



ASSOCIATION OF
MORMON COUNSELORS
AND PSYCHOTHERAPISTS

AMCAP
2500 East 1700 South
Salt Lake City, UT
84108

MARCH 1985
SPECIAL ISSUE

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



ASSOCIATION OF
MORMON COUNSELORS
AND PSYCHOTHERAPISTS

CONTENTS

ARTICLES AND ESSAYS

OCTOBER 1984 CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| Preface | Val D. MacMurray | 11 |
| Priesthood and Partnership: Some Thoughts for LDS Marriages | Elder Marion D. Hanks | 13 |
| Gospel Power in Troubled Homes | Elder J. Thomas Fyans | 22 |
| AMCAP Men and Women: Together in Mutual Respect and Unity | Della Mae Rasmussen | 29 |
| Women and the Helping Professions: A Judicial View | The Honorable Christine Durham, Utah Supreme Court Justice | 40 |
| Panel Presentation— Women and Roles: Transcending Definitions | Francine Bennion | 48 |
| Roles and Role Models: A Survey of Issues in Gender Equity | Russell Osguthorpe & Ida Smith | 52 |
| Some Social Structural Correlates of the Status of Women and the Modern World | Merlin Myers | 56 |
| Roles or Mission | Carolyn Rasmus | 58 |
| Mormon Forms of Psychopathology | Louis A. Moench | 61 |
| Dealing with Infertility Problems | Robert & Jayne Taylor | 74 |
| Heritage of Nightmares: Therapy for the Adult Molested in Childhood | Gerry Hanni | 78 |
| Mild to Wild: Assessment and Treatment of Sexually Abused Children | Barbara Snow | 84 |

BOOK REVIEWS

| | | |
|---|-----------------|----|
| <i>Strategic Family Therapy and Behind the One-Way Mirror</i> by Cloe Madanes | Marybeth Raynes | 89 |
|---|-----------------|----|

BRIEF NOTICES

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| In Memoriam of Dr. Veon Smith, Sr. | Dean Hepworth | 93 |
| Biographical Sketches of Editor and Associate Editors | Paul Cook | 95 |
| Forthcoming Professional Conventions | S. Brent Scharman and C. Ross Clement | 97 |
| In Future Issues | Burton Kelly | 99 |

EDITOR

Burton Kelly

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Addie Fuhrman

Paul Cook

Bruce Brown

Clyde Parker

Marybeth Raynes

Richard Bednar

BOARD

Sally Barlow, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Patricia Esplin, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Douglas Gottfredson, Ph.D.

Sandy, Utah

Michael Lambert, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Sharon Staples, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Eugene England, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Dennis D. Ashton, MSW

Spokane, Washington

Louis Moench, M.D.

Salt Lake City, Utah

Charles Madsen, Ph.D.

Tallahassee, Florida

Gary Carson, Ph.D.

Ogden, Utah

Ione Simpson, MSW

Midvale, Utah

Lynn D. Johnson, Ph.D.

Murray, Utah

Duane Laws, Ph.D.

Ypsilanti, Michigan

Peter B. Johnston, M.D.

Chicago, Illinois

A. Dean Byrd, Ph.D.

Frederick, Maryland

Audrey Perkins, MSW

Salt Lake City, Utah

Carlfred Broderick, Ph.D.

Cerritos, California

Kate Kirkham, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Allen Bergin, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Lowell L. Bennion, Ph.D.

Salt Lake City, Utah

Daniel D. Christensen, M.D.

Salt Lake City, Utah

Myron Manley, Ph.D.

Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Lynn Scoresby, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Lorraine Wright, Ph.D.

Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Gary Burlingame, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Margaret Hoopes, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Brent Barlow, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Jed Erickson, MSW

Salt Lake City, Utah

Jill Mulvey Derr, Ph.D.

Alpine, Utah

Victor Brown, Jr., DSW

Sacramento, California

Alan Proctor, MSW

Salt Lake City, Utah

Gary Bunker, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Wayne E. Wright, Ph.D.

Logan, Utah

Richard Heaps, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Mike Bertoch, Ph.D.

Logan, Utah

C. Richard Chidester, Ph.D.

Bountiful, Utah

Terry Olson, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Blaine R. Porter, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Karl White, Ed.D.

Salt Lake City, Utah

M. Gawain Wells, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

Robert Stahman, Ph.D.

Provo, Utah

J. Brad Burton, MSW

Provo, Utah

Barbara Wheeler, DSW

Provo, Utah

Elizabeth Hirsh M.D.

Sandy, Utah

ASSOCIATION OF
MORMON COUNSELORS
AND PSYCHOTHERAPISTS

OFFICERS

Val D. MacMurray, Ph.D.
President
234 TLRB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-7753

Richard C. Ferre, M.D.
President-Elect
Primary Children's Medical Center
320 12th Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
(801) 521-1451

Della Mae Rasmussen, Ed.D.
Past President
149 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-7256

Dale F. Pearson, Ph.D.
Treasurer
934 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-3493

ADVISORS

Jay L. Risenmay, Ed.D. ('85)
Nominations and Elections
155 Elm
Rexburg, ID 83440
(208) 356-1100

Kenneth W. Matheson, DSW ('85)
Area Coordinators
1321 West 1050 North
Provo, UT 84604
(801) 378-7626

Paul Bramwell, Ed.D. ('86)
Awards and Fall Conventions
532 Cuesta Drive
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
(805) 461-2080

David H. Coombs, Ph.D. ('86)
History Coordinator and Fall Convention
161 Fashion Lane Suite 114
Tustin, CA 92680
(714) 546-3323

Evelyn Thatcher, MSW ('87)
Membership and Spring Conventions
95 West 100 South, 340
Logan, UT 84321
(801) 752-5302

Alice T. Clark, Ph.D. ('87)
Journal, Newsletter and Spring Convention
622 E. 23rd Dakota Avenue
Grand Forks, ND 58201
(701) 772-4368

EDITORS/ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Burton Kelly, Ph.D.
Journal Editor
149 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-3035

Richard Bednar, Ph.D.
Associate Editor
244 TLRB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-7757

Addie Fuhrman, Ph.D.
Associate Editor
Dept. of Education Psychology
327 MBH
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
(801) 581-5566

Clyde Parker, Ph.D.
Associate Editor
Center for Counseling
McKay-Dee Hospital Center
3939 Harrison Blvd.
Ogden, UT 84409
(801) 625-2012

Paul Cook, Ph.D.
Associate Editor
210-R McKay Bldg.
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-2070

Bruce Brown, Ph.D.
Associate Editor
1126 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-6365

Marybeth Raynes, MSW
Associate Editor
24 M Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
(801) 531-7389

C. Ross Clement, MSW
Newsletter Editor
226 TLRB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-4094

Scott R. Peterson
Newsletter Assistant Editor
Media Representative
224 TLRB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-7639

Henry L. Isaksen, Ph.D.
Historian
Heber, UT 84032
(801) 942-6935

CONSULTANTS

S. Brent Scharman, Ph.D.
Continuing Education
780 West 800 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84104
(801) 537-7900

Dan Gray, MSW
Facilities
780, West 800 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84104
(801) 537-7900

Wendy Jones, B.S.
Student Representative
149 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-4062

Richard W. Johnson, Ph.D.
By-Laws
149 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 378-4062

AREA COORDINATORS

Sam Ball, MSW
Arizona

David C. Willis, MSW
California (Central)

David H. Coombs, Ph.D.
California (Southern)

Garth Eldredge, Ph.D.
Colorado & Eastern Wyoming

Jane Garside, Ph.D.
Hawaii

Kay M. Crook, MSW
Idaho (Boise)

Wendy Williams
Idaho (Southern)

Ken J. Christensen, MSW
Midwest (Chicago area)

Alice T. Clark, Ph.D.
North Central States

Sherman Beck
Oregon (Portland)

Don Driggs, Ph.D.
Southeastern States

Paul Ricks, MSW
South Central States

E. Wayne Wright, Ph.D.
Utah (Northern)

Terry Olson, Ph.D.
Utah (Provo-Orem, Utah County)

Rex R. Ashdown
Utah (Ogden)

LuDean Robson, MSW
Utah (Salt Lake City)

Darrell Hull, MSW
Washington (Seattle)

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 Sept. 30, 1981)*

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.

