



Journal of the Association
of Mormon Counselors
and Psychotherapists

October 1982 Vol. 8, Issue 4

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

The purpose of this Association shall be:

- a) To promote fellowship, foster communication, enhance personal and professional development, and promote a forum for counselors and psychotherapists whose common bond is membership in and adherence to the principles and standards of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, both in their personal lives and professional practice.
- b) To encourage and support members' efforts actively to promote within their other professional organizations and the society at large, the adoption and maintenance of moral standards and practices that are consistent with gospel principles.

*Article 1, Section 2, AMCAP By-laws
(as amended Sep. 30, 1981)*



Journal of the Association
of Mormon Counselors
and Psychotherapists

October 1982 Vol. 8, Issue 4

Editor Burton C. Kelly
Brigham Young University

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 address indicated below.

Change of Address

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

AMCAP
Counseling Center
149 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 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 the 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 manuscript should be sent to the editor:

Burton C. Kelly, Editor
AMCAP Journal
149 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602

As we conclude the last issue of the 1982 *AMCAP Journal*, again our thanks to each of you who have contributed articles and letters and also to the many others who have lent encouragement and support in improving the quality of the *Journal*. Special gratitude is expressed to Brother Allen Bergin for his excellent assistance. Brother Bergin has just concluded his service on the AMCAP Executive Committee and as the Executive Committee advisor to the *Journal*.

As virtually always, we need more articles. It would be great to have received sufficient articles that we could be reviewing and selecting them six months in advance, instead of often waiting for an article so we can go to press. Please take the time to share with your fellow AMCAPers your thoughts and ideas, and also encourage others to do likewise. If you have read an article elsewhere that you think would be of interest and value to AMCAP members, and have reason to believe that most of our members may not have read it--for example, Brother Eugene England's very illuminating article in this issue, please notify us. Yes, it would be alright to be overwhelmed with responses. We believe our stress management programs will allow us to deal with a flood of articles--and then we would resist the now well practiced response, nearly obsessional at this point, of making another request with each issue.

Those of you who attended the October AMCAP Convention had the opportunity of hearing a number of intriguing and helpful applications of gospel principles to critical therapeutic incidents. Although they may be very brief, if you have such incidents, please share them.

We are looking forward to a 1983 *Journal* with increasing scope and quality. Your help as always will be much appreciated. Thanks and a great Christmas Season and New Year for you and yours.

BCK

EDITORIAL

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Burton:

May I thank Brother and Sister De Hoyos for their article in the July issue. Such a thoughtful, yet dispassionate review of an often passionate subject is timely.

Their observation is pertinent about an "upsurge of emotion" directed at a middle-of-the road synthesis of Gospel and secular therapies. I have been saddened by a tendency of some to reject, as unprofessional, those who rely upon the Gospel as the filter thru which they pass clinical concepts and practices. Surely it is shortsighted to dismiss, out-of-hand, what the secular literature has to offer. Is it not then shortsighted to dismiss the sacred also?

I am grateful to the *AMCAP Journal* and those who have given so much over the years to nudge it along to its present status. It is now a forum for vigorous exchange out of which can emerge increasingly helpful insights.

Sincerely,
Victor L. Brown, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HUMAN INTIMACY: FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

by Victor L. Brown, Jr. 5

HOW REALISTIC IS THE GOAL OF PREVENTING PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH TEENAGE SEXUAL ACTIVITY?

by Terrance D. Olson 13

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE HEART-- A SCRIPTURAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

by Paul F. Cook 15

THAT THEY MIGHT NOT SUFFER: THE GIFT OF ATONEMENT

by Eugene England 21

HUMAN INTIMACY: FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Victor L. Brown, Jr.,* Ph.D.

Presented at the AMCAP Convention

2 April, 1982

While preparing for this presentation I inferred that AMCAP's invitation implied more than a review of my recent book *Human Intimacy, Illusion and Reality*. Therefore, today I intend to go beyond theory and offer some clinical suggestions as well as offer for your scrutiny some ideas which have emerged over the years.

The primary point I wish to make is that the word, the concept, the experience "intimacy" is deep and broad and ought not to be a synonym for valueless sexuality. As I have explored this subject I have been concerned by too free a use of the narrower definition.

Values

In the "state-of-the-art" mentality of these times, it has become professionally and popularly chic to use technical, erotic competence as a criterion for sophisticated sexuality. Perhaps if we were analyzing social dancing, emphasis on technique would not matter much, but when we speak of how human beings share themselves intimately, the matter is of grave significance. To interpret sexuality too narrowly obscures the more expansive power and joy of intimacy by encouraging people to settle for relatively superficial emotional and physical pleasures. This is an irony of our times analogous to equating production of a K-Mart art print with the creativity which produced the original oil canvas and believing the print is a better acquisition because it costs \$9.95, plastic frame included. In a world where loneliness is all too often the norm, people readily settle for inferior relationships that resemble higher quality ones only on the surface. Just as the cheap art print is worth no more than the other thousands of exact copies, so are those relationships whose values are calculated by technical, physical accomplishment and nothing more.

Lest you think this is too extreme a charge, consider the sexological litany of multiple-orgasm, calculated interpersonal pleasuring, and obsessive self-pleasuring. The theories and the diagnostic and therapeutic approaches associated with current sexology are so frequently focused upon a technical repertoire that they either have no context of attitudes and behaviors or their context is erotic pleasure for its own sake. This robs the whole matter of its glorious potential and creates the risk that if a helping person attempts to deal with human sexuality exclusive of a values context, serious error can be introduced.

Teaching sexuality without values can be like teaching someone to drive an automobile by emphasizing the

mechanical, technical aspects and ignoring such values as courtesy, obedience to law, and respect for other persons and their property. Sexuality without values is reported by Masters & Johnson in their discussion of ambisexuality. This is a chilling account of unfeeling yet highly skilled manipulation of the human erotic potential.

Surely for the most part, Latter-day Saint helping professionals place sexuality within a values context. There is a richness about Mormon sexual doctrine which offers great preventative and treatment power. It can be utilized in clear, unambiguous values. It can be misused when those values are diluted. For example, when helping a person struggle with hetero-or homosexual problems, it is essential that the person sooner or later find a reason to solve the problem, a reason profound enough in certain situations to reject associates and circumstances which have provided enormous social, emotional, and physical reinforcement. The Doctrine & Covenants, Section 132, describes powerful consequences, both punishment and reward, for proper sexual behavior. For many of our clients these doctrines, these values, offer a compelling reason to struggle. In their article, "Ex-Gays: Religiously Mediated Change in Homosexuals", Mansell and Myrna Pattison (1980) report how strongly values can assist change and maintenance in very difficult cases, even without the pristine gospel.

There are other crucial values. D&C 49 and Ephesians 5 specify certain attitudes and behaviors as crucial for decent, complete relationships. In keeping with His promulgation of absolute personal agency, the Lord has given clear value guidelines for intimate behavior. How tragic that some cannot see these guidelines because they are in more refined, enlightened language than a sex manual or SEICUS film. Yet how liberating it is that while He dictates such guidelines with solemnity and with terrible penalties for their violation, He also grants unsurpassed pleasure when those guidelines are obeyed. Values such as these can immeasurably strengthen our clinical armamentarium. Admittedly, values can range from the sublime to the ridiculous. Even values associated with certain historic Judeo-Christian periods can be warped to cruel use, such as the Spanish Inquisition or the French persecution of the Huguenots. Nevertheless, there are time-tested values whose universal validity cuts across sectarian and secular boundaries and render intimate relationships benevolent when they are applied. D&C 4 lists most of them.

With this in mind we could then consider using certain

*Brother Brown is Area Director, Northern California Welfare Services.

terms so that our "diagnostic" and "treatment" efforts are less of the medical model and more like the restored gospel. Hence, as my second point, I suggest that we use terms like *evaluation*, *education*, and *healing* to describe the facets of our helping efforts.

Evaluation, Education, Healing

Conventionally clinicians are taught to suspend their personal values, or at least keep them under tight rein, in the client-professional relationship. However, in certain cases this is illogical, for it deprives the often confused client of a reference point. In one severe child-abuse case it was difficult for the mother to stir herself to initiate against her husband crucial emotional, legal and ecclesiastical steps until a key helping person (a Relief Society visiting teacher) aroused the mother's anger at several breaches of values. It seemed that she could rationalize away his emotional and legal violations of her and the children, but when confronted with his violations of eternal principles she found herself face-to-face with certain absolutes and was thereby moved to act to begin to save her children.

Frequently there comes a time when values tip the balance toward change. In sexual matters this is more often the case than it is not. Therefore, I have found it helpful to include value-laden sexual attitudes and behaviors within the broader context of intimacy and offer help in three phases: evaluation, education and healing.

Evaluation is a fundamental element in our professions, for it is the assessment of the situation. I propose that we add to our evaluative criteria the values factor. Of this and DSM III, more shall be said later.

Education is a phase which most of us may resort to, but not always as explicitly as is merited. Some time ago my friend and colleague, Allen Bergin, said that he had concluded that the next evolution of therapy ought to be toward education. This idea has influenced me greatly ever since. It is certainly consistent with the Gospel methodology of teaching correct principles by which people, if they choose, might govern themselves.

Preventatively and clinically, education demanded its due when I was studying homosexuality. Time after time I found myself trying verbally to share essential information with clients about the development of homosexuality. Not only was it tedious, but it was also inefficient. Allen's observation triggered *Fred's Story* (Brown, 1981) as reported in this forum on a previous occasion. Immediately the results were encouraging. After a brief, initial interview the client would take a copy of *Fred's Story* home to read. He would then return with a basic understanding of my data and values position. And, as requested, his notes in the extra-wide margins informed me as to his position. Recently I have found a similar utility with *Human Intimacy* (Brown, 1981(2))

The important element here is not that the client be "converted" to the therapist's views but that, in the beginning, there be common understanding of each other's position to avoid fruitless or at least inefficient groping. But the education phase need not be neutral, especially when trying to discover illusions and realities

of intimacy. If illusion could be defined as denial of consequences and reality as recognition of consequences, then it is a responsibility of anyone who presumes to intervene in another's life to be aware of consequences.

For years I paid deference to the empirical humility which implied that we in the social services knew very little about cause and effect. With the passage of time and accumulation of experience I am increasingly skeptical about this pseudo-humility. It may well be an illusion, even a "cop-out." True, there is much not known about the etiology of many problems, e.g. schizophrenia or clinical depression. But in other things there is a great deal known, e.g. that an abusing parent was probably an abused child, and the first abusing progenitor probably suffered from a severe sense of inadequacy complicated by his parents' ignorance of effective child-rearing methods or their lack of self-control. Or in other words, intelligent, confident love begets healthy people while ignorant, fearful rejection begets unhealthy people.

Is it not time for those of us who claim the title counselor to have the courage of our convictions and educate people to the best of our ability? Given the human distress rampant around us, is there time anymore for us to temporize? Frequently the properly cautious language of research, "it appears," "perhaps," "it may be that," is misused in the educational, clinical phase, especially in reference to the consequences of behavior. If we know the consequences of sexual problems include venereal disease, self-abuse, exploitation and manipulation of others, should we temporize our education of our clients?

There really are times when the consequences of certain attitudes and behaviors are not clearly understood unless the values element is considered. Consider an example which may appear contradictory but which does support the usefulness of values in behavioral education. Helping people have heard these statements made frequently by the same sexually adventuresome person: "I feel guilty for what I have done," yet "My sexual partner (extra-marital, homo or heterosexual) and I have experienced something that is very special." These statements, or close variations of them, have come from people who have engaged in incest, male and female homosexuality, mental-emotional adultery, physical adultery, and premarital sexual behavior. On their face they tend to evoke two opposing reactions. Some people conclude this means "If it feels good, do it!" While others conclude "That is sick!"

One striking example comes from a man who had made a career of confessing his unworthiness to Mormon bishops around the world wherever his work in international banking took him. Despite the fact that he was separated by his work from his wife for long periods (two years once) he was completely faithful, and he did not even masturbate. Yet shortly after they would move into a ward or branch, he would routinely go confess his unworthiness. He finally demanded excommunication. His baffled bishop could not discover grounds for the action and sought advice.

What came out in this interview was (a) there *was* sinful, sexual behavior in his background for which he felt extremely guilty, and (b) this same behavior had occurred in response to a powerful emotional need which even twenty years later he could not repudiate. The behavior was incest with his sister during childhood. The need was for love at a time when he and his sister had been placed with a very uncaring (so he recalled) foster family.

In all his confessions this man had never actually confessed the reality of his distress, only the illusion. He hated the memory of the physical act but cherished the memory of the intimacy. Once he straight-forwardly dealt with reality--the consequences, if you will--the problem focused and he began to resolve it, and quite successfully.

It was necessary for this troubled man to face squarely the consequences of apparently contradictory attitudes and behaviors. On the other hand, as the gospel unfolded to his understanding, he realized he had committed a serious sin for which there were absolute consequences of morbidity of spirit and guilt. On the other hand, during a devastatingly lonely period of his life he and his sister shared affection with the consequence that years later it still warmed his heart. This apparent paradox was resolved when he was educated about the values of justice, i.e., he really did have something to confess about and repent of and mercy, i.e., that what he recalled of the tenderness of his sister's concerns, when separated from the sexual sin had been nourishment to a starving heart. With this knowledge he went back to his bishop to accurately repent and to accurately cherish and thereafter was free of his debilitating anxieties.

There is another well-documented example of the need for education, that of the "victim" of parent-child incest. Well-meaning people frequently hasten to assure the victim--usually a daughter--that she is guilty of nothing. Yet, she is frequently guilty, after a period of time, of collusion and even exploitation. This critical factor may not be understood unless values are used to evaluate the situation.

