs of the times and integrates the same into personal promise. "Lee congregation, high in a dream" is an allusion to Lehi's dream. Reference is also made to temple ceremony.

Stanza two sees the fall of man as a sign of the times as well. It is an allegorical comparison between the course of man and the destiny of the earth.

The second coming and the resurrection are the themes of stanza three. "Dark Mourning" intends to evoke imagery of the morning, a morning that perhaps always has been, but has been a light shining in the darkness. "To arrest real joy" is an allusion to the terrestrial. "Second sun" is in keeping with the allegory, but evokes an image of the Savior.

Generally, yet simply, this poem speaks and investigates simultaneous typological occurrence—that the atonement of the Savior, salvation and redemption, is infinite and eternal in all aspects. Into every kingdom, into every space reaches the great and last sacrifice of Christ, exemplary of pure love and demonstrating that "against such there is no law."

Proceeding forth, filling the immensity of space, both physical and spiritual, the light of Christ permeates all things: he is in all things and the life of all things, all things are by and of him. Whatever the realm, or kingdom, the light of Christ is present, though individuality may interpretively reflect this illuminance according to conditional degree of a particular sphere.

All things have a language, spoken or otherwise. By interpretive acumen can we begin to understand. It need not be supposed that the noise of man is the only language nor his present acquisition of thought the last word.

All kingdoms have a law given by which they may communicate with the at present finite mind of man. When man obeys a given law, the blessing and understanding are given. "All beings who abide not in those conditions are not justified:" therefore a particular kingdom's law refuses to speak and remains mute insofar as the unqualified are concerned.