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 member 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 theory of counseling and psychotherapy are appropriate for the Journal. Manuscripts should generally not exceed 20 double-spaced typed pages. Style should follow the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (third 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

EDITORS NOTE

We are most excited, and trust that you will be too, with the changes in this AMCAP Journal. In addition to the design, format, and content changes, you will notice a much expanded editorial staff. I am personally most pleased to welcome and commend to you each of our new associate editors and editorial board members. With the addition of these individuals, we anticipate a greater inflow of high quality articles and several regular special features, two of which are in this issue—the book reviews and “Brief Notices.” Marybeth Raynes will be the associate editor responsible for book reviews, and I’m sure she will appreciate your ideas both as to books to review and reviewers, including yourself. There will also be a current annotated bibliography section giving each of us input about selected articles and books to help us keep current on at least some of the best in the field. Bruce Brown will be the associate editor in charge of that section. Each issue we plan to have at least one feature article of special import. Associate editors Richard Bednar, Addie Fuhrman, and Clyde Parker will be responsible to receive and review those articles. Each of the associate editors will appreciate your input. (For a brief background on each of the associate editors, see “Biographical Sketches” in this issue.)

The Journal will now typically be published only twice a year rather than the four times of the past (that is, when we had sufficient articles for four issues). Currently scheduled publication months are May and November. In accordance with input and desire, we hope to have additional special issues. The two regular issues will alternate

with the semi-annual publication of the semi-annual publication of the Newsletter and provide quarterly contact with AMCAP for each of us. A major portion of these two issues will be devoted to articles from our AMCAP conventions. Paul Cook and Bruce Brown will have primary responsibility for the articles of these convention issues. Paul will also be assisting myself in the publication details of the Journal.

The Editorial Board members will be involved in soliciting articles and reviewing articles within the areas of their special interests and competencies.

We trust that the “new” Journal will not only have a significantly different look, but be more inclusive and helpful to each of us. Your input and suggestions on the Journal will be most appreciated. How about a Letter to the Editor expressing your views on the changes, the articles of this issue, or other personal concerns and desires?

As always, please send in your articles and ideas for review for publication. Please prepare them in harmony with the APA Publication Guide, third edition.

You will have noted that this issue is basically a compilation of the presentations made at the October, 1984 AMCA Convention. We think and hope you will be stimulated and have your professional competence enhanced by these articles. Thanks to each of the writers and all others who have assisted in this helpful issue.

A special thanks to members of the AMCAP Executive Committee and Advisory Board, especially President Val MacMurray, for ideas, time, and effort in developing the new look and stance of the Journal. The help and support of each of them and the AMCAP membership is much appreciated.

—BCK

IN A PEACEABLE HABITATION

VAL D. MacMURRAY, Ph.D.
Presented at the AMCAP Convention
4 October 1984

For our conference this year, we have focused our theme on peace, specifically the scripture from Isaiah prefiguring the millennial period when "my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in quiet resting places" (Isa. 32:19). We are approaching that theme through a particular concern with LDS "habitations" and the people who suffer most when those habitations are not peaceful: women and children. In so doing, we are sharing a professional concern that is nationwide among our colleagues as inquiry into the incidence of incest, child abuse, and battered women reveals what amounts to an epidemic of domestic violence. We have no evidence that would lead us to believe that LDS homes are spared in any higher percentage than others, hence our decision to focus on women's issues for this conference.

You are familiar with the statistics: Between 100,000 and 500,000 American children will be molested this year. One study (*Newsweek*, 1984) shows that 19 percent of all American woman and 9 percent of all men were sexually victimized as children. Probably between two and five million American women have been the victims of incest or molesters. Seventy-five percent of the perpetrators are friends, neighbors, or relatives. Once begun on child-molesting, most do not stop. One study (*Newsweek*, 1984) of arrest convictions and confessions showed an average of 73 victims per heterosexual pedophile and 30 per homosexual pedophile. About 90 percent of all child molesters

are men.

According to a study by Diana E.H. Russell (1982), unique insofar as I know because it was based on a random sampling, 38 percent of its sample of adult women reported at least one experience of sexual abuse before the age of 18. Twenty-eight percent reported at least one such experience before the age of 14. When these cases are broken down by whether the perpetrator was a relative, the rate of incest with relatives was 16 percent for women under 18, and 12 percent for women under 14. Only 2 percent of the incest cases were ever reported to the police, only 6 percent of cases where the perpetrator was not a member of the family were ever reported.

The statistics on wife battering and the physical abuse of children are even better known, but no less horrifying.

The work of Carol Gilligan (1983), of Harvard's Graduate School of Education, has recently synthesized and made available to a wide audience some serious challenges to the traditional measures applied to the moral development of men and women. In such systems, notably those of Kohlberg and Piaget, where moral decisions are made on the basis of the highest "rule," girls and women have usually been found to be a full stage or more behind boys and men, apparently "confused" and unable to sort out the rules. Gilligan's work, though not without problems, finds that women focus on relationships and make moral decisions in that context. Men, says Gilligan, define a self "through separation" while women define a self "through connection." Men measure themselves against "an abstract ideal of perfection" and women make the same appraisal "through particular activities of care" (Gilligan, 1983, p. 35). The implications of this general model

for the therapist are profound, particularly in our responsibility to help clients toward self-actualization.

If it is true, as Gilligan suggests, that men tend to associate danger and violence with intimacy (1983, citing Horner, 1968, p. 40), then it explains why women and children, relatively less powerful, are most frequently the victims of violence from the husbands and fathers who along with the power to protect, also have the power to harm. The assignment in our culture of responsibility for the quality of relationships to women also helps explain why many women see no alternatives for themselves in situations where they are the recipients of something besides love; it must somehow be their fault. LDS therapists can help them identify such alternatives. We must also recognize that presently in our profession the LDS therapist a woman is likely to see will be male. I tend to see this as increasing the problem for women. It may, however, be an advantage in helping to reshape the values and behavior of men. If the men who are beating their wives, raping their daughters, and seducing the children of neighbors can perceive masculine role models of genuinely loving and respectful behavior, I believe the chances are increased that they will be able to change. As a Latter-day Saint with a conviction of the Savior's redemptive love for us, I cannot accept the pessimistic statistics that the rehabilitation of incestuous fathers and pedophiles is virtually nonexistent.

But as a therapist, I must apply that Christian conviction as a serious working principle. How can that hope be translated into a reality?

Scott Peck, whose recent book on human evil (1983) has a great deal to say to Latter-day Saints, has observed: "Free will is the ultimate human reality. . . . Evil is the inevitable concomitant of free will, the price we pay for our unique human power of choice" (1983, p. 244). He also observed that we cannot conquer evil by destroying it. Only through

self-purification can we "by the grace of God . . . truly love [our] enemies." That love, he suggests, then can absorb evil "like blood in a sponge or a spear in . . . one's heart" so that it "loses its power and goes no further" (1983, quoting Gale D. Webbe, p. 269). Peck admits that he does not have a map of how love works, only that he knows from experience that it does work. I believe that all of us in this room who have wrestled with sin and actual evil in human form, can share his sense that "good people can deliberately allow themselves to be pierced by the evil of others—to be broken thereby yet somehow not broken—to even be killed in some sense and yet still survive and not succumb. Whenever this happens there is a slight shift in the balance of power in the world" (1983, p. 269).

It is my earnest hope that we may apply that perspective to the sessions which follow, focusing specifically on therapeutic issues for women. "The work of righteousness shall be peace," Isaiah promises us, "and the effect of righteousness, quietness, and assurance forever." May we be able to help the people who come to us achieve some measure of that quietness and assurance.

Val D. MacMurray, Ph.D., is manager of Research, Training, and Staff Development for Social, Employment, Rehabilitation Services—LDS Welfare Services Department, Associate Clinical Professor of Family and Community Medicine—University of Utah Medical Center, and president of AMCAP.