Knowing of this possibility, I have tried to help several young women face the consequences of what actually occurred. The pattern of one was frequently the pattern of all. First, she *was* a victim of sexual abuse by her father. A consequence was hatred of him. Second, she eventually began to collude with him, frequently to avoid threats. Occasionally she gained money, gifts, or privileges by exploiting his fears of discovery. Thus, one wound was due to assault, the other was self inflicted. The former required a soothing balm, the latter a strong purgative. To identify this, though, the helping person must be prepared to deal with specific experiences and specific consequences. To achieve this goal clear and precise education is needed. Frequently victims of incest report unreasonable, illogical, and ultimately cruel requests made of them by well-meaning helpers. It is the anguished plea, "Why didn't my (helping person) help me to go to my father and tell him I loved him?" Or "Why didn't my (helping person) help me work

this through with my father?"

There is a stark consequence to incest. It is the volatile mixture of hatred and longing. It is illusory to deny these consequences. They can be seen most clearly from a values perspective. The informed Latter-day Saint knows that there are laws irrevocably decreed and blessings or punishments consequent to those laws (D&C 130:20-21; 88:33-40). It should follow then that when a child is victimized by a parent the child will be emotionally, spiritually and physically violated. And that child will probably hate the parent. But it also follows that in the eternal scheme of things no child can obtain emotional peace or psychic identity while alienated from a parent, even a wicked one. (D&C 2; 110:13-15) Thus, victim and perpetrator must reconcile, either in this life or the next. The matter is complicated when the child has exploited the parent. Accordingly, the child victim of sexual abuse, if it extends long enough, needs both to despise and reconcile, to forgive and repent if healing is to occur.

To clearly and effectively educate our clients and ourselves, we must continuously remind all concerned of those values which bear upon matters of human intimacy. When we pull loose from this mooring, we drift, dangerously.

By our values criteria it is wrong, whatever the circumstances, to be sexually active outside marriage. By our values, love is the law upon which all else is based. (See Matthew 22:34-40.) Thus, in a gospel paradox, justice and mercy appear to collide until mercy makes successful claim on justice to effect healing.

Healing is a term and process I prefer over "change." It suggests the reality that we recover from wounds due both to the ministrings of others and our own powers of recuperation. It is instructive that when He appeared in the New World, the Savior urged the survivors of the destruction at his crucifixion, "Will ye not now return unto me, and repent of your sins, and be converted, that I may heal you?" (III Nephi 9:13)

I earnestly believe that we ought to be engaged in healing the wounds that afflict our brothers and sisters, which, like intimacy itself, is a process more encompassing than mere therapeutic change.

Healing versus mere change in intimate matters forces the LDS person to confront an apparent conundrum. Sexology offers rapid, simple, therapeutic methods. Indeed its short-term intervention, specific behavioral techniques, and immediate results marked it, at least initially, as a major breakthrough. But with the accumulation of more data we find that, like the Pill, there are serious consequences to valueless sexual behavior. Among these are a malaise, a loss of sexual interest, throughout a culture that now has no serious sanctions against consenting adult sexual expression. Deadly physiological consequences such as herpes and hepatitis have become epidemic. And in what may be the most insidious process of all, as sexuality is reduced to technique and is separated from identity, role, and relationship, human affectional bonds are worn away until there is a loss of even the idea of intimacy, let alone the fact. As stark evidence one need only point to the

emotional poverty of the entertainment media, where in song, film, or television there is a decreasing offering of and audience for themes of emotional passion and depth without graphic eroticism.

If this sounds like a Jeremiad, it is, for the Western world seems to be nearing a point of no return in its rejection of human intimacy. (See Solzhenitsyn, 1978) Are we perilously on the brink of so completely forsaking essential values that there is no remedy? (II Chronicles 36:14-16) The easiest of therapeutic tasks may be to teach or restore erotic competence. The higher task, and a very difficult one, is to locate and heal the true source of injured intimacy.

At this point one would expect the questions, "What is it you propose to heal? Where is the deepest wound?" The response is that in seeking the source of intimate pain we need to evaluate the problem as it is seen in identity, role, or relationship problems.

Identity, Role and Relationship

Identity.

Trying to trace the etiology of psychosexual problems has led to my third premise. It is that the seeds of serious social-emotional distress are sown when a person sustains damage to his or her innate identity sufficient to provoke two consequences usually seen in role behavior and relationship skills: (a) a devastating sense of difference from others, and (b) a devastating loneliness. Attempting to compensate for these consequences, the person resorts to whatever means are at his disposal. This process usually begins very early in life, but not always.

Evaluating each of the various clients with whom I have worked has given evidence that there is a facet of the total individual that is innate and so essential to one's sense of self that to tamper with it is to open Pandora's Box. When assaults are made upon the essential identity of a person, the damage can be nearly total.

Let me illustrate using homosexuality. Perhaps the phrase most frequently heard from male clients who are homosexually involved is "I have always had these feelings as far back as I can remember." Kent Petersen of LDS Social Services, who has done excellent work in this area, calls this the early memory type of homosexuality. Gay activists translate early memory into claims that male homosexuality is inborn. Their assumption apparently is that sexual preference is inborn and therefore people are born with either hetero- or homosexual predilections. Most homophobes challenge this as untenable because, they claim, normal people are innately heterosexually inclined. But neither view is compatible with values based upon personal agency and chastity, for to condemn or punish or even seek to change sexual behavior that is genetically dictated could be at least unkind, e.g. changing left-handedness; or cruel, e.g. disciplining adolescents whose hormones demand that they pet. Either sexual behavior--homosexual and heterosexual--is by education and choice, or it is not, if certain key values are to be valid.

This same problem worries me about anti-homosexual campaigns. Is it less immoral to be a heterosexual adulterer than a homosexual one? As we

implacably oppose the sin and, I believe, the deviance of homosexuality, so should we oppose heterosexual sin and deviance too!

What then might be a source of psychosexual sin, misbehavior, deviance, or distress? I suggest that one of these exists when a person's innate sense of self collides with unyielding external forces with the consequences of loneliness and difference powerful enough to force the person to choose between personal integration or disintegration. The cost of disintegration is so high, even to the young child without introspective ability, that the person seeks compensations which appear to solve the problem. However, some compensations eventually clash with realities of biology, law, culture, or values. At that point the person is confronted with another crisis of integration.

For some, the initial crisis of integration occurs in early childhood. There is an innateness at birth, an inner sense of self, which may well be unquenchable. It is apparently universal. Kagan (1978) refers to it. Any mother of more than one child knows of it. Our knowledge of premortal development and growth predicts its existence. Referring to male homosexuality, the early memory type describes someone who began from infancy to sense a dissonance between himself and external factors--parents, peers and culture. Bell, Weinberg and Hammersmith, in their book, *Sexual Preference* (1981, pp. 216-220) refer to this. However, given to dramatically dissonant sexual preference of which it is a root, its linkage with male homosexuality has overshadowed its linkage with other consequences. The consequent compensations for stress of identity include heterosexual deviance, obsessive overachievement, slavish dependence, and more.

In other words, it is to be expected that the human infant is not a blank computer tape awaiting the input of environment. Rather, each normal infant is sentient, cognitive, volitional, and an entity unique in certain ways from other infants. When this entity is stressed by parental, peer and cultural forces which threaten the child's integration of self, he reacts *throughout life* and makes myriad attempts to compensate. The obsessive scholar, frantic athlete, frenetic promoter, and martyr mother are only a few. In sexual matters we encounter voyeurism, machismo, or seductiveness.

Over the years I have been interested in social-emotional genealogies. I have done a chart on one line of my extended family. It is a very interesting exercise. In recent months my wife, Mareen, and I have tried to do this with our nuclear family.

We have six children, ranging from 22 to 10 years of age. As they get older we see a solidifying of identities. They have obvious traits, preferences, and so forth. (Sensitized by them, we see early in our granddaughter clear, innate traits which we believe foretell adolescent and adult behavior.) As the six children advance in years there are traits we cannot account for as consequences alone of parent-child interaction. Interestingly they pair off, each pair a boy and girl. Children A & B have the same color hair and eye color, similar body build and facial features. Socially-emotionally this pair is intense,

goal-oriented, and rather uncomfortable with new people or situations. Both reject any hint of competition. Their values tend to be sharply black or white with little tolerance for deviation in others. Children C & D also share the same hair and eye color, similar body builds and facial features. Socially-emotionally this pair is outgoing and intense about relationships, but not highly goal oriented, although they are achievers and good students. They handle pressure well. Their values are strong but they tolerate deviance in themselves and others. Children E & F have hair and eye color alike, similar body build and facial features. Socially-emotionally they are extremely vulnerable to unkindness from others, guileless in the extreme, have little impulse control, are focused on the here and now, affectionate, and tender-hearted. Their values tend to be situational, though not markedly deviant from their family's.

My observation is that, even granting a different environment due to unique parent-child-peer interactions, there are traits in each child and in each pair which Mareen and I cannot explain unless they are seen as innately part of that person. This is vividly seen with children A & B. Even though both placed similar demands (from a parent's perspective) on us, B was responded to with considerably more patience and understanding than A. Even so, B has views of life, urgent needs, and temperamental patterns very similar to A--patterns which I formerly believed were due to my faulty parenting of A. Demonstrably though, I did not make the same mistakes with B, yet A & B are so similar. I am increasingly of the opinion that there are parts to each of us that are not amenable to change. I believe they are neutral and are of little or no moral consequence. Children A & B struggle when under pressure while C & D almost blithely shrug it off. Two of the children are very coordinated, two are not, and two don't care. Two of the children rather enjoy new faces and places; two avoid them if at all possible.

From this brief social-emotional genealogy of our children, and considering the significance of identity, I prefer to divide identity into two parts: personality and character. Personality can be defined as those facets of identity which cannot easily be given moral weight or value. By this definition it is of little moral meaning that our children are variously shy, noncompetitive, outgoing, relaxed, and emotionally tender. Character includes those facets which can be and frequently ought to be given moral weight or value. By this definition it can prove to be of grave moral meaning whether our children are honest, kind, industrious, generous, greedy, deceitful or arrogant.

The wisdom of parents; the data of Kagan (1978), Bell, Weinberg and Hammersmith (1981); and the truth of the scriptures combine to point to personality--or something like it--as a part of each of us which is so completely *us* that it ought to be left alone by parents, peers and therapists; at least until those who dare to tamper with it fully understand the consequences of their tampering. Personality is a handy label to use because it is a familiar word and because much of the

time we use it in this manner anyway. We tolerate, enjoy, or condemn someone's attitudes or behavior as "That's him," or "Oh, that's just her personality." I believe that this innateness, this essence, is something that cannot be changed, and change ought not be attempted. Such attempts cause severe turmoil in the person's roles and relationships. When personality is bruised very major psychosexual consequences can result, because identity is threatened with disintegration. Symptoms are then seen in role and relationship behavior.

Roles and Relationship Skills.

If a person is challenged from birth to be something he is innately not or is coerced to assume role and relationship traits at a pace or to a degree which exceeds his capacity to assimilate, stress builds up within him that eventually demands compensation. This compensation is demonstrated in role distress or exploitive or manipulative relationship skills--hence the obsessive athletic, bullying, promoting, martyrish, voyeuristic, macho or seductive character traits.

Referring to homosexuality and the early memory type, client after client has revealed that there is something innate which, when acted upon by external forces of parental, peer, and cultural disapprobation, evokes a necessary compensation. When a person--child or adult--feels criticized for traits that are very difficult or impossible to modify, he is a most desperate person. In his desperation he must do something to reduce his anxiety before his identity is destroyed.

As discussed in a previous meeting, in the development of a homosexual orientation there are various types of role and relationship compensations which include unilateral self-expression, fantasy, fragmentation and self-focus. (Brown, 1981, p.5)

What was not specified then, but is here, is that there apparently is something that has existed from birth to which the homosexually involved person may legitimately refer to as meaning "I have always felt this way; this is me." This something is seen in such early life experiences as the tendency of the male child not to enjoy his role in rough and tumble or cooperative play. In adolescence it involves stereotypic relationships due to an increasing sense of difference from peers. It is seen in critical late adolescence or early adulthood as a pseudo-resolution of role and relationship ambiguity, when the person concludes that he is homosexual. "Here I fit, I belong." One client reported that after over 15 years of married life and full church activity, there was still within him a feeling of difference, uniqueness from other more conventionally straight people. This is the same thing Cory (1960) referred to when after becoming heterosexual he said he felt like "one of the elite of the world," and "I cling (even now) to my entire personality." (p. xv)

Homophiles pounce on this as proving there is no such thing as a cure for homosexuality. They miss the point. Another interpretation is that there is something within the heart or mind or spirit of all people which cannot and ought not to be destroyed, i.e. personality. Character, however, remains completely exposed to whatever

logical, legal, psychological, or spiritual influences the individual chooses to accept. Personality--shyness, outgoingness, enthusiasm, reticence--may be untouchable traits. Character--honesty, deceit, diligence, sloth--ought to be dealt with vigorously. Hence, the male who is homosexually involved may be educated about his very legitimate innate divergence from stereotypic machismo. He may take great comfort from discovering that his inner gentleness is good and congruent. He cannot, however, justify clinging to compensations he has made over the years of self-focus, carnality or exploitation of the human body, or manipulation of other people's needs for attention and affection. To be healed and integrate his identity, he must rediscover on the one hand his true personality while on the other he must sluff off detrimental character traits.