References

- Gilligan, Carol. *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- "Hidden Epidemic." *Newsweek*, 14 May 1984, pp. 30–33.
- Russell, Diana E.H. "The Incidence and Prevalence of Intrafamilial and Extrafamilial Sexual Abuse of Female Children." *Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal*, October 1982. Typescript in possession of the author.
- Peck, Scott M. *People of the lie: The hope for healing human evil*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

PRIESTHOOD AND PARTNERSHIPS: SOME THOUGHTS FOR LDS MARRIAGES

ELDER MARION D. HANKS
A member of the Presidency
of the First Quorum of
the Seventy
Presented at the AMCAP Convention
4 October 1984

There are a few stories that seem so absolutely appropriate that they must inevitably be told. I have one of those that was dredged up as I spent a busy week between necessary involvements preparing to speak to the priesthood meeting Saturday night for just a few minutes on substantially the subject I have come here to talk to you about at a little greater length. This story I heard years ago. The president of a railroad was on a hunting expedition out in the boondocks and got lost. He almost froze, but fortunately found his way to a little weigh station of his own railroad. Inside he found a young man in a cubby hole sending out wires. The small waiting room was freezing. Not identifying himself and in his rough hunting clothing, he tried to persuade the young man to start a fire in the stove. The young man, not knowing, of course, that he was talking to the president of the railroad, declined. He said, "I am too busy sending wires to start fires." The president then said, "Please send one wire to my office." He wrote, "By return wire, fire the man who runs this weigh station," and signed it with his name and title. The young man looked at it, burst quickly from the room, grabbed the coal bucket, and said, "Sorry, sir, I am too busy building fires to send wires."

I have felt like that this week, trying to distill into a few moments so signifi-

cant a subject as marriage and what relates to it, but it has been enjoyable.

I think I have probably heard substantially every problem you have had to listen to. In the last two years in the temple, I have had a graduate course in trouble. It is a remarkable place to be and it needs no exposition of its beauty and joyfulness, but it also is a collection point for problems, particularly if one is willing to listen, and I am as occasion permits. It is also a marvelous place for sanctuary from coarseness and crudity and the minimization of institutions we know about which is too much with us on every television set and all about us. Walking through the airports of Asia is an education in itself in avoiding moral pollution. We are all susceptible, and the effort has to be calculated, deliberate, persistent, and consistent. The temple is a real sanctuary.

For what I have to say today, I offer as a kind of support, a letter I received 12 years ago from a psychiatrist, a strong and noble fellow with whom I was exchanging, as it were, referrals. In those times, there were few who would listen and few who believed in what some of these experts have to offer, and I both was interested and believed in some of them whom I knew well. They would send people to me to be taught the fundamental principles of faith and repentance, and I would send people to them when I felt that people needed the kind of special help they could give—which, in a sense, was also faith and repentance, but from their expert and highly qualified point of view. I have great respect for people who are in your professions, not because you are in them, but because sincere and earnest people are desperately needed in them, and I assume you are both professionally competent and sincere. If you are not, you shouldn't be doing what you are

doing. The doctor wrote, and I simply read what he wrote without pride or apology, what he felt was needed:

The need for wide dissemination throughout the Church of your observation on marriage is becoming more critical each day. You have indicated in the past you may write a book on the subject. Even a booklet would help. The inundation of professional offices by families in trouble is a tragedy because it is preventable if an adequate education program can be installed to identify marriage for what it is: one of the hardest jobs for any individual to undertake, requiring tolerance, patience, and planning as well as love instead of the romanticized concepts which are found even in many of our Church publications. It is heartbreaking to see so many fine young people destroyed on false illusions of what marriage should be. A book or booklet would be real helpful. I hope it will be available soon.

Your perceptions of my sense of inadequacy will be supported by the fact that the book was never written nor was the booklet. In a sense, I am sorry for that. Many good books and booklets have been written, and the library in my house has a suitable store. The fundamentals of which I will speak may be, in some sense, found much as they are treated elsewhere, but I would hope I may speak them with some special sense of what people in the Church can and should learn, and also of the resources available to us. I keep thinking of what Conrad Hilton said when someone asked him his biggest problem in the hotel business: "Getting people to put the curtain inside the tub." That may almost capture the homely nature of what I wish to say to you.

Let me also share a few lines from Ogden Nash at his height. He defines marriage:

Just as I know there are two Higgens, Walter and Copen [for you younger people, Walter Higgens was a great golfer], I know that marriage is a legal and religious alliance entered into by a

man who cannot sleep with the window shut and a woman who can't sleep with the window open. Also, he can't sleep till he has read the last hundred pages to find out whether his suspicions of a murdered eccentric's recluse secretary were right. And she can't sleep until he puts out the light which, when he finally does, she's still awake. . . . That is why marriage is so much more interesting than divorce because it is the only known example of the happy meeting of the immovable object and the irresistible force. I hope husbands and wives will continue to debate and combat over every thing debatable and compatible because I believe a little incompatibility is the spice of life, particularly if he has income and she is patible. (*I Do, I Will, I Have, Selected Poems of Ogden Nash*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1975, p. 248.)

Let me also note from a recent issue of *U.S. News and World Report*: "Despite the risks, Americans remain the marrying kind. Eventually more than 90 percent of the population will marry. Even those who have endured the trauma of divorce usually make at least one more attempt to achieve wedded bliss," says sociologist Jerry Talley of Stanford. "Although people may be disappointed in a marriage partner, they are not generally disappointed in marriage." There are other and many interesting things. J.P. Marquand is quoted as saying, "Marriage is damnably serious business, particularly around Boston."

Well, it is serious business, and it is the basis for much that is meaningful in our religion as in our lives. I start by noting what a good man, Sir Arthur Bryant, said, extracted from a London newspaper: "Though life in this transitory world can never, for anyone, as in fairy stories, be free of threat and trouble, the companionship of two partners, tried in the fires of life and brought together by true and lasting love can be and is the best thing by far that life offers a man and a woman." My wife, Maxine, and I were once at the home of Robert Burns in Scotland. Under glass on his

desk was a little single-sentence note he wrote to a friend in 1789: "That you may have a safe journey and a happy meeting with that dearest of all connections, your fireside circle, is the sincerest wish of your obliged humble servant, Robert Burns." I have had that in mind ever since, "That dearest of all connections, your fireside circle." In a beautiful sealing room in the temple one day, I talked with a little boy dressed in white ready to join his parents and brothers and sisters in the sacred ordinance. I said to him, "Why is your family here in the temple?" He said, "To be sealed." I said, "What does it mean to be sealed?" He said, "To be a forever family." "Oh," I said, "You're going to be a family *forever*? You must have a good family, a happy family, if you want to be with them forever. Do you have a happy family?" (His parents and brothers and sisters and others were there.) "Yes, sir." This fine lad had already begun to understand two of the most important principles anyone could ever know: 1) That our Heavenly Father has provided for marriage and family ties which may be established permanently, to endure forever, and 2) that a marriage that we can joyfully look forward to forever must be a good marriage here. Such a marriage is the heart of a happy home and family.

There is another truth of which I also would wish to testify: that the principles of the gospel, particularly those of the temple, are the best possible basis on which to build a strong marriage and that such a marriage *never just happens*. The sealing ceremony in the temple is to us beautiful and indispensable, but it does not automatically assure a successful marriage. Such a marriage is *brought about*, not by circumstance or chance, but by two mature, loving adults who are able and willing to learn the principles upon which a genuine and durable marriage may be fashioned and who, day by day, year by year, earnestly make the effort, building on the solid foundation of the covenants of the temple.

I note these five basics: (1) temple

marriage as the basis for (2) a happy eternal union, (3) built on the solid foundation of gospel covenants (4) by two mature adults who are learning and growing together, and (5) with the priesthood as the authority through which these covenants are administered and as a commission for leadership in the home in the spirit and after the pattern of the principles which were central in the life of the Savior. The "Holy priesthood after the order of the Son of God," I am saying, is not a commission to superiority or dictatorship or domination. It is a commission in one instance to seal by God's authority, and it is—and for all of us ought to be understood to be—a commission for leadership in the home, in the spirit and after the pattern of the principles and life of Jesus Christ—"The Holy priesthood after the order of the Son of God."