It is necessary to underscore this idea, because if we are to speak of healing we must know the source of the suppurating infection. If we and our clients understand in certain role and relationship behaviors that they are trying to compensate for early wounds to their identities then they can frequently reach back, through social-emotional genealogical means, for healing balm. They can acquire relationships more consonant with whom they have long yearned to be, but all this as moderated and shaped by values about character.

In one very dramatic situation, a client tape-recorded interviews with her father. Her ostensible reason was to capture oral history. Her underlying reason was to understand the origin of her pain. She had so much identity stress that at age 40 her role was of a destructive, wasteful child (nearly bankrupting her husband) and her relationship skills were decidedly manipulative. As she and her father used the tape recorder as a mechanism for communication, old wounds began to heal until she had literally integrated her identity to her satisfaction. Long years of self-doubt and agony ended. She clearly learned the role of mature wife and mother. Her relationship skills became nurturant. Had we sought mere accommodation, it is likely that she would have gone only far enough to identify her father's weaknesses and perhaps arouse a mobilizing anger about him. As it was, through evaluation and education, she went beyond that--understood him, had compassion for him, and forgave him, which integrated her identity and healed her and her marriage.

Evaluation.

Let me discuss now some specific, clinical examples which refer back to evaluation and *DSM III*. This phase of the helping process is an honest, useful concept meaning an attempt to understand the whole situation. Those clinicians who too readily grasp the mechanics of sexology without values risk evaluating only part of the situation and therefore educating about and helping change only a part. This is a factor in the *DSM III* categories of psychosexual problems. Certainly there are times when minor technical education heals small emotional bruises, but my experience suggests that most of the time the people who seek us out are

suffering from far more than superficial abrasions. *DSM III* subdivides its psychosexual chapter into four sections: gender identity disorders, paraphilias, psychosexual dysfunctions, and other psychosexual disorders. To illustrate, let us consider a brief sample case in relation to each section.

Gender Identity Disorder: Transsexualism. The client, married and a father of a two-year-old boy, embarked on a literal odyssey seeking sex-change surgery. He could not convince most physicians that he was unambivalent. Eventually he found one who performed the operation, yet after that he deteriorated further. Having achieved his long-sought goal, he discovered that there was no magic in being a woman--and he was rather striking as a woman. No longer able to use his obsessive quest as a distraction, with illusion dispelled, he faced realities of identity, role, and relationship which had plagued him from birth.

Born and raised in a small Southern town, he had never achieved the macho-male role expected of him. He had developed such effective manipulative and exploitive skills that he made a large sum of money in sales. After military service, he married a beautiful woman. Unable to enjoy their sexual relationship, he sought therapy. When that failed he gave up trying to perform the stereotypic role and gave himself over to ever-expansive fantasies until he took irreversible steps.

Several months after the operation he "awoke" to the realization that his agony all along had been of identity and the role and relationship compensations he attempted. He was then doubly desperate but with no way to reverse all that had been done.

Paraphilias: Sadism/Masochism. A middle-aged couple sought help because neither could bring the other to climax through ordinary intercourse so they had evolved into a sado-masochistic arrangement which guaranteed orgasm. Their initial request was for erotic enhancement. However, it was clear that each was paying a high price in self-esteem in trying to keep the marriage and family from flying apart due to the centrifugal force of problems other than sex. He had a classic identity and role problem derived from a lifelong attempt to satisfy family traditions of aggressive male entrepreneurs and civic and Church leaders, while being, innately, a nurturant, noncompetitive personality. She had sustained extensive damage to her identity in childhood through successive foster homes and had developed seductive, manipulative relationship skills. They clashed, rather than meshed, because he could not straightforwardly express emotional or physical affection, relying instead on fantasy and paraphernalia. She could not express herself either and accepted humiliating treatment, treatment mixed with autoeroticism. A fireside talk caused their symbiotic contract to collide with gospel values and they sought help.

The helping effort consisted of evaluation of their identity problems and education about physiology, biology, and self-respecting ways to nurture each other. Rather mundane family scheduling, budgeting, and hygiene concepts were also learned. Practice was begun

in expressing verbal and nonsexual physical affection. After this they were able to rediscover each other without the counselor's involvement. At termination the trend was positive and was to be closely monitored by their bishop.

Psychosexual dysfunction: Vaginismus. A very anxious young couple came in the morning after their wedding night. They had been unable to consummate physical relations. After eliminating factors such as guilt from unworthiness to go to the temple, regret at the marriage, and troubled backgrounds, a technical question seemed appropriate. "How long do you and your wife prepare before you attempt full intercourse?" "Oh, quite a long time," the husband replied. "Could you estimate the actual time in minutes?" He said, "Oh, at least five minutes." Whereupon, some technical education was offered about female emotions and bodily processes and about male emotions and processes, with rather specific instructions about the time needed to achieve new virginal, physical intimacy.

Other Disorders: Ego-dystonic Homo- and Heterosexuality. Here may I refer to all the boys and men (and increasing numbers of girls and women) who are caught up in pathetic attempts to perform stereotypic macho or seductive roles, based on exploitation and manipulation. *DSM III's* definition reveals the illusion by referring to ego-dystonic homosexuality. "The essential features are a desire to acquire or increase heterosexual arousal, so that heterosexual relationships can be initiated or maintained..."

So far as I can determine, the prevailing professional and popular definition of heterosexual arousal clashes almost totally with Gospel values. It is based on lust or erotic arousal—meaning a rather indiscriminate, carnal interest in females and implies that paraphilia disorders and dysfunctions are social or personal problems mainly because they are either thoughts converted into acts with unwilling people or are failures by willing people to achieve erotic competence. All manner of formerly deviant sexual practices between consenting adults have been brought under the umbrella of "normal" as long as they are performed privately by adults who mutually agree. This rationale has brought sexology to a place where restoration of erotic functioning with willing partners is the measure of success.

Yet, one fails to find in Gospel values allowance for any sexual interest in anyone except one's spouse. We are forbidden to even think sexual thought about others besides our spouse, let alone perform physical acts. We are not justified to think about or act sexually with anyone, male or female, except our spouse. Anyone who claims there is biological or psychological data showing that we are impelled to be indiscriminately sexual collides with the doctrine and value of personal agency. To reconcile this, we must resort to a Mormon Calvinism, teaching of a treacherous diety who implants powerful, nearly overwhelming urges and then demands, upon pain of hell, that we crush those urges.

The innocent man or woman seeking intimacy can be caught between two great extremes, one propounding sexual license and one propounding sexual

impoverishment. Perhaps it is these extremes which have resulted in an increasing sexual malaise among many people. (See Kaplan, 1979, p.57)

It is more consistent with LDS doctrine and values to believe that there stirs within each of us an innate urge toward intimacy—a trait, if you will, of personality. This urge, even when crippled by parental, peer, or cultural stress, cannot be extinguished. Of its own momentum it seeks expression in some way, frequently socially acceptable, but often not so.

The helping effort is enhanced by knowing whether a psychosexual problem is deeply rooted in personality, in a wounded desire for intimacy, or is instead a matter of relatively superficial character. Self-discipline and moral integrity must be learned whichever is the case, but simply learning law-abiding impulse control may not be enough. To cope with and fully enjoy intimacy each of us may also be required to comprehend our identity, personality, and character. Without this integration there exists—and we sadly see—people who are apparently morally orthodox but who actually have an illusory, unhappy, and constricted "orthodoxy." These are those rigid, even brittle people who break after having done all that is proper because finally the separation between their unintegrated self and their apparently integrated roles and relationships widens to a chasm. An apparently ideal marriage ends. A devoted youth leader is arrested on a morals charge. Incest destroys what everyone thought was a stalwart home.

No one should mistake these comments as disregarding the place of character in evaluation or education. Our values system is based upon character. Perhaps this is justice. Yet in many psychosexual cases, if healing is to be accomplished, attention must be paid to deep, innate inner pain. Perhaps this is mercy. Many clients must cease to use pornography, refrain from bizarre practices, learn technical facts about sexual activity and exercise them with tender decency. This is character. Many clients must fathom their relationships with parents, reinterpret recollections of cruel peers, or redefine their roles and relationships in regard to an erotically obsessed culture. This is personality.

How many people would be freed from severe psychosexual distress if they were permitted to view themselves and others as not hormonally or genetically obligated to be either hedonistically heterosexual or homosexual. Instead, they are obligated to be nurturant, to be kind, and to reject exploitation or manipulation of others. Then, within the values enshrouding benevolent marriage, they can develop complete social, emotional, physical and spiritual intimacy in that manner suggested by millennia of culture and prescribed by God.

This concept has proven to be a markedly effective educational tool in working with both homo- and heterosexually troubled clients. It frees both from the burden of impossible expectations. By removing the culturally fostered illusion of hyper-eroticism, it permits focus on far more tangible, measurable change tasks such as redefining role attitudes and behaviors in harmony with innate identity (a real man need not be a financial, professional or Church VIP; a woman can be

an efficient manager of money or resources), and learning and practicing nurturant relationship skills (a man may be gentle and noncompetitive; a woman may be brisk, of vigorous opinions and strong interests). But neither should manipulate or exploit each other in their relationship.

Summary

The subject of human intimacy reminds me of the galaxy of which our planet is a part. Physicists and astronomers discover certain laws which govern orbits and distances on into infinity, but they seldom comprehend the ultimate origin or purpose of the universe. Similarly, Godhood may be the only state in which a person is able to fathom the depth and breadth of intimate relationships. Professional licensure may not quite do it all. Hence our finite minds must begin with relatively primitive data. However, we are taught by our values that mankind and the human heart are modeled after Diety. This value allows no pandering to crude or carnal criteria. By giving respectful attention to secular data about human development but filtering it through Gospel screens in our interpretation of that data, we can help our brothers and sisters prevent or heal psychosexual distress. Education based upon eternal truth will free them and us of illusion. Helping methods based upon eternal truth will free them of illusion. Helping methods based upon the severe mercy of a pristine Christianity will heal them of distress. Surely these goals are worth the extraordinary effort of breaking free from secular misimpressions and exploring and embracing higher, finer understanding and methods.

REFERENCES

- Bell, Allan, Weinberg, Morton, and Hammersmith, Sue. *Sexual Preference*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981.
- Brown, Victor L. Jr., "Male homosexuality: Identity Seeking a role." *AMCAP Journal*, 1981, 7(2):3-10, 35.
- Brown, Victor L. Jr. *Human Intimacy*. Salt Lake City: Parliament Publishers, 1981.
- Cory, D.W. (Pseud.) *The Homosexual in America*. New York: Castlebook, 1960.
- DSM III. *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, Third Edition. The American Psychiatric Association, 1980.
- Kagan, Jerome. "The baby's elastic mind," *Human Nature*, January 1978, pp. 66-73.
- Kaplan, Helen Singer. *Disorders of Sexual Desire*. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1979.
- Masters, William H. and Johnson, Virginia E. *Homosexuality in Perspective*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979.
- Pattison, Mansell and Myrna. "Ex-Gays: Religiously mediated change in homosexuals." *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1980, 137(12):1553-1562.
- Solzhenitsyn, Alexander. "A world split apart," *Vital Speeches of the Year*, September 1978, 45(22):678-84.

Discussion groups met following Brother Brown's presentation. The following are the written summaries of the oral reports presented at the convention by the three group leaders who prepared statements for the Journal:

Richard Berrett

There are three issues which we think would be appropriate to hear a response to:

The first has to do with the notion that personality should not be changed. The people in our group who were vocal on this issue tended to think personality can be altered. There are some innate personality characteristics which need to be modified. One example given was hyperactivity in children.

The second issue concerned the statement, "sexual preference and sexual arousal are learned." The vocal ones in our group suggested that before we came to this earth life, we were taught truths. If these spiritual teachings included truths about the relationships of men to women over the eternities, then it is inherently right to like members of the other sex, and in fact, that inherent predisposition may actually lead us toward the eventual sexual mating. So, rather than preference and arousal being neutral, perhaps preference and arousal are innately heterosexual.

For the third issue there seems to be, in some of our presentations at AMCAP, and to some degree in this one as well, an idea that the scientific method is not very valuable and what we've learned from it is not really that important to consider in our deliberations. Statements from our group suggested that we need to not only use the information we gain through the scientific method, but we must also use science as one vehicle in the continuing search for truth.

Val MacMurray

Vic's book, *Human Intimacy*, has a touch of genius in appealing to a diverse audience (e.g. client, professional, ecclesiastical, interested laypersons) much more so than any other comparable works. It is a landmark composition in this regard as well as in dealing with a challenging issue in a gospel value context. The book has extensive philosophy and conceptual specialism encompassing the whole subject matter of intimacy. The bibliography is comprehensive citing numerous well-known scientists.

The following questions were raised by individuals in our group:

1. Could a clearer differentiation be made between character and personality?
2. Should a continuum be provided as opposed to classifying all people into one group?
3. What are illusions and realities in personality?
4. What is the impact of biology on roles?

There is still much to be done on this subject. Perhaps this requires another book that Vic might consider in terms of operationalizing a treatment or preventative approach to problems discussed in this book.

completed on page 27

HOW REALISTIC IS THE GOAL OF PREVENTING PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH TEENAGE SEXUAL ACTIVITY?

Terrance D. Olson,* Ph.D.

Testimony to the United States Senate Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations Subcommittee, May 5, 1982.

Jorgensen (1981), in discussing how likely it might be that adolescent pregnancies could be reduced in the 1980's by educational means, noted four barriers to the efficacy of such education.