As to temple marriage, I believe deeply that honorable marriage with honorable people involved, wherever and however performed, is acceptable to God. I believe God honors honorable marriage and blesses it with His love and spirit, but He Himself has established and made available to some, and given them the responsibility to teach others, a more excellent way, a more excellent hope. There is a best way to start such a significant and demanding enterprise as marriage. He would like us all to know about that and choose it. That is the reason for missionary work. That is the reason for the expansion of temples. Of eternal marriage, the scriptures teach us that marriage is ordained of God for His children, and we who truly love a husband or wife and live in some kind of a respectable, respectful, growing, developing relationship could not contemplate an eternity without marriage and family. Much of everything lovely and eternally significant relates to those who are closest and dearest to us, and we could not really think of heaven absent their association and their love. This week, I chanced upon some Whitman lines that I will share: "Oh, to make the most jubilant song. It is not enough to have this globe

or a certain time. I will have thousands of globes and all time."

The Lord declared that whatsoever He does shall be forever. His way of everlasting marriage is filled with hope and promise and is designed to lead to happiness here and to an eternal stewardship like that of God himself. In the beginning after the earth was prepared, God brought man and woman together in the garden, and the first wedding occurred. They were not yet mortal. Death had not entered into the world, and no time limitations were placed upon their marriage. God declared, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Genesis 2:24). When Christ lived among men, he quoted this commandment and added, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not men put asunder." (Matt. 19:6) He gave his disciples power to bind in heaven that which is bound on earth. It was later declared by Paul that "neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord." (1 Cor. 11:11) In the time of the restoration of the gospel came a renewed understanding of temples and temple worship. The power to bind and seal in heaven has again been entrusted to chosen servants of God. Eternal marriage, temple marriage, marriage of the highest promise, is again performed for time and all eternity by authorized officiators in the holy temples of the Lord. Thus, the more excellent way is given its base, and that which can weld, blend, and build and bless with an eternal marriage is indispensable to our eternal happiness. Parley Pratt said that Joseph Smith had influenced him in a way he could not have imagined. "It was from him that I learned that the wife of my bosom might be secured to me for time and all eternity; and that the refined sympathies and affections which endeared us to each other emanated from the foundation of divine, eternal love. It was from the Prophet that I learned that we might cultivate these affections, and grow and increase in the

same through all eternity." (*Autobiography of Parley P. Pratt*, Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1938, pp. 297-98).

But an eternal marriage will have to be a happy marriage, creative, progressive, gracious. Sometimes the distinctive elements of temple marriage are thought of as resting exclusively in duration and authority. Of course, everyone who comes to the temple to be married understands that it is by God's authority for time and eternity. But the remarkable revealed ceremony at the altar in the temple contemplates much more than this. Wonderful promises are sealed upon a man and a woman in a temple marriage, blessings related to the solemn commitments the two make to each other, and the promises that they make individually and as a couple to the Lord. The commitment of each with the other is total and permanent, the whole person "as is" for the whole journey.

Now, of course, neither will remain as he or she is. That is not meant to be. They will grow and develop in a multitude of ways—or can; but the pledge they make to each other is without condition or reservation. On this solid foundation, the newly formed family undertakes to build a strong and loving union that will grow more wholesome and more glorious forever.

How will they do this? The personality and the individuality and uniqueness of each partner to marriage must be understood, accepted, protected, and preserved if there is to be happiness; but this liberty must be enjoyed in the spirit of a deep commitment to the building of the union, not chiefly in the spirit of self-concern, self-satisfaction, self-determined expectations. You are probably acquainted with the Daniel Webster saying that to me has more to do with marriage than with politics, though it has a lot to do with both. Said he, "Liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever." Emerson with all of his mighty intellect didn't quite understand that or at least unbalanced it with all the emphasis on the individual's needs and expectations and rights of fulfillment. Lincoln under-

stood it better. Lincoln understood that unless there is a strong union there cannot be any independence and liberty. Now, he too, of course, was talking politically, but his great mind and great heart would have understood that, like the states of the union over which he presided, unique, separate, special, individual human beings brought together in this most total, intimate, and close relationship are not obligated to surrender. They make an alliance. They do give up some freedoms in order to establish and perpetuate a union, and that union becomes the base upon which their individuality may truly be accepted, appreciated, and expressed in the sense God intended it to be because each of us has been around a lot longer than the total of our birthdays. We are eternal persons and this personality is eternal. "Liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

Ibsen's, *The Doll House*, surely in your memories, has a scene when Nora, self-sacrificially, has done something to sustain Torbin, but he, bland and inconsiderate, doesn't really appreciate that. Indeed at the height of that dramatic moment he says to her, "I want you to understand that before all, you are a wife and mother." Her answer is, "I believe that before anything else, I am a human being." Now, nothing I know of in eternal marriage—and certainly not in the temple where those covenants are made—in any sense mitigates or vitiates that critical truth. You who know what you should know about marriage—and perhaps have been married long enough to get philosophical and a little whimsical—will be aware that, indeed and in fact, you have not plumbed the depths of this other individual. You'll have that interesting day when your heart and your tear ducts and your center of exultancy and the smile muscles and all the rest will just kind of mingle in a high, holy moment when you will look at her or him and marvel. You will have learned how much deeper and better and decent and full of faith she is than you are or will ever be. And there will come the marvelous

recognition that you, knowing all you know, have not penetrated the depths of this person.

A human being is sacred, for one reason, because he or she is always more than a human being, an eternal child of God.

Two human beings, as they are married in the house of the Lord, have a new life open to them with many relationships and unities which can and are meant to develop into a union. She becomes wife, mother, homemaker, heart of a home; he becomes husband, father, protector, provider, and priesthood leader in our home for most of her marriage. My mother lived alone for 45 years until she died in her eighty-fifth year.

Among the new relationships—in the sense they never have existed before—is a *partnership* which the two entering bring assets to and in which they recognize a need to grow with the problems, challenges, and conflicts; but the two become partners in the warm, sweet, wonderful, sharing, learning, growing sense of marriage. Partners. Real partners. Equal partners. Sharing, valued, respected, admired partners. They become *companions* in a special sense, whether they are in the same room or a world apart. They are married 24 hours a day. They care about the whole person and the whole future of each other with good humor, good dispositions, and a genuine consideration of the other's needs and desires. They set out to make it a happy life. They laugh a lot and cry a little. They are warm, considerate, and thoughtful. The note, the telephone call, the kind word, the sensitive response, the tremendous excitement of heading home to her when the work is done or the trip is over—back home to her and them and your place. And the wonderful excitement in them when you are coming home.

You get a group of grown children with their own children together and listen to what they remember and watch how they behave when their partner is arriving. Matthew Cowley wrote a

beautiful little piece on the eternal triangle: "The triangle is man, woman, and God. My companion wife is one with whom I break bread, that being the very meaning of the word." The root of the word *companion* is "bread with," and the implication obviously is that the experience will be warm, rewarding, exciting, pleasing, and thoughtful in its preparation and sharing.

Through a few words of covenants the basis is laid, but the job is not accomplished, for the two to become *sweethearts*. Married people are sweethearts in a special creative union, blessed with a powerful chemistry that draws them together, sometimes from next door, sometimes from a world away. The sexual union is one of the many unions or unities in marriage which is critical and significant, a divinely bestowed blessing. It is not the only flower in the garden. It must be sustained by other fundamental qualities—by respect, integrity, and loyalty to be what it is meant to be. To be able to give oneself with complete confidence and trust and to receive the other joyfully and gratefully is a blessing that grows in meaning forever.

One of the saddest, heartbreaking moments of thousands of hours of counseling—mostly listening, trying to help a little—came when a beautiful woman, the wife of one of my closest and best-loved friends, sat across the desk from me—well-groomed, well-dressed—and asked me to speak to her as if she were a bride. She was desperate. The marriage had no meaning. They were not really partners although they had made a lot of money, and she could spend it, but there was no sense of sharing, nothing left of their beautiful months in one-room with a let-down bed. "We are not companions really," she said. "He has his shotgun, his golf clubs, his friends, his handball gloves. We are not really sweethearts anymore, either. We have nothing left to express." I cried, and I feel like crying now. Married all those years, beautiful children, everything anyone could want, and they had ceased sharing, ceased

being companions, ceased being sweethearts.