1. There might be deliberate pregnancies associated with "untenable" family situations.
2. Levels of adolescent cognitive development may be related to immature and unwise decision-making regarding sexual behavior.
3. Current "sex role structures" of adolescent couples encourage precocious sexual activity.
4. There is a lack of parental involvement in educating children about sexuality.

If these are barriers to effectively reducing adolescent pregnancies, how can they be overcome? More specifically, how might prevention programs realistically eliminate or reduce these barriers?

First of all, it may be naive to think that putting sex education in the schools is going to solve the problem. At best, public schools are a secondary influence in an adolescent's world, while the primary influences on adolescents in our country remain the family and the peer group. However, if the entire population of teenagers is to be addressed, doing so through the school system is logical, but such attempts to influence teenage behavior should link the secondary influence of the schools with the primary influence of the parents. Moreover, where possible, philosophies of the peer group which lead to self-destructive behavior among teenagers should be identified and contrasted with modes of reasoning which are more related to quality family experiences across the life span. What some regard as "typical" behavior among adolescents in our society is not necessarily wise or beneficial, and teenagers deserve to be shown that all modes of living do not have the same consequences. There are different paths they can travel, with different consequences which they themselves can choose.

It is recognized that these barriers produce the symptoms of problems (such as venereal disease, premarital pregnancies, etc.) which the adolescent family life bill hopes to alleviate. We propose that the barriers identified by Jorgensen can be eliminated most successfully by being addressed directly. If they are the source of the symptoms, our solutions should be focused on those sources. How might this be done?

Barrier 1: The negative family situation

*Brother Olson is Professor of Family Sciences, BYU.

If some adolescents achieve pregnancy as a means of escaping conflicted relationships with their parents or as a means of finding "fulfillment" in an otherwise hostile world, then the teenager's motives for sexual involvement/pregnancy are already self-defeating. Parental involvement in family life education with their teenagers can provide parents and their adolescents with new views of conflict resolution and of inter-generational understanding. Where parents are unwilling or unavailable for involvement in family life education, education can still be beneficial to teenagers and can be conducted in a way which promotes the possibility of harmony in parent-child relationships. However, by not attending to the family dimensions of a teenager's experience, school curriculum may undermine the most powerful influence available: the parents.

Barrier 2: Inadequate cognitive development or moral reasoning skills

Levels of adolescent cognitive development may contribute to immature and unwise decision-making regarding sexual behavior. Such decision-making may not take place with an understanding of the meaning of such decisions across time or across generations. Specifically, teenagers may be unprepared cognitively to deal with philosophies which promote premature sexual activity. Thus, the very philosophies of sexual expression to which our teenagers are exposed are barriers to the solution of problems such as adolescent pregnancy.

Fortunately, adolescents are also asking questions about the meaning of such concepts as justice or honesty, and could be taught criteria by which to ponder such concepts. These same criteria could be applied by teenagers to their decision-making in educational, financial or relational contexts.

However, these discussions cannot be conducted in a moral vacuum where every available choice is presented as if it were equal to every other available choice. Such an approach would imply that there is no particular value in any value, and would obscure the very kind of knowledge the students need to make responsible value judgments. In short, prevention programs must include cognitive development and skills in moral reasoning because they are fundamental to the adolescent decision-making process.

Barrier 3: Teenage couple "Sex role structures" which promote early sexual involvement

Such couples may insulate themselves from the "real world" with fantasies, while behaving in ways which

have real consequences. Such fantasies are a further expression of a failure to think maturely about behavior which can affect the future so dramatically. The consequences of immature behavior weigh most immediately and dramatically on women, and have implications for future family relationships, economic opportunities, and social and emotional development.

These couples often suffer from the egocentric thinking which is the hallmark of adolescent reasoning. One way to attack this barrier to responsible sexual decision-making is through the focus on cognitive development already noted. In addition, the differential motivations and meanings of sexual involvement for males and females should be explored.

This should include a reminder that the double standard is not dead with respect to the consequences, physically or emotionally, of sexual activity. The woman bears the greater risk and generally takes the greater responsibility regarding the consequences of sexual involvement.

Barrier 4: Lack of parental involvement in educating children about sexuality

The problem here may be less a failure to teach the fundamentals of biology and reproduction than it is a failure of parents and teenagers to communicate beliefs about what would constitute wise sexual conduct through the adolescent years. Yet curiously, a common reason given by pregnant adolescent females when asked why they did not use contraceptives indicates that they did not want their parents to know they were sexually active. This reason reveals that teenagers may not be ignorant of parental values even if they have not been explicitly discussed.

It may be that lack of knowledge--either of human biology or of parental value systems--is not generally the contributing factor in premarital pregnancies. Rather, a conflict of teenage behavior with parental values and *in spite of* biological knowledge seems to be a typical context. It is proposed, if true long-term prevention of problems of adolescent sexuality is desired, that such prevention is best achieved by exploring the meaning of such behavior, not just to the individual, but to the family across generations.

In promoting the view that we must teach about family life and not just about sexual behaviors, we underline our assumption that morality in this country rests ultimately and most clearly upon the family. And this morality involves much more than just sexual behavior; it involves honesty, integrity, justice, responsibility, etc. Hafen (1981), in an address to the National Council on Family Relations emphatically states that while:

the individual tradition is at the heart of American culture,...the fulfillment of individualism's promise of personal liberty depends, paradoxically, upon the maintenance of a set of corollary traditions that require what may seem to be the opposite of personal liberty: Submission to authority, acceptance of responsibility, and the discharge of duty.

Specifically, if we were to teach children of any age that the family implications of sexual behaviors do not matter, we teach that the family does not matter. Would

we expect a businessman to be honest in his business dealings, but not in his associations at home? Do we wish to promote the idea that a school teacher should behave justly at school, but not at home? No, we expect family behavior to be moral behavior, and that our behavior in society should reflect the best of our behavior at home--whether we are businessmen, school teachers, college professors or senators.

The family, then, is the uniquely necessary source of public virtue. It is within family life that children are taught to be willing to obey the unenforceable.

In review of this point, it may be that philosophies which affirm sexual license among teenagers are more at fault for producing the problems addressed by the adolescent pregnancy bill than lack of parental instruction. However, parental commitment to such instruction cannot be underestimated.

Thus, any prevention program, to be realistic, must utilize and foster family strengths. If we abandon this generation of teenagers by not teaching them the family dimensions of responsibility, they may then reproduce a level of moral irresponsibility in the parent of tomorrow that the parents of today have not yet imagined.

Summary of Recommendations for Prevention Programs Mandated by the Adolescent Family Life Bill

1. Parental involvement should be fundamental to any program designed to prevent the problems associated with teenage sexual activity.
2. Programs which seek to prevent problems associated with teenage sexual activity should directly address the very philosophies which promote that activity.
3. Teenage cognitive development includes concerns about moral issues and about questions such as what is justice, honesty, integrity, or responsibility. A prevention program should include an exploration of these concepts as they apply to all aspects of human conduct.
4. Irrespective of the family backgrounds from which teenagers come, they all face life decisions which have implications for their family as well as for themselves. The consequences of their decisions affect relationships in their own family across time and across generations--past, present, and future. Therefore, the family context should be the foundation of any discussion of issues related to teenage decision-making.
5. It may be naive to think that any educational program could, in and of itself, be successful in preventing the problems associated with teenage sexual activity. However, any program which invites teenagers to reason and to ponder the family meaning of their behavior addresses the fundamental issues of prevention. To abandon the family dimension in discussions of these matters in favor of the treatment of immediate symptoms is even more naive because it offers no foundation to teenagers by which they can examine the full range of logical social, emotional, physical, and family consequences of their choices.

completed on page 27

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE HEART-- A SCRIPTURAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Paul F. Cook,* Ph.D.

Presented at the AMCAP Convention

1 October, 1982

Abstract

The word heart was used by the Hebrews and Greeks as an equivalent of our modern words of mind, emotion, will and personality. The Lord who revealed his ideas about the heart anciently has continued to use this word in modern revelations, thus raising the possibility that it is still useful to us. This paper defines heart, examines seven ways a treasure is established in the heart, and draws implications for a theory of personality and psychotherapy. Recommendations for research are also included.

The purpose of this paper is to examine more closely the word *heart* as it is used in the four standard works of the Church as well as the talks and writings of general authorities of the Church. Heart is a fundamental word used in conceptualizing human behavior in the scriptures. The ancient Greeks and Hebrews used heart to encompass a number of concepts which today are the province of psychology. Is it possible to find useful concepts for a theory of personality and psychotherapy by examining more closely the scriptural teachings regarding the heart? This paper will first define heart, second, look at what it means to build a treasure in the heart, third, discuss ways treasures are built, and fourth, examine some implications for a theory of human personality and psychotherapy.

Defining the Heart

Most of us have used the word *heart* fairly glibly in daily discourse. However, the word is worth looking at less casually because of its ancient and lavish use in the scriptures. The new *Topical Guide* to the scriptures has 176 references to heart in the four standard works. The *Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* (1962) identifies four separate uses of the word:

1. A part of the physical body
2. The seat of psychic life
 - a. the seat of the emotions
 - b. the seat of the intellect
 - c. the seat of volition and the moral life
3. The point of contact with God
4. The equivalent of the personality

The *New Bible Dictionary* (1962) reports the word is used 29 times to refer to the physical organ, 257 times to the

***Brother Cook is an Instructional Developer, David O. McKay Institute of Education and Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, BYU.**

Acknowledgment is gratefully given to Burton Kelly who provided me with a number of scriptural and *Journal of Discourse* sources on the heart and related topics.

personality, 166 times to indicate emotional status, 204 times to describe intellectual activities and 195 times to refer to volition or purpose. In defining heart, the *New Bible Dictionary* says:

... the Hebrews thought in terms of subjective experience rather than objective, scientific observation, thereby avoiding the modern error of over departmentalization. It was essentially the whole man, with all his attributes, physical, intellectual, and psychological, of which the Hebrew thought and spoke, and the heart was conceived of as the governing center for all of these. It is the heart which makes a man...what he is (Prov. 16:23, 23:7) and governs all his actions. (Prov. 4:23) Character, personality, will, mind are modern terms which all reflect something of the meaning of heart "in the Biblical usage."

The New Testament usage is very similar...while it does not altogether lose its physical reference, for it is "made of flesh" (II Corinthians 3:3) but it is the seat of the will (e.g. Mark 3:5), of the intellect (e.g. Mark 2:6-8), and of feeling (e.g. Luke 24 and 32). This means that "heart" comes the nearest to the New Testament terms to mean "Person." Furthermore, there is no suggestion in the Bible that the brain is the center of consciousness, thought, or will. It is the heart that is so regarded, and though it is used for emotions also, it is also more frequently the lower organs (bowels, etc.), in so far as they are distinguished, that are connected with emotions.

"Mind" is the closest common term to the Biblical usage of "heart," and many passages could well be so translated. (e.g. Eccles. 1:17, Matt. 5:28)

In Greek usage (*New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* 1976), the heart was the seat of the emotions and feelings, of the instincts and passions. The Greeks thought of emotions like joy and sadness, courage and cowardness, strength and fear, love, hatred and anger. Further on the similarity of heart and mind, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (1962) says:

Because of its concrete character the Hebrew language can hardly express the idea "to think" except by the phrase "to say in the heart" (Gen. 27:41, Ps. 10:6). "With the heart man makes his plans" (Prov. 16:19) and seeks knowledge and understanding (Eccles. 8:16). The heart is the storehouse of memory (Prov. 3:3, Luke 1:77). So intimate is the connection of heart and thought that the English versions (of the Bible) sometimes render the Hebrew word for heart as "understanding" (Job 12:3) or mind. "To steal the heart" means "to deceive the mind."

Kallistos (1966) has summarized the scriptural meaning of the heart very well:

The term "heart" is of particular significance in the Orthodox doctrine of man. When people in the west today speak of the heart, they usually mean the emotions and affections. But in the Bible, as in most ascetic texts of the Orthodox Church, the heart has a far wider connotation. It is the primary organ of man's being, whether physical or spiritual; it is the centre of life, the

determining principle of all our activities and aspirations. As such, the heart obviously includes the affections and emotions, but it also includes much else besides: it embraces in effect everything that goes to comprise what we call a "person."

Building a Treasure in the Heart

A number of scriptures and sayings of the Savior and the prophets emphasize the critical importance of building a good treasure in the heart. In Luke Christ made the following remarks about the role of the heart in human behavior.

A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh." (Luke 6:45)

In this scripture Christ likens the heart to a treasure chest, for it is out of our treasure chest that our thoughts and actions are generated. The heart is seen as a container of thought. In modern days the elders of the Church were told to "treasure these things up in your hearts..." (D&C 43:34)

However, a container does not have the power to fill itself; it must be filled by someone and it is critical to fill it with good things. Jesus scathingly rebuked the scribes and Pharisees by saying "Cleanse first that which is within..." (Matt. 23:25-28) Paul taught that the treasure in our heart will be evaluated when he said, "Even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God which trieth our hearts." (I Thess. 2:4; see also Ps 17) He further proposed we should speak, "To the end he may establish your hearts unblameable before God." (I Thess. 3:13) Thus we should "...answer them which glory in appearance, and not in heart." (II Cor. 5:12) Samuel declared, "for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." (I Sam. 16:7)

Why is the quality of the treasure in our heart so important that it serves as the criteria by which the Lord judges man? The answer apparently lies in the belief of the prophets that the treasure in our hearts is the motivator of our thoughts and actions. For example, in Abraham 1:6-7, Abraham asserts that the heart of his fathers were "set to do evil..." Jesus taught that it was "out of the heart and not from without" that evil thoughts proceed. (Mark 7:15,21-23.)

If the contents of our heart are so important, what do the prophets have to say about how those contents are established, built up, maintained, or changed, and does this have relevance for theory building in education and psychotherapy today?

Man Controls the Treasure in His Heart

If we were to ask the question, "who controls the treasure in our heart-God, Satan or us?" the prophets would answer that we do. However, the individual cannot build a "good" treasure without God's help. Brigham Young said, "Man cannot govern himself, he never was able to do it, and never will be able to until he receives this wisdom and intelligence which comes from God." (*Journal of Discourses*, 1966, Vol. 1, p. 153) Further, he said, "In and of ourselves we have no power to control our minds and passions; but the grace of God is sufficient to give us perfect victory." These statements

imply that we are not able to build a good treasure by ourselves and that we must be submissive in order for God to become our instructor. Only then can we govern ourselves.

Brigham Young was once asked to explain the origin of thought. He replied,

The origin of thought was planted in our organization at the beginning of our being. This is not telling you how it came there, or who put it there. Thought originated with our individual being, which is organized to be as independent as any being in eternity. (JD. 1966, Vol. 2, p. 134)

In Mormonism we believe that individuals have free agency guaranteed by God. God cannot violate this basic principle of agency of man in exercise of free will. Of this Brigham Young said in 1866:

The volition of the creature is free. This is a law of their existence, and the Lord cannot violate his own law; were he to do this he would cease to be God...this is a law which has existed from all eternity and will continue to exist through all the eternities to come. Every intelligent being must have the power of choice, and God brings forth the results of the acts of his creatures to promote his kingdom and subserve his purposes in the salvation and exaltation of his children. (JD. 1966, Vol. 2, p. 171)

Nels L. Nelson, a Mormon apologist writing in 1904 declared that the primal intelligent entity must have been a free agent. He said:

This ultimate, uncreated being was a free agent. I reached that conclusion from the following reasons: being eternal and therefore co-eternal with the universe, it was beholden to no power whatever for its existence; and being indestructible, it might, in a negative way, defy all powers outside of itself combined. That is, if all forces of the universe and of all other intelligent beings beside itself, should combine to make it say yes, it might still say no, and maintain its attitude. This evidently is the real meaning of free agency; without such ultimate negative power, no being can be said to be free. (Nelson, 1904)

This statement on agency is reminiscent of Viktor Frankl's description of agency as a prisoner in a war camp. When everything we normally consider as freedoms was taken away from him, he gained a belief in free agency because he still had the freedom to live or die, or, that is, to say "no" to this world.

In the Doctrine and Covenants the Lord explains further the relationship between law and agency:

And unto every kingdom is given a law; and unto every law there are certain bounds also and conditions. All beings who abide not in those conditions are not justified. (D&C 88:38-39)

Apparently, if we want to master a kingdom (or world order), we must learn the laws of that world and then live them. But we may choose not to obey those laws and pay the consequences of not being eligible to live in that world, and thus be relegated to some different world order where we are willing to abide the laws. The gospel teaches us that we do indeed have the power to say no and that no one or no influence can defy that power.

These statements, along with many scriptures which could be cited (Moses 3:16-17; 2 Nephi 2:11, 16, 17; D&C 58:28), teach that man is a free agent in his thinking, beliefs, emotions, and behavior. It is reasonable to

conclude that man can indeed build a treasure, either good or bad, in his heart--not only that he can, but he does--and that it can be built in no other way than through his volition.

From our discussion so far it is clear that the heart is like a container that can be filled with good or bad things, and that which comes out of us--speech and actions--is the result of what is in our treasure. We have also established that what is in our treasure is of immense concern to God and that we are in control of our individual treasures, but that they cannot become good treasures unless God becomes our instructor.

Building a Treasure

We now turn to the question of how we build a good treasure in our hearts? Brigham Young taught that the first principle of building this treasure was to inculcate true religion in our hearts. He defined religion as principles (ideas) and feelings:

If the religion we possess does not control and reign predominate over every other principle and feeling, we have not been schooled in it so as to learn our lessons correctly--we are not masters of this heavenly science. (JD. 1966, Vol. 1, p.335)

To John Taylor it was very important to plant in the heart true beliefs and attitudes. Every belief and feeling is to be screened through this Gospel net of true ideas, principles, and feelings. To quote:

Man is an intelligent being, but how far does that intelligence fall short of that which regulates the world! He cannot even govern himself....If he can receive it from God as his instructor, he is then able to govern himself, possessing intelligence which he now knows nothing about; an intelligence which indeed is worthy of God and man. (JD. 1966, Vol. 1, p. 153.)

Other scriptures corroborate this view. For example, Paul taught that:

For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their minds, and write them into their hearts: And I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. (Hebrews 8:10; see also Hebrews 10:16)

Sources of the Treasure in the Heart

There are at least seven sources alluded to in the scriptures for developing a treasure, either good or bad, in our hearts. First, the treasure may be built through *imagination*. Imagination is the process or power of forming a mental image of something that is not or has not been seen or experienced. All persons have the capacity to make images in their minds to one degree or another. This process is apparently important in building a treasure as well as telling us what has already been established. To use a computer metaphor, imagination is a way to program as well as to provide a playback function to see what is already programmed. Some examples of scriptures that mention or allude to imagination include:

And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every *imagination* of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. (Genesis 6:5)

Oh Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, our fathers, keep this forever in the *imagination* of the thoughts of the heart

of thy people, and prepare their hearts unto thee. (1 Chron. 29:18)

Neither shall they walk anymore after the *imagination* of their evil heart; (Jer. 3:17), and speaking of the Jews who were wicked, Jeremiah added, "They walked in the counsels and the *imagination* of their evil heart, and went backward and not forward." (Jer. 7:24)

Speaking to William Law, the Lord said, "He shall mount up in the *imagination* of his thoughts as upon eagles wings." (D&C 124:99)

It was said of the events surrounding the birth of Jesus, "Mary kept all of these things and pondered [imagined] them in her heart." (Luke 2:19)

Second, the treasure is built by choosing what one thinks about. That an individual can select what he thinks or imagines may not be accepted by all theorists. Most of us recognize that thoughts and images are very fleeting, ethereal, and flicker in and out of consciousness like motion pictures with a variety of degree of color and clarity. The evidence presented by some neurotic and psychotic conditions seems to argue against the idea that we can always control our thoughts. For example, people with obsessive-compulsive thoughts strive endlessly to keep troublesome thoughts from entering their mind, and, to themselves, they seem powerless to be able to do so. The origin and dynamics behind obsessive-compulsive thinking are not fully known; but, following gospel principles, we have to conclude that normally thoughts are under the control of the individual. Brigham Young said:

If you are injured by a neighbor, the first thought of the unregenerate heart is for God to damn the person who has hurt you. But if a person blesses you, the first thought that arises in you is, God bless that man; and this is the disposition to which we ought to cleave. But dismiss any spirit that would prompt you to injure any creature that the Lord has made, give it no place, encourage it not, and it will not stay where you are. You can let the black man, (bad thought) or the white man (good thought) into your house, as you please; you can say, Walk in, to both of them...When the white man presents himself, you know him at once by his complexion; the same when you see darkness and blackness advancing, you know it is from beneath, and you command it to leave your house. When the good man comes, he brings with him a halo of kindness which fills you with peace and heavenly comfort; invite him into your house and make him your constant guest. (JD. 1966, Vol. 2, p. 134;135)

This same doctrine has in recent years been taught by Boyd K. Packer. To quote:

Years ago I put some signs in my mind. They are very clearly printed and simply read: No trespassing. No dumping allowed. On occasions it has been necessary to show them very plainly to others. I do not want anything coming into my mind that does not have some useful purpose or some value that makes it worth keeping--I have had to evict some thoughts a hundred times before they would stay out. I have never been successful until I have put something edifying in their place. (Packer, 1977)

Most of us believe that we have the power to control our thoughts. We do this by what we attend to. Each of us can pay attention to what we find interesting; and when self-discipline is exercised, we pay attention to what we find *disinteresting*. We also intuitively understand that the mind needs disciplining in what we

attend to. From the early years of school, one of the major tasks children must learn is to concentrate. When we do this we exercise control, by choice, over what we are paying attention to and thinking about. This leads us to our next method of building a treasure in the heart.

Third, the treasure in our heart is built by training. The early leaders of the Church believed that we established a treasure in our heart by training ourselves to think. Brigham Young said:

Do you know that it is your privilege to so live that your minds may be so well-schooled in the knowledge of your religion, that your minds are as perfectly under your control as are your bodies, except when they are nervous (psychotic or very neurotic)?...Study to preserve your bodies in life and health, and you will be able to control your minds. And when you come to meeting, bring your minds with you. (JD. 1966, Vol. 8, p. 135)

Elder Orson Hyde said, referring to the incident of Solomon and the two women:

To divide that child would have destroyed it, just like dividing the mind: it destroys its power and efficiency, let the mind be concentrated, and it possesses mighty power. It is the agent of the Almighty clothed with mortal tabernacles, and we must learn to discipline it, and bring it to bear on one point, and not allow the devil to interfere and confuse it, nor divert it from the great objective we have in view. (JD. 1966, Vol. 7, p. 152)

Elder Orson Pratt said, speaking of Sir Isaac Newton, "How was it that he was able to make his important discoveries? Because he had disciplined his mind to that extent that he could concentrate it for a long period of time upon one object." (JD. 1966, Vol. 7, p. 152)

Fourth, thoughts that go into our treasure may be initiated to meet the needs of the body. The scriptures do not always describe man as being a unitary whole: They tell of a spirit and a body, which together are a living soul.

You are aware that many think the devil has rule and power over both body and spirit. Now, I want to tell you that he does not hold any power over man only so far as the body overcomes the spirit that is in a man, through yielding to the spirit of evil. The spirit that the Lord puts into a tabernacle of flesh is under the dictation of the Lord Almighty. (Brigham Young, JD. 1966, Vol. 2, p. 255)

Brigham Young believed that thoughts may be motivated by the body but they need not be forced into the treasure in our heart. We only put them in our treasure when we choose to do so by being enticed by the flesh. Such fleshy thoughts may include fearful, worrisome, hedonistic, envious, sexually debasing, or other selfish impulses. When we persist or train ourselves to think these thoughts, then a fleshly treasure is established in our heart.

Fifth, Satan can be the source of thoughts which effect our treasure. Orson Hyde taught,

I have an idea that the devil comes and catches away the word that is sown in our hearts, to defeat the design that the Lord had in sowing it. Whereas, if we could control our minds, and not allow them to be caught away, then our eye would be single and the whole body would be full of light. (JD. 1966, Vol. 7, p. 152; see also John 13:2; Acts 5:3)

In this thought, Elder Hyde is warning us that Satan is able to steal from the treasure of our heart by causing us

to be confused and to doubt the true principles which have been placed there from the Lord's sources. In other words, Satan effects our hearts by enticing us to change our beliefs away from the truth.

Sixth, our spirit generates thoughts. Thoughts are apparently also generated from our individual spirits. Brigham Young taught the saints to:

Continually and righteously watch the spirit the Lord has put in you, and I will promise you to be led to righteousness, holiness, peace, and good order....Let the spirit take the lead, and bring the body and its passions into subjection and you are safe. (JD. 1966, Vol. 2, p. 256)

Thoughts can come from our own individual spirit, and thoughts from this source are reliable according to Brigham Young.

Seventh, we can build our treasure through revelation. John Taylor said,

What will enable you, brethren and sisters, to govern yourselves? The Spirit of God; and you cannot do it without the Spirit of the Living God dwelling in you. You must have the light of revelation, or else you cannot do it. If you get the Gift of the Holy Ghost and walk in the light of the countenance of the Lord, you can govern yourselves and families, that is, if you retain it by your good works. (JD. 1966, Vol. 10, p. 55)

One of Job's antagonists gave us important insight about revelation. He said, "But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding. (Job 32:8) After King Benjamin's address to the Nephites--

he sent among them to find out if the people believed his words. And they all cried with one voice, saying: Yea, we believe all the words which thou hast spoken unto us; and also, we know of their surety and truth, because of the Spirit of the Lord Omnipotent, which has wrought a mighty change in us, or in our hearts, that we have no more disposition to do evil, but to do good continually. (Mosiah 5:1-2)

According to these scriptures, man's treasure may be built directly in his self--by-passing the physical senses.

This phenomenon of revelation is wonderful for the individual but problematic for development of a science of personality. Psychologists have struggled with the issue of individual consciousness. Subjective internal experience cannot be made public--thus violating one of the first principles of science, that data must be public.

The philosopher Polanyi distinguished between two kinds of knowledge. These two knowledges are propositional and tacit knowledge. Propositional knowledge is the knowledge of both reason and gossip. It is composed of all "interpersonally shareable statements," most of which--for most people--are observations of objects and events. Tacit knowledge may also dwell on objects and events, but it is knowledge gained from experience with them, experience with propositions about them, and rumination. A further elaboration of this idea was made by Tolstoy who proposed that "Through reason man observes himself; but he knows himself only through consciousness." Tacit knowledge is all that is remembered somehow, minus that which is remembered in the form of words symbols, or other rhetorical forms. (Stake, 1978)

Psychologists have been convinced that propositional

knowledge is the only sure foundation for building a science of psychology. However, public knowledge is rather removed from the most important and influential knowledge possessed by an individual--that of individual awareness and understanding. It is easy to be discouraged by the fact that God does not often reveal himself through public knowledge, but there are good reasons for this. Human beings are not motivated by public or propositional knowledge. We may know about something academically, and we may have this knowledge explained to us in great detail, but such knowledge is not the same as that understanding which convinces us and changes our attitudes and beliefs. The Lord reveals his mind directly to our hearts because it is more convincing. Tacit knowledge not only has direct access to our hearts but it is regulated by the Lord according to the amount and kind of information which we can process and absorb. This process is described as "line upon line and precept upon precept." (II Nephi 28:30) Thoughts planted in our heart by revelation from God are indeed a treasure.