I never apologize for a personal example, although this one comes with some unease because it requires a great deal of trust in your good sense. Christmas Day—sometime since when all our children were still at home (we had four teenage daughters, the oldest about to move into her own life, and a little brother), I gave their mother a beautiful white nightgown and said to them, "Now, I don't know that you are able to understand this, but you will remember it, and one day you will understand it. Your mother and I have been married many years and have been blessed with you five and some whom we have lost along the way. A marriage of this most intimate and total and close relationship has brought us our own prize. Having been through all of this together and knowing each other as we do, she is more pure and more beautiful to me today than she was the day I met her or the day I married her." I repeated, "I don't think you will understand that, but I wanted you to hear it and remember it. She is more beautiful and more pure to me than the day we met or the day we married."

The sweetheart relationship is appropriately sustained by character, quality, consideration, the capacity to repent, and the capacity to forgive. The complete trust that a few have the capacity to have, and others don't deserve, that beautiful sweet thing—minimized, maligned, and tragically imposed upon through centuries—is a plant established by God's good grace which ought to flower and grow with all that sustains and blesses it. The two become *friends* in the special way that married people should be best friends. The little kindnesses and constancies that are expressed will endure—the cherishing, the kindness, the thoughtfulness, and support. Married people should be best friends, because, in truth, no relationship on earth needs friendship as much as marriage.

As I walked up the aisle in the auditorium at a university recently, I

stopped and said to a young man sitting on the edge of the row, "Who is that beautiful girl sitting by you?" "My best friend," he said, right off the top of his head. "Oh, and is she also your wife?" "Yes." I spoke to her, "Is that true? Are you his best friend?" "Yes." "And is he your best friend?" "Yes." I said, "Do you know how lucky you two are to be married to your sweetheart who is also your best friend?" They said, "We know."

Friendship blows away the chaff, rejoices in the uniqueness of the other, listens patiently, gives generously, forgives freely, and is loyal. Friendship may indeed motivate one to cross the room to say, "I'm sorry, I didn't mean it," or "I didn't understand. I love you." Friendship will be more important than winning an argument or proving something. Friendship will endure our immaturity and our callousness. We are all adult and child, so much of our response is childish in a nonconstructive sense. Friendship will not pretend at perfection nor demand it. It will not insist that both respond exactly the same way in every situation in thought and feeling; but it will be understanding and supportive, repentant, and forgiving, respectful, trusting, and trustworthy. Friendship will say, "I am your husband, I love you. We are married. I am often responsible for behavior that isn't quite consistent with the level of my understanding, but I love you and I am proud of you. I'll speak well of you, and I will not betray your trust. I will delight in your uniqueness. I am your best friend."

A good marriage doesn't just happen. Temple marriage is not isolated. It serves both as a culmination of other ordinances and as the foundation for family and eternal future. Some of you may not know that no one can enter into a temple marriage until he or she has been to the temple previously to receive their own blessings, to personally make sacred covenants with the Lord. These covenants center in principles that are basic in a truly Christian life and in the formulation of good

marriage and family. The covenants we make in the temple, like the other sacred covenants of the gospel, commit us to the Lord Jesus Christ and His loving example. In the temple—think now of your experience—we make commitments to follow Christ in doing God's will and keeping his commandments, in valuing others and unselfishly serving them, in loving God and our fellowman. We pledge complete fidelity to moral principle, self-control, devotion to the cause of righteousness and truths; and all of this happens through the priesthood, the holy priesthood after the order of the Son of God.

A thoughtful understanding of this single reality should automatically eliminate any false perceptions of superiority or inferiority. Men and women are of equal value before God and must be equally valuable in the eyes of each other. A true devotion in following the example of the Son of God will never permit notions of domination or dictatorship or possession or control. It will never justify unrighteousness, abuse, or foul talk, or discourtesy. Christ's way is the way of persuasion, long-suffering, meekness, kindness, love unfeigned, pure knowledge, unselfishness, gentleness, mercy.

It is simple to see, isn't it, that the kind of marriage we are talking about doesn't just happen. Nobody can pronounce happiness. No one can pronounce the quality that forgives and thus expresses real love. These are elements in lives that have to be brought to the union by those involved, grown in and developed in—through the course. The foundation can be laid in the House of the Lord. The marriage can be pronounced by the authority of God, but it must be fashioned by two who are wholesome, prepared emotionally and practically, and who are honest. It requires being ready to go to a temple, being mature enough to make promises and keep them and to receive holy promises that qualify for their fulfillment.

Wherever one is with respect to marriage—years from it, deep in it, close to it—the same basic principles

should be understood. Keep the commandments. Be honest. In this most close and intimate relationship one is committed in the most serious and sacred decisions of life. Temple marriage is much more than the experience of the temple, the sacred ceremony, the authority by which it is performed, and the wonderful promises sealed upon us. It involves our attitudes towards God and each other, toward marriage, toward marriage, toward children, toward family. It involves our preparations, our worthiness, our ability to learn and grow and graciously endure.

The inspiration for all of us is the assurance, deeply impressed upon the hearts of decent people who live as they should, that heaven will be heaven for us because this one we love the best will be there. A few days ago, we sat in a room with our five children and their eternal partners and their 16 children. Twenty-eight of us were joined in a circle of affection and appreciation. That circle established at an altar in the holy house of the Lord only a few short years ago has expanded miraculously. I sat marvelling. Now, I don't know what you may know, but I know enough to be aware that when a magnificent phrase like "eternal lives" is repeated, it refers to that kind of life which exaltation expresses—that is, a creative life, a God-like life on a God-like level with the Almighty. I looked at 27 other people, realized that we haven't had a child for 24 years and will not again in this world. Yet, 28 of us were in the room with children yet to come. If God is willing, we may even live long enough to see the next generation. This stewardship of ours is expanding eternally, like the stars of the heavens and sands on the seashore. We little specks, 28 of us, are important individuals, producing life.

One who never knew his father begins to get excited about that. One who loves a mother appreciates that. I get interested in a 13-year-old boy who joined the Church—a drover, a rough-neck, with crude language and all the rest who became a grandfather to me; an 18-year-old girl who stood on a street

corner knowing what the elders were saying was true and also knowing her father would never permit her name to be said again in his house when she joined the church.

What an exciting remarkable vision to perceive continuity into the past and into the future: that all of us will find a place, ultimately, a loving place under the holy influence of Him whose spirit children we are and whose holy life and sacrifice brought us the blessings of these excellent hopes.

Now, I must finish by sharing three other things very briefly. I have to say to you that of course the plan of God will be fair altogether, as He is fair. Those who earnestly desire the eternal blessings of marriage and family, but through no fault of their own are deprived of this blessing here, will ultimately have an opportunity to enjoy it. The Holy One of Israel standeth at the gate and "employeth no servant there." The judgments and decisions of eternity will be stamped with his approval, his justice, and blessed with his influence. It is my absolute conviction that no one will be forced into an eternal relationship that is not wholesome and desirable, nor deprived of a joyful, eternal relationship which they desire and have done their part to qualify for. The plan provides for vicarious blessings to those who have no opportunities to enjoy them. So also will it provide for those who are deprived of the blessing they deserve and desire.

The last thing is to just say that the glorious promises of God are summarized in a magnificent verse of scripture: "Then shall thy confidence wax strong in the presence of God, . . . the doctrine of the priesthood shall distill upon thy soul as the dews from heaven. . . . the Holy Ghost shall be thy constant companion, . . ." (D&C 121:45-46).

What is the doctrine of the priesthood? Is it the doctrine of command, of domination? This morning we went through the temple with all the General Authorities and their wives. I listened with you in mind, especially, saw the drama, but was a little uneasy. Will

someone perceive from this something more than a magnificent and needed instruction on the inevitability and beauty of free agency? Is it a lesson of hierarchial value? Who will observe the kneeling at the altar of two who take each other by the hand and look to the Lord Jesus Christ and who will make covenants—every one of which looks to Him as the holy exemplar—and think it gives some kind of domination? No one with any sense in my judgment.

I get the privilege of looking young men in the eye, and I do it regularly, and charging them to understand that simple thing: that the priesthood is a called commission to serve in the spirit and after the pattern of the Lord Jesus Christ applied to your home in all the challenges you have. The doctrine of the priesthood is a doctrine of agency, of learning, teaching, blessing, receiving, storing, acting in the ordinances, becoming a Savior to our people.