Summary

From our discussion thus far it can be seen that the quality of our heart, our treasure chest of desires, attitudes, beliefs, and understandings, is very crucial both within a religious framework and a psychological framework. We feel and act according to the treasure that is in our heart. To establish a good treasure is to work out one's salvation as well as build strong emotional strength. The establishment of our treasure is an individual endeavor and cannot be accomplished except by individual choice. God is unable to build our treasure, and the devil is unable to add to or take away from our treasure without our voluntary consent. There are a number of processes by which we build our treasure. These include imagination; choice of thought; training our thinking; listening to the impulses of our body, Satan, and our own spirit; and, grandest of all--revelation. This paper has not attempted a comprehensive discussion of all the ways that a treasure may be established in the heart. There probably are more ways which could be documented.

Implications

The concept of "heart" has probably been overlooked by those attempting to build theories of personality, probably because it has appeared to be too imprecise to be useful. There are, however, some important implications which can be drawn about human personality by studying the way heart is used by the prophets in the scriptures.

The first implication is that thought and images become crucial in the development of the personality. As the proverb says, "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he." (Prov. 23:7) This suggests that if secular theories are to be drawn upon by us, those with a perceptual-cognitive orientation may be useful. The key to building a righteous and strong personality, or changing personality, appears to be in altering thinking and thinking habits. It would appear that with most of us emotions, habits, and motivations follow from thinking.

Distinguished writers discussing the phenomenon of the heart have used a computer metaphor. Schumacher (1977), an economist and philosopher, in pointing out the enormous superiority of the human over the animal because of our capacity for self-awareness, noted:

Now, self-awareness is closely related to the power of attention, or perhaps I should say the power of *directing* attention. My attention is often, or perhaps most of the time, *captured* by outside forces which I may or may not have chosen myself--sights, sounds, colors, etc.--or else by forces inside myself--expectations, fears, worries, interests, etc. When it is so captured, I function very much like a machine: I am not *doing* things; they simply *happen*. All the time, there exists, however, the possibility that I may take the matter in hand and quite freely and deliberately *direct* my attention to something entirely of my own choosing, something that does not capture me but is to be captured by me. The difference between directed and captured attention is the same as the difference between doing things and letting things take their course, or between living and "being lived." No subject could be of greater interest; no subject occupies a more central place in all traditional teachings; and no subject suffers more neglect, misunderstanding, and distortion in the thinking of the modern world. (p. 66-67)

Wilder Penfield, a world famous neurologist and brain surgeon, published a summary of his findings about human personality under the title *The Mystery of the Mind*. He says:

Throughout my own scientific career I, like other scientists, have struggled to prove that the brain accounts for the mind. But now, perhaps, the time has come when we may profitably consider the evidence as it stands, and ask the question: *Do brain mechanisms account for the mind?* Can the mind be explained by what is now known about the brain? If not, which is the more reasonable of the two possible hypotheses: That man's being is based on one element, or on two? (Penfield, 1975)

Dr. Penfield comes to the conclusion that "the mind seems to act independently of the brain in the same sense that a programmer acts independently of his computer, however much he may depend upon the action of that computer for certain purposes."

An emphasis on thinking raises a number of empirical problems for investigators who use the scientific method. Much of the data language necessary for public communication of knowledge about thinking is undeveloped and many concepts are not operationalized. This state of affairs may require new methods and techniques not now available in traditional science. This does not mean, however, that new methods and techniques may not be developed. We need to learn a great deal more about what constitutes proper thinking, how people can be trained to think properly, and how to diagnose what has been programmed into the heart.

Another implication of this study into the heart is that somewhere in the human personality there is a programmable part (the heart) that is deeply profound and open-ended in the sense that it has access to intelligence that is outside the individual. The heart is programmed by another part of our personality that is immediately aware and attendant to thoughts and perceptions in the environment. This immediately aware part of the personality performs its programming largely by focusing on certain perceptions and by

choosing to think about them in certain ways. There are definite elements in the concept of heart as discussed in the scriptures that are reminiscent of the unconscious as used by Freud, but little to support the concept of divided consciousness as used by Hilgard (Hilgard, 1977). The heart as used in the scriptures appears to be more of a servomechanism which turns repeated thoughts and acts into habits which occur automatically and take place at a level of thinking which is largely out of the individual's awareness. Nowhere in the concept of heart is the idea that there is a fully articulate subconscious in the personality, which is unknown to the individual, as postulated by Hilgard. The closest gospel concept to the idea of divided consciousness is the individual spirit belonging to the person or the possession of the person by other spirits. The unconscious is a problem for some concerned with harmonizing gospel and secular concepts because it implies that motivation is unconscious. Hence, the person cannot be responsible for his behavior and is not a free agent. Our study of the heart, however, suggests that we are totally responsible for our programming. Once it has become habitual, free choice enters into a less conscious area. But we can alter our programming by examining our thoughts, and changing them, or by inviting in the Holy Ghost, which can also cause a change in programming if such a change is the will of God and of ourselves. However, it is interesting to note that the prophets do not see that we can program our heart in such a manner that we can control ourselves or obtain salvation without help from God. The new covenant, meaning the Gospel, is seen as the basic rules and regulations which must be programmed into the heart before the heart is truly effective or right before God.

Another implication which can be drawn about human personality is that right or proper programming allows us to function totally in harmony with the world order in which we find ourselves. When the heart is not properly programmed we find ourselves out of harmony and suffering as a result. If we are truly progressing as the scriptures say "from one kingdom to another," through the stages of eternal progression, then one of the great developmental tasks of this life is to learn to live the rules of this kingdom or world order. When we do not, we not only suffer, but apparently we are held back from progressing to a more complex or higher world order. This is rather consistent with certain rational-emotive therapies and theories of personality which suggest that individuals can overcome a number of personal problems by learning to think rationally. One of the criteria for rational thinking as used by Maultsby (1975), for example, is that it must be based on reality and not be magical thinking. Construing the world as magical in a sense puts us in the position of trying to be a creator of the world order, or, that is, we are not willing to abide by the law of this kingdom and are not "justified." (D&C 130:20-21) Many times in therapy we hear the word "should." This situation should be that, or that person should be this. Whereas, according to this scripture, everything in the world is exactly as it should be. Our problem is to figure it out

and to live in harmony with it.

Another implication is that our theories must rest firmly on a foundation of free agency, and must focus on an internal locus of control. Extreme environmental determinism must be rejected. While it is true that the environment can and does influence perception and thinking, it is not the factor that directly determines human personality. There is no doubt that environment can be a tremendous influence on personality, particularly in the early years of a person's life. However, the scriptures are firm in asserting that the individual chooses (or decides) to focus on certain perceptions and to think certain thoughts. If we can decide to think one way, we can also decide to think another if we become aware of the options. Extreme biological or hereditary determinism is also to be rejected in building sound theory. There is nothing in the concept of the heart that suggests that the body controls the human personality. There is the implication that it has certain needs which can influence our thinking, but still we remain in control. If we decide to follow our biological inclinations, we may do so, but we may also decide not to by what we choose to think about. It is implied from our study of the heart that the body is a sort of wonderful machine which may run in control, or out of control, at our own decision. A great deal of the body's performance is determined by the programming in the heart.

Based on our investigation into the heart, the following areas of research appear to be useful in building personality theory. *First*, methods and procedures are required to enable us to conceptualize, communicate and undertake investigations into the establishment of a good heart or the changing of the hardened or impure heart. These methods and procedures may or may not be along traditional scientific lines. It would indeed be beneficial if they could be observable and measurable, but if it proves impossible or unfeasible then other convincing procedures must be developed.

Second, a clear concept of a good heart needs to be fully defined, particularly within a psychological and therapeutic framework. This paper has suggested some of these characteristics but only in general terms. If possible, the concepts need to be much more fully operationalized. For example, what steps should be undertaken to soften the hardened heart, or to program peace into one's heart, or to change a fearful heart and so on?

Third, methods need to be developed to diagnose and evaluate the state of a person's heart. How can what has been established in the heart be made open and visible? It may not be possible for the treasure in a person's heart to be made known publically, but at least the individual should have access to his own heart and be able to be fully aware, when he desires, of what has been placed there.

Fourth, methods need to be clearly identified and operationalized which enable a person to change the programming in his heart. Based on the scriptural

completed on page 27

THAT THEY MIGHT NOT SUFFER: THE GIFT OF ATONEMENT

Eugene England,* Ph.D.

This sermon was one of a series given in the first part of 1966 to introduce Mormonism to friends of L.D.S. students at Stanford University and was published in the Autumn 1967 issue of *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*.¹ Eugene England was then an editor of *Dialogue*, a teaching assistant in the departments of both English and Religious Studies at Stanford, and a member of the Stanford Ward Bishopric.

A deep feeling of estrangement haunts modern life and literature and thought. The feeling is not at all new to human experience, but in our time we seem especially conscious of it. More men seem caught up by the divisions in their lives to a terrible anguish or a numbed resignation.

We find ourselves cut off from *others*, relating to each other as things, not as personal images of the eternal God; unable to say our truest thoughts and feelings to each other, exterminating each other in the gas ovens of Auschwitz and the firestorms of Berlin, fighting unjust wars to satisfy our greed or pride, responding to the color we reflect to each other's eyes and not to our sense of each other's being.

We find ourselves cut off from *God*, without a deep sense of joyful relation to him; witnessing him die in us and our civilization through the dead forms of our concepts of him and the inflexible forms of our response to him in the world; unable to let our confidence wax strong in his presence through the feeling that our lives are in harmony with his will.

And we find ourselves cut off from *ourselves*. We sin. We act contrary to our image of ourselves and break our deepest integrity. We do not just make mistakes through lack of knowledge or judgment but consciously go contrary to our sense of right; and therefore we not only suffer the natural consequences of all wrong action (however innocently done), but we also suffer the inner estrangement of guilt — that supreme human suffering which gives us our images of hell. This is an important distinction, made very clearly in Christian thought: "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin" is James's definition. Christ had said, "If ye were blind, ye should have no sin, but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth." We all know sin. We are inescapably moral by nature in that we cannot evade the question that finally comes into all reflection: "Am I

justified?" We have eaten of the tree of knowledge of good and evil and find the self of action tragically divided against the self of belief.

These are things we all know about. And if we are Christians we also know something about a claim which is incredible to most men — the claim that these estrangements can uniquely be healed through the atonement of Christ. Atonement — a word whose pronunciation disguises its meaning, which is literally *at one ment*, a bringing to unity, a reconciliation of that which is estranged: man and man, man and God, or man and himself. That Atonement remains, as Paul described it, "unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness." We have no greater need than that there be a force of healing in all our public and inner strife; that there be some source of forgiveness and change for the oppressor as well as help for the oppressed; that there be something large enough in love to reach past the wrongs we each have done and can never fully make restitution for; that there be hope in the possibility that any man can be renewed by specific means to a life of greater justice and mercy toward others. But for most men the claim that such a possibility truly exists is scandalous.

The scandal to humanistic man is the idea that man cannot go it alone — that his reason will not save him. Knowing what is right is not enough; there must be power to *do* what is right, and men (as the appalling organized evil of this century has reminded us), no matter how sophisticated or civilized they become, continue to act against what they know is right — their additional knowledge and merely efficient reason capable of becoming, in fact, more powerful means of doing evil. The scandal to the non-Christian is that God would take the necessary reconciliation upon himself, but is somehow unable to do it except by descending below all men into particular events in the history of the Jews and finally into the particular body and life of one man, Jesus of Nazareth — and that as a man he would enter the full range of human experience, including the very thing he was to save us from, estrangement itself. The scandal to the non-Mormon is the claim by a contemporary church of special insight into the meaning and means of the Atonement and of special authority in making it efficacious in the lives of men.

In his letter about Mormon beliefs to Chicago editor Joseph Wentworth in 1842, Joseph Smith said, "We believe that through the Atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel." The Atonement makes it possible that *all men may be saved* — by obedience. God's concern is for the salvation of every man and he expresses that concern in the free gift of Atonement, which, as we shall see, is directly related to man's actual

*Brother England is an associate professor of English, Brigham Young University, and bishop of the BYU 139th Ward.

¹Grateful acknowledgement is expressed to the editors of *Dialogue* for permission to reprint this article.

growth through obedience — in fact, *makes such obedience possible*. The understanding that Joseph Smith had come to through a long process of revelation and study finds succinct expression in this Article of Faith. It embodies a unique understanding of the harmonious relationship of grace and works and of the resulting effect of the Atonement on the moral nature of man, and it implies a unique role of the properly authorized Church in bringing to men the full power of the effect through the teachings and ordinances of the Gospel.

In traditional Christian thought, the Atonement of Christ has always been related directly to the Fall of Adam. For some, it has seemed a direct and relatively simple answer, a solution to the estrangement of God from man which was caused by God's rejection of Adam after Adam's rebellion had spoiled God's plan. But most Christians (and Jews) have been able to see that it is inconsistent with their understanding of the nature of God to imagine him turning his back on man, to suppose that man must propitiate God and win back his favor in the process of atonement. Clearly any rejection involved is the rejection of God by man and any reconciliation must be the reconciliation of man to God. As Paul said to the Corinthians, "[God] has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them..." (II Cor. 5:18-19). But in too much Christian theology, as well as folk religion, the Atonement has remained an event remote from the common life of man, somehow involving Adam and God and mysterious supernatural realms such as the spirit prison or strange metaphysical structures such as absolute justice — something crucial, no doubt, and to be deeply grateful for, but having nothing very clear to do with redeeming the daily round of studying differential equations and commuting to work and waking up in the night in the deep loneliness and pain of our regret.