I testify to you that God is fair, good, and just, and that we don't fool him any. We are dealing with realities—the people who walk through the temple

with their broken hearts or with whom I sit every day if there is time. Their problem is not understanding law. Their problem is that they do not know who they are, or they have met and been involved with someone who doesn't know who he is or she is. The fundamentals of the gospel are real and true and applicable and appropriate for all of God's children.

My prayer is an earnest one for you. Either personally or counseling, repentance and forgiveness all important—so important that your life depends upon it, as mine does. And so I urge you if you have real reservations, consider the simple sweet truths in an excellent way that doesn't remove responsibility from the individuals involved, but indeed gives them a base upon which to build, formulate, and fashion. This can be done by two mature adults who really want to and who can learn—not being blessed with perfection. There are no perfect marriages, but there are some very good ones, and they are always the product of fundamental principles.

GOSPEL POWER IN TROUBLED HOMES

ELDER J. THOMAS FYANS
Of the Presidency of the
First Quorum of the Seventy
Presented at the AMCAP Convention
5 October, 1984

My dear brothers and sisters, this is an honor and responsibility being with you this morning, recognizing that you perform such a vital function.

I understand that the speaker following me will instruct us on self-esteem. As my self-esteem becomes battered during my talk, I plan to remain for the next speaker to build my self-esteem back up. So if you will just bear with me, then we will look forward to the next speaker who is going to help all of us.

There is great collective power for good in this room in your commitment to increase righteousness. You have an overwhelming challenge being laborers in a vineyard where your assignments are at least as much to fight the weeds that are choking good growth as they are to nurture the fruitful vines.

Flooding Down from the Mountains

We experienced extreme flooding earlier in 1984 along the Wasatch Front. The heavy snowfall melted, sending its waters cascading down into our valleys. We were deeply concerned. A call went out for volunteers and several hundred responded. There was a vitality of neighborliness that existed. Sandbags were filled and placed into position to control the flow of water and provide protection for the homes, schools, churches, and other valuable property. Occasionally water surged beyond its prescribed bounds, causing a great deal of damage and inconvenience.

What was the attitude toward the

snow in the mountains and its potential danger to homes and loved ones as warm temperatures brought devastation surging into our valleys? Were fists shaken in anger, expending valuable strength on meaningless motions that consumed energy but produced no positive results? No, we drew from the resources of the human mind in man's ability to control his environment. Areas of potential weakness were anticipated and defenses shored up to withstand the onslaught.

Now suppose we have a different kind of intrusion upon our comfort. This time we are not the objects of physical duress, but there flows into our presence a besmirching of things we hold sacred. Should we not shore up our defense? Is this a time to build channels of control for the ill winds that may blow? Should we not store in our reservoirs great spiritual resources to absorb and neutralize this onslaught?

Statistics on Family Violence

May we review some statistics on family violence given to me by Brother Val MacMurray which will provide a contest for our discussion:

1. Nearly six million wives are physically abused by their husbands annually in the United States. Between 2,000 and 4,000 of these women are beaten to death.

2. Over one-third of these battered women say that they have also been raped or otherwise sexually abused by their husbands or co-habiting partners.

3. One in four husbands slap their wives, one in ten beat them with their fists, and one in 18 threaten them with weapons.

4. One million children are abused or neglected annually. Every year about 2,000 of them die as a result.

5. Between 25 and 38 percent of girls under 18 are sexually abused. Almost half of these sexual incidents occur within the family, where the girl is abused by a relative. Father-daughter incest is the most common form, with the average age for such incidents starting at about 10.

In your minds these statistics become part of your week's work.

The Latter-day Saint and Family Violence

No matter where such cases occur, they are cause for serious concern. The fact that these statistics are gathered in the United States, where people are relatively well-educated and affluent, intensifies that concern. Even more serious is the fact that Latter-day Saints don't escape such grievous sins. Cases have come to our attention of husbands and fathers appearing to be active and responsible members of the Church, who are or have been involved in incidents of abuse and violence.

As professionals in providing therapy, with particular stewardship for our own Latter-day Saints, you are aware that the Church does not, at whatever level, view sexual or physical abuse with any degree of lightness. It accepts no excuses for such behavior. Any man participating in such activities has placed his priesthood in jeopardy, for the Lord's instructions are extremely clear on this point:

. . . The rights of the priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven, and . . . the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled only upon the principles of righteousness.

That they may be conferred upon us, it is true; but when we undertake to cover our sins, or to gratify our pride, our vain ambition, or to exercise control or dominion or compulsion upon the souls of the children of men, in any degree of unrighteousness, behold, the heavens withdraw themselves; the Spirit of the Lord is grieved; and when it is withdrawn, amen to the priesthood or the authority of that man. (D&C 121:36-37)

Righteous Use of Priesthood

Even though ample cases exist to indicate that women are sometimes the abusers as well as the abused, and that children have also, many times, been the abusers of other children, may we consider primarily those situations in which men who are husbands and fathers have failed to provide the kind of example in the home that their families could expect from one holding the priesthood. In so doing, I echo the expression of concern pronounced by a loving Father in heaven in D&C 121:41: "No power or influence can or ought to be maintained by virtue of the priesthood. Only . . . by gentleness and meekness, and by love unfeigned."

Put Your Own Oxygen Mask on First—Spiritual Air

A couple of weeks ago an assignment took me to South America. As the plane was about to take off in Salt Lake, the Western flight attendant gave these instructions: "In the event of an emergency, oxygen masks will fall down automatically. Place your own mask firmly over your nose and mouth and breathe normally; then assist others in the placement of their masks." In Los Angeles I changed from Western to Varig, a Brazilian airline. As we took off, this same announcement was made: "In the event of an emergency, oxygen masks will fall down automatically. Place your own mask firmly on your nose and mouth and breathe normally; then assist others in the placement of their masks." This instruction was given in English and then in Spanish because our destination was Lima, Peru. This same instruction was then given in Portuguese for the Brazilians on board, and finally in Japanese because the plane had just landed coming from Tokyo and many Japanese were continuing their flight to South America.

Our bodies require a constant supply of air. We can go without food for a week or more, but oxygen must be available constantly. Recently my wife and I visited La Paz, Bolivia, high in the

Andes Mountains of South America. La Paz is at an altitude of approximately 13,000 feet. As we landed and descended from the plane, those who met us were very solicitous. We were told that because of the extremely thin air, we should walk slowly to the lounge. Once there, we were invited to sit down. I insisted I felt fine—but in a moment or two became light-headed, and I sat down. They supplied me with oxygen. I needed help.

Spiritual Air—How Obtained

After several minutes of oxygen deprivation, we lose consciousness and life leaves us. Each spirit is housed in a physical tabernacle. There is a spiritual air upon which it is dependant for sustenance.

Do we ever find ourselves in a situation where our spirits are deprived of spiritual air? In such a spiritually threatening situation, where can we go to renew the quality of our spiritual air? Activities of fasting, prayer, scripture study, love, service, and sharing the gospel are bathed in their own atmosphere of spiritual air. This life-giving oxygen permeates our souls and we are sustained spiritually.

Results of Breathing Spiritual Air

What are the results of breathing spiritual air? In Mosiah 5:2, we read about such a circumstance: "...because of the Spirit of the Lord Omnipotent, which has wrought a mighty change ... in our hearts, that we have no more disposition to do evil, but to do good continually." Each moment love—the pure love of Christ—flows from us to others, we are generating this spiritual air within us to the point that we cannot contain its influence and we reach out to others. The process brings an automatic restoration within ourselves; we are renewed.

We partake of proper foods, acquire sufficient rest, and participate in some form of physical exertion to tone our physical bodies. Following these rules for good health brings a feeling of physical well-being.

In our daily routines we also study and internalize the scriptures; we accept certain covenants and participate in sacred ordinances. We spiritually meditate and ponder and attune ourselves to the power of heaven through prayer. This brings a feeling of spiritual well-being.

This isn't the end—it is but the beginning. Now we are ready to serve. Having our spiritual oxygen masks in place, now we reach out to others and do for them what they can't do for themselves.

Dual Responsibility as Latter-day Saint and as a Therapist

You have a dual responsibility, to put on your own mask first and then reach out to others, or, in other words, *first* as a Latter-day Saint and *secondly* as a therapist. As Latter-day Saint men and women, your personal and family lives are examples for the troubled individuals and families who come to you for help—tangible evidence of the effects of fasting and prayer, scripture study, love, service, and sharing the gospel. In dealing with friends and associates, our love needs to reflect the love and respect due the individual as a child of God. Our behavior toward our family and friends communicates the commitment of love that initially brought us together and the continuing commitment toward the attributes of godliness in which we sustain and support each other.

Do we consider and appreciate the needs of each individual and strive to meet these needs appropriately? Do we regard their activities to be equally as important as our own? Do we expend special effort to assure that our families receive the same special treatment as those with whom we associate in our dealings away from home?

The Apostle Paul, in giving advice to the youthful bishop, Timothy, counseled, "But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith." (1 Tim. 5:8) This "providing for" includes not only economic and material needs but

those tender needs, needs pertaining to their self-esteem and the renewal of love that are so necessary to the emotional stability of us all. In this way we create a firm launching pad from which we can accelerate to our second responsibility and role as a therapist in counseling troubled individuals and families.

In addition to your role as a Latter-day Saint, you have a second responsibility in your role as a therapist in counseling troubled individuals and families. As you know, your task is not to assign guilt or pronounce judgments. The ecclesiastical systems of the Church and the legal systems of the state have judgment responsibilities. They can label and bring consequences for the offending behavior.

Counseling Responsibility Three-Fold

In counseling, it would appear your responsibility is three-fold:

First, there must be cooperation with authorities in preventing further damage to innocent parties. Of particular concern are children who are dealing with feelings of love for a parent, and may be confused by inappropriate activities. As a result, these children may have been forced to assume responsibilities in a relationship that can only be asked of mature people. The redemption of Christ is available to everyone, but many people have put themselves in a position where they can no longer experience the light of Christ in a way that influences their behavior significantly. Nephi in chastising Laman and Lemuel tells them, "Ye have seen an angel, and he spake unto you; yea, ye have heard his voice from time to time; and he hath spoken unto you in a still small voice. *But ye were past feeling*, that ye could not feel his words. . . ." (1 Ne. 17:45, italics added). Some offenders can no longer *do* works of righteousness without help. Until such help can be provided, nothing is more important than to prevent them from inflicting further damage upon their victims or from seeking new victims.

Second, you must help the victims

to understand what has happened, to resolve any feelings of confusion or guilt that may, if not treated, have a crippling impact upon themselves and upon their future families, and to provide these victims with the skills to protect themselves against further recurrences. In many cases, they need to know where they can receive help. They need someone with whom they can talk, if necessary over a period of several months. They need models of appropriate adult behavior. In many cases they have had both mothers and fathers who have been strangely passive in crucial personal matters. They need to know that there are appropriate ways to take charge of their lives, to deal with situations, to identify their own feelings, and to meet their own needs.

It is unfortunate that these children have been thrust into circumstances where they must acquire understanding and skills that would normally come over a long period of time in a safe environment where they could be tested and refined. It is urgent that they not be left vulnerable again to the persuasions of an adult, or prey to their own confused feelings.

Third, you must help the perpetrators of these crimes. I think of President Kimball, whose love is a deep-flowing well. Even in the black-and-white words of the printed text of a speech, or in his image projected on a television screen, President Kimball's love touches everyone. When in his presence, whether in a crowded conference hall or in a private meeting, no one can leave the room without feeling the refreshment and joy of that freely given love.

For some that human need to give and express love has been damned up, turned on itself, forced to find strange and torturous channels in the troubled individuals who would offer violence or sexual abuse to their own wives and children. As therapists, your professional training and skills will indicate to you the best way to approach these deficiencies so that these individuals may claim the promise of the Savior to those who understand and use their

priesthood correctly: "Let virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy confidence wax strong in the presence of God; and the doctrine of the priesthood shall distill upon thy soul as the dews from heaven. The Holy Ghost shall be thy constant companion. . . ." (D&C 121:45-46)

Obviously these troubled individuals have a great deal of experience with compulsion. Many of them, from what I understand, have been the victims of sexual and physical abuse themselves. Many of them no doubt have never had the experience of being touched by the Holy Ghost in ways that they have been able to understand, or of feeling the redeeming love of the Savior. Your profession often provides opportunities for you to use your skills as a lifeguard.

You Can Recognize Someone Drowning in Emotional Distress

On my return flight from Tacna, Peru, as I boarded the airplane in Dallas, Texas, I found myself seated alone. Following dinner a trainee flight attendant came and sat by me and we had the following conversation:

"I'm not a quitter," she said.

Surprised with this expression, I looked at her and said, "You don't look like a quitter."

"I don't like the way people are treating me."

"What is causing you that concern?"

"I just don't like it."

Not knowing exactly what was happening, I asked, "Where are you going? How are you enjoying your flight attendant experience?"

"I am not enjoying it."

"Wasn't it wonderful that Sharlene Wells was made Miss America?"

"Well, I was in the Miss Utah Pageant, a contestant against her."

"Oh, is that right? That is wonderful! What talent do you have?"

"I played the piano."

"How long have you played the piano?"

"Oh, for about 12 years."

"You don't look that old to me." I was trying to cheer her up.

We talked about her schooling at Utah State University and her desire to travel. The conversation so far was not making any sense. All of a sudden, she said she had work to do. As she stood up I observed that she looked completely lost. She soon returned and we resumed our conversation.

"I don't like the way people treat me," she said.

"Well, then, you just sit here, and we'll chat."

It was obvious that she was really depressed. I tried to express positive things about her and complimented her on being qualified to be in the Miss Utah pageant and having attended a university. There was very little intelligent response, very little response at all.

By this time the "fasten seatbelt" sign came on. She said, "The fasten seatbelt sign is on; I wonder if I should go up and announce that?" I said, "Why don't you just sit here and take care of me?" By this time I was getting knowing looks from the flight attendants. The plane started down, and she indicated she did not want the plane to come down.

I offered to be of help to her when we landed and indicated my wife would be there to meet me. She assured me her parents were coming and that she would like to meet my wife. I told her I would wait just outside the plane while she got her things together. She said, "Oh, don't leave me." So we sat back down and waited until every passenger left the plane. When she went to find her luggage she came back with the wrong suitcase. As she went to the back to look for her own luggage, one of the other flight attendants thanked me for my help. They may have been grateful for my help, but I was wishing some of you people could have been there with your professional insight—you see, I did not even recognize the symptoms under which this young lady was operating so that I might address her needs more directly. We then walked to

the front door of the plane, where the father and mother of the girl were waiting for her. The mother had extreme anxiety on her face. They were shocked to see her. I had given her a card on the plane but she asked if I could give her another card. My reply was that she could have as many cards as she wanted. Introductions were made to Helen and we bid farewell. I was able to determine where her parents lived and after a couple of days had passed, I called and talked to her mother. The mother began to apologize. She had thought I was an employee of the airline who was responsible for her daughter's release from flight attendant school. Her mother related other disappointments in her daughter's life. The daughter and her parents came to Salt Lake and had lunch with me.

When my daughter Suzanne, an R.N., came down to visit with us this morning, I related this story of the girl on the airplane. Then I asked her if I could share some ideas on the talk I was planning for Mormon counselors. She said, "Dad, you have just had an experience that you ought to make part of your talk." I asked her what she meant. She said, "You were trying to deal with someone who had lost contact with reality and apparently her having been rejected as Miss Utah and as a flight attendant, and probably another rejection in her love life, caused her to snap. And that was what you had beside you."

You counselors and psychotherapists have the capability to recognize emotional distress.

You can pull such victims from troubled waters and help them remove the restraining entanglements.

You can place them on the beach where the warm rays of heavenly light will raise the temperature and the blood will flow more freely and begin to nurture the brain.

You can help unclutter their minds and point them in the direction of all power.

After such help, these individuals will be in a position to be receptive and influenced by ecclesiastical leaders who

have the responsibility and mandate to give them experiences with fasting, prayer, reading of the scriptures, and priesthood blessings. As they continue to gain strength and their thinking processes become more clear, a greater susceptibility to the Spirit will occur, thus opening the conduit to that divine source which can be relied upon to change feelings most directly, most powerfully, and most permanently—healing can then take place.