Mormons are certainly not immune to this tendency to miss the immediate relevance of the Atonement to their day-to-day lives, but there are dramatically unorthodox resources in Mormon theology with which to involve man in that relevance. In Mormon scriptures Adam's action did in no way spoil God's plan but was, in fact, *part of the plan* — a preordained action, necessary to man's eternal development, which Adam entered into knowingly. Mormons do not look upon Adam as a depraved, willful sinner caught up in a pride of his own being and a desire to know which led him to rebel against God, but rather Mormons see him as a great, courageous figure who chose a difficult path necessary to his and all men's progression — the way of estrangement and reconciliation, of sin and resultant openness to redeeming love.

Mormon scriptures tell of Adam becoming, as it were, a Christian. Sometime after his expulsion from the Garden, in the time of his separation from God and extreme consciousness of the threat of death, Adam is taught by an angel of the Lord about Christ's mission, which would come to fruition on the earth in the far distant future. Christ's Atonement would include a

Resurrection which would eventually reunite each man's spirit and body in a condition of *everlasting life*; and it would also include a Redemption that could immediately give to each man *who chose to respond to it* power to be reunited to himself and to God in a condition of *eternal* (or increasingly God-like) life. These scriptures, given in vision to Joseph Smith from the writings of Moses, unabashedly imply a notion heretical to most traditional Christian thought — *Felix Culpa*, the fortunate fall. Adam's response to the great message of the angel about the forthcoming Atonement is, "Blessed be the name of God, for because of my transgression my eyes are opened, and in this life I shall have joy, and again in the flesh I shall see God" (Moses 5:10).

A Book of Mormon prophet makes the point in these words: "Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy. And the Messiah cometh in the fulness of time that he may redeem the children of men from the fall. And because that they are redeemed from the fall they have become free forever, knowing good from evil; to act for themselves and not to be acted upon..." (II Nephi 2:25-26). The clear implication is that the process of estrangement and reconciliation, of sin and atonement, is not a flaw, an accidental thwarting of God's plan, but an essential part of it, a necessary ingredient of man's eternal realization of his possibilities as a child of God. Through this process, and apparently no other, he is able to reach the depths and thereby the heights of his soul's capacity — to know fully his capacity for evil and to know the full freedom and strength of soul that come uniquely through being caught up in response to the "pure love of Christ."

There is an additional important implication of this account of Adam, which is reinforced by many experiences in the Book of Mormon. It is clear that long before Christ had actually performed the central acts of the Atonement — the suffering in Gethsemane, the death on the cross, the resurrection — men were able to be affected by those acts through the prophetic knowledge that God intended to perform them in the future. What this means is that the mechanics of the mission itself did not occur in time as a necessary *precursor* to their effect on men, as some theories of the Atonement would require; Christ's mission was not to straighten out some metaphysical warp in the universe that Adam's taking of the fruit had created. The effects of the Atonement were not metaphysical but moral and spiritual: they reach men living at any time and place through each man's *knowledge* of the spirit and events of the Atonement.

About 600 years before Christ was born, a young man living in Jerusalem, seeking confirmation of his father's spiritual experiences, was given a remarkable vision:

...I looked and beheld the great city of Jerusalem, and also other cities. And I beheld the city of Nazareth; and in the city of Nazareth I beheld a virgin... And it came to pass that I saw the heavens open; and an angel came down and stood before me; and said unto me; Nephi, what beholdest thou? And I said unto him: a virgin most beautiful and fair above all other virgins. And he said unto me: knowest thou the condescension of God? And I said unto him: I know that he loveth his children; nevertheless, I

do not know the meaning of all things. And he said unto me: behold the virgin whom thou seest is the mother of the Son of God, after the manner of the flesh... And I looked and beheld the virgin again, bearing a child in her arms. And the angel said unto me: behold the Lamb of God, yea, even the Son of the Eternal Father. (1 Nephi 11:13-21)

After further explanation by the Angel, Nephi continues, "And the angel said unto me again: Look and behold the condescension of God! And I looked and beheld the Redeemer of the world, of whom my Father had spoken." (1 Nephi 11:26-27)

We have here an important insight into the Atonement of Christ, an insight preserved by this young man and his people in their religious history as they journeyed to America and until their descendants six hundred years later welcomed Christ there after his death and resurrection. The word chosen by Joseph Smith in his translation is crucial: *condescension* — descending with. Christ is the descending of God with man into all that man experiences, including his estrangement, and this is the heart of the power of the Atonement.

Many years after this group of people had arrived in America, one of their great prophet-kings named Benjamin, approaching old age and death, gathered his people together to declare to them a great revelation of understanding that had come to him. After reminding them in very colorful terms of the implications of their human tendency to sin and the effects of guilt upon a man — "which doth cause him to shrink from the presence of God, and to fill his breast with guilt, pain, and anguish, which is like an unquenchable fire, whose flame ascendeth up forever and ever" — King Benjamin tells them of a vision that had come to him of an event still 125 years in the future:

For behold, the time cometh, and is not far distant, that with power, the Lord Omnipotent who reigneth, who was, and is from all eternity to all eternity, shall come down from heaven among the children of men, and shall dwell in a tabernacle of clay....

And lo, he shall suffer temptations, and pain of body, hunger, thirst, fatigue, even more than man can suffer, except it be unto death: for behold blood cometh from every pore, so great shall be his anguish for the wickedness and the abominations of his people.

And he shall be called Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Father of Heaven and earth, the Creator of all things from the beginning; and his mother shall be called Mary.

And lo, he cometh unto his own, that salvation might come unto the children of men even through faith on his name.... (Mosiah 3:5, 7-9)

Here for the first time chronologically in all known scripture we have a clear reference to what seems to be the central experience of that part of Christ's Atonement that concerns our individual sins; "Behold, blood cometh from every pore, so great shall be his anguish for the wickedness and the abominations of his people." This is not a description of what occurred on the cross, but of what occurred in the Garden of Gethsemane in that night when Christ participated fully in the fearful loneliness that lies at the extremity of human experience — participated even in the anguish of

estrangement. Christ descended, through capabilities which only he had as the literal Son of God, into the fulness, both in depth and breadth, of human guilt. We begin to get clearer insight into what occurred in that Garden through a revelation given by the Lord Jesus Christ to Joseph Smith in 1830.

Therefore I command you to repent — repent, lest... your sufferings be sore — how sore you know not, how exquisite you know not, yea, how hard to bear you know not. For Behold, I, God, have suffered these things for all, that they might not suffer if they would repent: But if they would not repent they must suffer even as I; which suffering caused myself, even God, the greatest of all, to tremble because of pain, and to bleed at every pore, and to suffer both body and spirit — and would that I might not drink the bitter cup, and shrink — Nevertheless, glory be to the Father, and I partook and finished my preparations unto the children of men. (Doctrine and Covenants 19:15-19; emphasis added)

Although we certainly can't begin to understand all that happened in Gethsemane, especially *how* it happened, we can begin to feel the impact in our hearts of the divine love expressed there. Jesus Christ has created the greatest possibility we can imagine: that our common lot of meaninglessness and alienation can be redeemed, that we might not suffer if we would repent. The God who planned and created and who directs our earth experience, who sent us here into tragic risk and suffering because only here could we experience further growth in his likeness, has sent his son, not only to guide and teach us through his revelations and his life, but to enter willingly into the depths of man's life, take upon him human "temptations," "sicknesses" and "infirmities" that he might be "filled with mercy" and thus come to "know according to the flesh how to succor his people" (see Alma 7:11-13) — not offering solutions without knowing the pain of the problem and not setting prior conditions, but taking into himself the fullness of pain in all human estrangement by gaining some awful awareness of the full force of human evil. Because the love is unconditionally offered and comes freely from the same person who gives us our standard of right and who will eventually judge us, it has the power to release man from the barrier of his own guilt and give him the strength to repent.

The effect of King Benjamin's revelation on his people was immediate and dramatic. After hearing his words,

...they all cried with one voice, saying: Yea, we believe all the words which thou hast spoken unto us; and also, we know of their surety and truth, because of the Spirit of the Lord Omnipotent, which has wrought a mighty change in us, or in our hearts, that we have no more disposition to do evil, but to do good continually. And we, ourselves, also, through the infinite goodness of God, and the manifestations of his Spirit, have great views of that which is to come... And it is the faith which we have had on the things which our king has spoken unto us that has brought us to this great knowledge, whereby we rejoice with such exceeding great joy. And we are willing to enter into a covenant with our God to do his will, and to be obedient to his commandments and all things that he shall command us, all the remainder of our days.... (Mosiah 5:2-5)

King Benjamin responded,

Ye have spoken the words that I desired; and, now, because of

the covenant which ye have made ye shall be called the children of Christ, his sons, and his daughters; for behold, this day he hath spiritually begotten you; for ye say that your hearts are changed through faith on his name....And under this head ye are made free, and there is no other head whereby ye can be made free. There is no other name given whereby salvation cometh; therefore, I would that ye should take upon you the name of Christ, all you that have entered into the covenant with God that ye shall be obedient unto the end of your lives. (Mosiah 5:6-8)

A great thing is occurring here — the formation of a Christian community 125 years before Christ as a group of people respond in faith to the possibility that they can be at one with themselves through means provided by Christ. Struck to the heart by the meaning of God's love extended to them in the midst of their estrangement from him and themselves, they experience a mighty change which leads them into a covenant and the covenant sustains a process of development through continual repentance toward the image of Christ.

Fifty years later, another prophet among these people, clearly influenced by the prophecies and experiences which had been part of his people's history, discoursed on the sacrifice of Christ and made even clearer what had happened to King Benjamin's people:

...it is expedient that there should be a great and last sacrifice, and then shall there be...a stop to the shedding of blood, then shall the law of Moses be fulfilled....

And behold, this is the whole meaning of the law, every whit pointing to that great and last sacrifice; and that great and last sacrifice will be the Son of God, yea, infinite and eternal.

And thus he shall bring salvation to all those who shall believe on his name; this being the intent of this last sacrifice, to bring about the bowels of mercy, which overpowereth justice and bringeth about means unto men that they may have faith unto repentance.

And thus mercy can satisfy the demands of justice, and encircles them in the arms of safety, while he that exercises no faith unto repentance is exposed to the whole law of the demands of justice; therefore only unto him that has faith unto repentance is brought about the great and eternal plan of redemption. (Alma 34:13-16; emphasis added)

This prophet, named Amulek, seems to be saying that Christ's sacrifice — his suffering — is uniquely capable of striking through the barrier in man's nature which prevents him from overcoming his estrangement from himself enough to move on to achieve the exalting power to act as he believes. Here we must remind ourselves of an amazing aspect of the eternal human personality. Paradoxically, man's moral sense of justice both brings him to the awareness of sin that must begin all repentance and yet interferes with his attempts to repent. He feels that every action must bear its consequences and that he must justify his actions to himself; since there is a gap between belief and action he is in a state which brings into his heart and mind a sense of guilt, of unbearable division within himself. As Alma taught his sinful son Corianton, "there was a punishment affixed, and a just law given, which brought remorse of conscience unto man." (Alma 42:18) This same moral nature, this sense of justice that demands satisfaction, causes man to want to improve his life but also to insist that he pay the penalty in some way for his sin. But of course there is no way he can finally do this.

As Paul knew from his own experience and expressed so poignantly in his epistles, the law which men looked to for salvation in the Pharisaic tradition can inculcate great moral seriousness and indicate direction for change, but it can also be a terrible burden because man always fails to some degree in living it fully and it therefore stands as a continual reminder of his failure — a failure that the law's framework of justice demands be paid for, but which man is incapable of paying for. God pierces to the heart of this paradox through the Atonement, and it becomes possible for man to personally experience both alienation and reconciliation, which opens him to the full meaning of both evil and good, bringing him to a condition of meekness and lowliness of heart where he can freely accept from God the power to be a god. And Alma taught this other essential role God plays in the Atonement. Besides giving mankind "remorse of conscience" by giving the law and judging man," God himself atoneth for the sins of the world, to bring about the plan of mercy, to appease the demands of justice" (Alma 42:15).

Christ is the unique manifestation in human experience of the fullness of that unconditional love from God which Paul chose to represent with the Greek term *agape*. As Paul expressed it, "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Christ's sacrificial love was not conditional upon our qualities, our repentance, anything; he expressed his love to us while we were yet in our sins — not completing the process of forgiveness, which depends on our response, but initiating it in a free act of mercy. This is a kind of love quite independent from the notion of justice. There is no *quid-pro-quo* about it. It is entirely unbalanced, unmerited, unrelated to the specific worthiness of the object (except in that each man has intrinsic worth through his eternal existence and God-like potential), and that is precisely why it is redemptive. It takes a risk, without calculation, on the possibility that man can realize his infinite worth. It gets directly at that barrier in man, his sense of justice, which makes him incapable of having unconditional love for himself — unable to respond positively to his own potential, because he is unable to forgive himself, unable to be at peace with himself until he has somehow "made up" in suffering for his sins, something he is utterly incapable of doing. The demands of justice that Amulek and Alma are talking about, which must be overpowered, are from man's own sense of justice, not some abstract eternal principle but our own demands on ourselves, demands which rightly bring us into estrangement with ourselves (as we gain new knowledge of right but do not live up to it) and thus begin the process of growth through repentance, but which cannot complete that process. An awareness of the true meaning and source of that last sacrifice and its intent has the power, as Amulek says, "to bring about the bowels of mercy, which overpowereth justice, and bringeth about means unto men that they may have faith unto repentance."

That the Atonement is performed by Christ, the son and revelation of God, is, of course, crucial. He represents to man the ultimate source of justice and is

the one whose teachings and example bring man directly to face his need for repentance; he awakens man's own sense of justice and stands as a judge for all his actions and only he can fully release man from what becomes the immobilizing burden of that judgment, through the power of mercy extended unconditionally in the Atonement. It is possible, as King Benjamin's people found, to be moved to sufficient faith in a divine being by his redemptive act that there comes into the soul a power which can bring men to repentance as no other power can. I stand all amazed at this love — and that is precisely the point: This love can move us with sufficient amazement through our knowledge of it to change our minds and our hearts, to release us from self-inflicted suffering as it creates in us the possibility of new being through repentance.

The question "Why is man's salvation dependent on Christ and the events surrounding his death?" is the most central and the most difficult question in Christian theology. The answers (and there are many) are, as I have said, the chief scandal of Christianity to the non-believer. Attempts to define logical theories of the Atonement based on New Testament scriptures have been largely contradictory and ultimately futile — mainly because the New Testament is not a book of theology, a logical treatise, but rather gives us the reaction, the varied emotional responses, of men to the Atonement as they experienced it and tried to find images for their joy. Some men clearly felt released from the powers of evil and darkness which they believed, much more literally than any of us today, were all about them. Some believed that their souls had been bought from the devil. Some felt that Christ had taken their place in suffering the just and necessary punishment under the law for their sins. The explanation I have tried to develop, based largely on Book of Mormon scriptures, is at significant variance with most of these theories, especially on one major point: The redemptive effect of the Atonement depends on how *an individual man* responds to it rather than on some independent effect on the universe or God, which theories such as the ransom theory, the substitution theory, the satisfaction theory, etc., all tend to imply. Of course, the rich reality of the Atonement lies beyond any theory or explanation, including the one I am suggesting here, and some men bring themselves into redeeming relationship with God from within the framework of each of these theories as they somehow reach through to that rich reality. But the need for powerful personal response and for a release from the immobilizing demands of justice within man seem to me crucial and best served by an explanation different from the traditional theories.

The ransom theory, which was prominent in Christian thought into the middle ages, seems very crude to us today. The idea was that because of Adam's sin man deserved to die and go to hell, but God bought the souls of men from the devil with the sacrifice of Christ. Satan was deceived into believing that he could keep Christ's soul in exchange, but once the bargain was completed, the devil could not hold the soul of the divine, sinless Christ. Of course, this seems to require a concept

of a God with whom the devil can make bargains and who in turn is capable of practicing a shabby trick on Satan. The more sophisticated "satisfaction" theory was put forth in the 12th century by Saint Anselm. In Anselm's view, God's nature, which includes absolute justice and mercy, demands satisfaction for man's sins even though God *wants* to forgive man. Man himself is incapable of providing that satisfaction because his sin is infinite, being rebellion against an infinite being. Therefore, to retain his honor and position, God himself, in the person of Christ, becomes a substitute for man in paying for sin through suffering. This view of the Atonement prevails in various forms down to the present day.

The popular image associated with the theory is that of the traffic court: Man has broken the law; justice must be satisfied, but man hasn't enough money; Christ steps forward to pay the fine and release man while still upholding the law. An immediate objection to this view is that it seems on the face of things to be a legalistic formula clearly influenced by the feudal times in which it grew up. It implies that God is in a position much like a feudal lord. If he allows his justice to go unanswered, if he allows people to get off easy, his position will be questioned in the minds of his subjects, which will lead to disrespect and rebellion. Of course, this is carried even further in the notion some have that there is some absolute principle of *retributive* justice (as opposed to natural law of cause and effect) which God himself is bound by despite his own desires, that a certain amount of sin must be balanced in the scheme of things, sometime and by someone, with equivalent punishment and suffering — in addition to the natural consequences of actions. It is a very disquieting notion that God should be bound to an unfortunate situation and in a way that men clearly are not. In human experience, we continually are able as men to forgive each other without satisfaction and yet with redemptive effect.

Anselm's contemporary, Abelard, was convinced that God *could* forgive men without conditions and that the problem lies in man's nature not God's. He denied the whole legalistic framework, believing that Christ's sacrifice exercises its power by moving men to awareness of guilt and a change of life: "The purpose and cause of the incarnation was that He might illuminate the world by His wisdom and excite it to the love of Himself." The immediate danger of this position, which places the *moral influence* of Christ at the center of the Atonement, was immediately seen — and Abelard's work was rewarded by his denunciation as a heretic. The main problem is that his theory seems to leave the Atonement without a foundation of absolute necessity. In other words, if someone drowns trying to save me after I've fallen in a stream, it is one thing, but if he walks along a stream with me and suddenly jumps in and drowns, crying "Look how much I love you; I'm giving my life for you," it's hard to see some kind of essential sacrifice taking place.

The Mormon concept of the Atonement which I have suggested seems to me close to Abelard's, with the important addition of an understanding of *why* the

atonement is absolutely necessary. It is not necessary because of some eternal structure of justice in the universe outside man which demands payment from man for his sins, nor of some similar structure within the nature of God. The Atonement is absolutely necessary because of the nature of man himself, a nature that is self-existent, not the creation of God, and therefore uniquely impervious to metaphysical coercion. The problem is not that God's justice must be satisfied (or the universe's) but that *man's* own sense of justice demands satisfaction. When it creates a barrier to repentance that barrier must be broken through and it can not be broken by metaphysical tinkering with the nature of man; it can only be broken through by the powerful persuasion of a kind of love which transcends men's sense of justice without denying it — the kind of love that Christ was uniquely able to manifest in the Atonement.

The Atonement is a necessary, but not sufficient, factor in men's salvation from sin — necessary because no one else can fully motivate the process in the free agent, man, and insufficient because man must respond and complete the process. There is no condition in which we can imagine God being *unable* to forgive. The question is what effect will the forgiveness have; the forgiveness is meaningless unless it leads to repentance. The forgiveness extended in the dramatic events of the Atonement is that kind of forgiveness uniquely capable of bringing "means unto men that they may have faith unto repentance." In other words, the forgiveness must be *accepted* in order to be efficacious: "For what doth it profit a man if a gift is bestowed upon him, and he receive not the gift" (Doctrine and Covenants 88:33). As Paul Tillich has pointed out, the most difficult thing for man to do is accept his acceptance, to accept the fact that God accepts him, loves him — freely — even in his sins. Man's usual nature in his dealings with other men and, most important to my point here, in his dealings with himself, is to demand satisfaction before he can accept, to demand justice before he can forgive. This is not Christ's way and therefore his love (and the love which he tells us we can develop in response to that love) is redemptive. It has a quality of mercy which allows us to be at one with ourselves and thus gain the strength to be the new person that our sense of justice in the first place demanded that we be. We do not repent in order that God will forgive us and atone for our sins, but rather God atones for our sins and begins the process of forgiveness, by extending unconditional love to us, in order that we might repent and thus bring to conclusion the process of forgiveness. And the center of the experience is Christ's ability to break through the barrier of justice, in those men who can freely respond, with the shock of eternal love expressed in Gethsemane. It comes to us only through our deep knowledge of that event and our involvement in the process of sustaining that knowledge in our lives, through the continual reminding of ourselves of the event and recommitment to the implications of it which occurs in the ordinances of the Gospel. The process is a complex one, an ongoing one. It may be triggered by particular events and have climaxes, but essentially it is a lifelong process — one

beautifully described towards the end of the Book of Mormon in these words from the prophet Mormon to his son Moroni:

...repentance is unto them that are under condemnation and under the curse of a broken law. And the first fruits of repentance is baptism; and baptism cometh by faith unto the fulfilling the commandments; and the fulfilling the commandments bringeth meekness, and lowliness of heart; and because of meekness and lowliness of heart cometh the visitation of the Holy Ghost, which comforter filleth with hope and perfect love....(Moroni 8:24-26)

As a young missionary, I had not yet experienced the central drama of the Christian faith and of my Mormon faith in a decisive personal way. Towards the end of my mission experience in Hawaii, in a new assignment different from previous assignments that had meant mainly teaching primary school and administration, I was suddenly faced with a very real human situation involving the central principles of the Gospel. A Southern sharecropper who had lived a life of extreme brutality and self-indulgence, had jumped ship in Hawaii, married a Japanese girl, and under her influence and the influence of children coming into his life had softened and opened — to the point of hearing the Gospel from missionaries. He had believed their message and came to me with a plea for help. He believed that certain principles were true but could not find the power to change his life to live in accordance with those principles and was suffering deeply. He was estranged from himself, his habits terribly opposed to his sense of God and what God hoped for him. As I tried to help him, searching again the scriptures and explanations of the scriptures having to do with the Atonement, as I gropingly expressed my growing sense of what the love of Christ meant to me and tried to express, along with my companion and the man's family, some of that same unconditional love to him, and as I watched him grow under that love and under his growing awareness that Christ was capable of loving and forgiving him in his present condition, he and I both came slowly and then suddenly to a deep sense of the kind of love that was expressed in the Garden that made atonement possible. I saw him change dramatically as the power inherent in an understanding of that experience came into his life. The burden of sin was lifted and the healing, renewing process of repentance made possible as he said to himself, "If God can have this kind of love for me, who am I to withhold it from myself?" My life didn't change as dramatically, but the beginnings of change were laid there, and the understanding of atoning love that began there has been increasingly vindicated in all my experience.

Men in our time have turned upon each other with incredible hate and cruelty. And the victims and dispossessed and their allies have turned back in kind. The ills of our time, which grow by escalation — blow for blow, hurt for hurt, raid for raid, riot for riot, all defended in the name of justice and personal or national rights — must eventually be subjected to more than justice.

Each of us must come to a kind of love that can be

extended equally to victim and victimizer, dispossessed and dispossessor — and even to ourselves — a kind of love that moves us to demand justice in society and within ourselves and then goes beyond justice to offer forgiveness and healing and beyond guilt to offer redemption and newness of life.

I am convinced by my thought and experience and the deepest whisperings in my soul that there is a source of that love — one that transcends all others and is therefore our salvation. In the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

continued from page 12

Della Mae Rasmussen

Several members of the group expressed the opinion that such a book was long overdue and stated the hope that its use would be widespread, and not just among Church members.

The lack of real intimacy among many couples and families was discussed, along with the observation that couples in the Church, as well as others, are often together but not "together." Another concern was that many women continue to feel that any affection or the offer of intimacy in the way of touching and hugging has strictly sexual connotations. Although this may often be true, both men and women need real human intimacy. Perhaps this book can help people understand this more fully, thus they might exploit others less frequently.

It was noted that the future generations desperately need a concept of human "intimacy" other than the "worldly" definition of it as merely sexual gratification. Church members, as well as others, should learn that despite biological arousal the bottom line is that there is a need to govern passions and often overrule them.

One question posed for Victor Brown's attention: "What about the personality that may not have the capacity for intimacy?" Two types mentioned were obsessive-compulsive where there is a lack of capacity to feel, and the hysteric who disregards consequences in favor of all kinds of emotions.

It seems apparent that those in the discussion group who had read the book believe that it holds promise for counselees, counselors, Church members, and all people who are seeking true human intimacy. It was suggested that some help on *how* to use the book to best advantage would be enthusiastically received!

continued from page 20

discussion of the heart, these methods will have to include helping to put the person in touch with revelation, which can, apparently, not only reveal correct thoughts to the person but assist in making a rapid and permanent change in his programming. For purposes of psychotherapy, it would be most beneficial to identify, if possible, how programming takes place internally by the spirit and how we can draw on these powers.

It is admitted that many of these comments and suggestions for emphasis on building a theory of personality and psychotherapy may lead us into non-traditional and unpopular pathways. However, we can be tied down to the approval of our secular brethren or take a new and lonely road. Perhaps it is better to say with Isaiah, "Behold. I will do a new thing---I will even make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert." (Isa. 43:19)

REFERENCES

- Book of Mormon.
- Doctrine and Covenants.
- Frankl, V. *Man's Search for Meaning*. New York: Pocket Books, 1977.
- Hilgard, E. R. *Divided consciousness--Multiple Controls in Human Thought and Action*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.
- The Holy Bible
- The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Journal of Discourses*
- Kallistos, Hieromonk. In E. F. Schumacher, *A Guide for the Perplexed*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Maultsby, Maxie C. *Help Yourself to Happiness Through Rational Self-counseling*. New York: Institute for Rational Living, 1975.
- Nelson, Nels. *Scientific Aspects of Mormonism*. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons, 1904, p. 81.
- The New Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Ed. by Colin Brown. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondewan Corporation, 1976.
- Packer, Boyd K. *Ensign*. Nov. 1977, pp. 59-60.
- Penfield, Wilder. *The Mystery of the Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Schumacher, E. F. *A Guide for the Perplexed*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Stake, Robert E. "The Case Study Method in Social Inquiry." *Educational Researcher*. Vol. 7, No. 2, Feb. 1978.

continued from page 14

REFERENCES

- Hafen, B. C. "Law and the Traditional Family." An address to the National Council on Family Relations, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 1981. Published in *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 1982.
- Jorgensen, S. R. "Sex Education and the Reduction of Adolescent Pregnancies: Prospects for the 1980's." *Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1982, p. 38-52.