You will face a special challenge in those situations where you are dealing with an individual who has somehow been able to define "priesthood" to include his inappropriate activities as a legitimate exercise of patriarchal authority. Helping such a person to create an image of reality that corresponds to the Father's view of love and sacrifice will be a particular part of your challenge.

Such individuals need a reminder that they are willfully distorting the teachings of the Church. Some of these individuals will have done harm to their families and removed themselves so far from the steady light of Christ that they may never be able to take their place in that family circle again. It may appear that the violation of their temple covenants has been so severe as to forfeit their sealings to their wives and children. However, we do not know about their eternal status. It is not for us to exclude them from the larger family that constitutes the family of God, our Eternal Father.

Just as priesthood brings great power, so it also brings great responsibility. Those who have proved themselves unworthy of that responsibility will also be denied its power, no matter what claims they make. But this determination lies with the ecclesiastical leaders of those individuals and ultimately in the hands of the judge we all must face to account for our stewardships. As the Savior reminded us, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick . . . I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." (Matt. 9:12–13) "The worth of souls is

great in the sight of God." (D&C 18:10) Our responsibility is to reach out and help.

I Have No Hands But Yours

As the residents of a small community in France surveyed the damage caused by bombing during World War II, it was concluded the rebuilding should begin at the central plaza where fragments of a statue of the Christus lay scattered amidst the rubble. Piece by piece the statue once again took shape. The form stood complete except for the hands. Disappointment brought the suggestion that the statue be removed from the square but traditional feelings would not allow its removal. After much consideration a plaque was constructed and attached to the base of the Christus which read, "I have no hands but yours."

May the Lord bless you as your hands are instrumental in reaching out, in touching and lifting—pointing the

right direction to his sons and daughters. May you be blessed to work beyond your natural means, being receptive of knowledge but commissioned at our educational institutions, and be touched by the Spirit and be lifted to help others needing your support, support that can be extended through your outstretched hands.

I bear you my witness that Jesus is the Christ. This is his church. The gospel principles to which all the scriptures contribute are not something conceived in the minds of men. They are principles that are eternal, and as we attach ourselves to those principles and put on our own spiritual oxygen masks—then we can reach out with our hands and touch and inspire and love others who may need enrichment in this pursuit. This is a most wonderful contribution you can and are making. I say these things humbly, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

AMCAP MEN AND WOMEN: TOGETHER IN MUTUAL RESPECT AND UNITY

DELLA MAE RASMUSSEN, Ph.D.
Presented at the AMCAP Convention
4 October 1984

And ye will not have a mind to injure one another, but to live peaceably, and to render to every man [and woman] according to that which is his [or her] due." These words from Mosiah 4:13 expressed my major goal as president-elect and president of AMCAP.

I desired that there be a great sense of caring, respect, and unity among our members. I have felt very close to some of my colleagues through activities in AMCAP over the years, and I wanted that same bond to exist for every member of our organization.

For this reason an experience I had just before the AMCAP meeting in the fall of 1983 was distressing to me. I was delivering the tentative program materials for the meeting to the newsletter editor when I chanced to meet a professional woman, admired by myself and well-respected in her field. In our chat I mentioned how excited I was about the AMCAP convention. "Will I see you there?" I asked. She stopped me short with her reply, "I won't be there. I'm not a member anymore. I can't put up with their chauvinism!"

I was shocked and also saddened, for she is a professional woman of great accomplishment, and I knew that AMCAP had benefited from her membership in the past. That experience prompted me to ask for feedback in the newsletter from members of AMCAP regarding their perception of male-female attitudes. I received a few letters, which I appreciated, but one hit with

special impact. The letter was written by a man, and I quote, "Perhaps the most embarrassing and disappointing experience that I observed of blatant sexism (in my estimation) occurred during the AMCAP meeting a few years ago when several women presented a program on women's concerns. Some AMCAP male members went to the registration desk afterwards and demanded a refund of their dues because of the nature of the presentation." The writer had personally found the presentation excellent and thought-provoking, and considered the action of these men demeaning to the women. He also felt that AMCAP had not since been willing to explore topics related to women that should be important to LDS counselors and psychotherapists.

This particular writer also mentioned the video presentation at AMCAP of the KSL special on Mormon women and depression. He believed that the discussion that followed had included statements demeaning to the women involved with producing the film. He believed these actions to be a manifestation of the male ego at stake, for there was no doctrinal basis or priesthood authority for the negative expressions following the program.

Is it true that these events have restricted AMCAP's ability to deal with sensitive issues in future meetings? Are we not members of a professional organization in and through which we should be free to discuss professional issues? Do some "powerful males" control the tenor of the organization? I would hope not.

I, myself, felt some negative emotions when the video on Mormon women and depression was presented. I had the feeling, accurate or not, that it claimed Mormon women were more depressed than other women. I took

issue with that notion since my own experience had been quite the opposite. However, the women in both cases, and in all cases, had every right to say what they thought and how they felt. Perhaps in attempting to present their strong feelings an attack was perceived. Some of the listeners, both male and female, heard their pain as stridency, and reacted defensively.

It is generally true that we become intolerant when we feel vulnerable or sense a threat to our personal or professional identities, but might we not all sincerely try for greater acceptance and understanding of one another? Allen Bergin, AMCAP president in 1981, wrote an editorial pleading for tolerance. He had heard negative, emotional remarks following a certain program presentation. Dr. Bergin said, "I don't object to people aggressively asserting their views. I think it is healthy. But I do object to the use of prejudicial and absolutistic judgments in evaluating each other's viewpoints. I don't expect differences to go away; but I do expect that a mature tolerance will foster more progress than intolerance." I agree completely.

In this matter of acceptance and tolerance, there is another area of some concern to me. I have personal knowledge of several formerly active LDS women who completed their master's or doctoral degrees, and then fell away from the Church. Some of them have become involved with friendly Friday afternoon get-togethers where there is wine and lots of good talk. They enjoy the intellectual stimulation in such collegiality. Surely, our Mormon professionals are also able to engage in stimulating talk. Why do these women leave the church? Could part of it be a lack of acceptance between professional Mormon men and women, and that such an atmosphere of collegiality does not exist in sufficient degree? When these women reject their faith, it is my belief that the Church and the women lose a great deal.

We live in an age of confusion for both males and females. Dr. James C.

Neely in his book *Gender, The Myth of Equality* (1981) sees "the terrible, the unnatural differences that have come between the sexes in recent years. These differences have been tearing our families, our very social fabric, apart." Divisive forces are obviously at work. Just before the recent national elections, I saw a headline and an accompanying article stating that one of the candidates of a major political party had a chance to win if he exploited the gender gap. That is, if he could draw the battle lines between men and women, he could win. To divide and conquer is the way to win. For me, a gender gap victory in any area is a way to lose. It is clear that the gender gap issues are very much with us. An army of writers continue to tell of the disadvantages of being a woman. Statistics are readily available:

1. Fewer women are getting married. In 1970, of women age 25–29, 10.5 percent had never married. In 1981, that figure was almost 25 percent.

2. Since 1960, the birth rate has been cut almost in half, while divorces have more than doubled.

3. About one-third of all children will spend some of their growing up years in a single-parent household and more than half will have working mothers.

4. Only about 15–20 percent of families fit into the category of nuclear family with working father and full-time housewife mother.

5. Men are playing a greater role in the home and in parenting, yet surveys show that working women still shoulder the prime responsibility for house-keeping and child care. Women in the workplace are running into more stress in their dual role of juggling job and family.

6. The most galling issue is the economic disparity between sexes. Few major firms have women as chief executives. Surveys show that women with a doctoral degree earn about \$8,600 a year less than a man with a doctorate. Overall, women earn about 62 percent of what men make—a ratio that has been constant for 30 years—

only 3 percent higher than when the first statistics were collected in 1939.

7. One of every seven families is headed by a woman, and roughly 40 percent of these families are below the poverty line (*U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1984). Jeanne H. Block in *Sex Role Identity and Ego Development* (1984), claims that the ways children—especially girls—are treated by parents, teachers, and others may limit the development of a strong sense of self. For example, although assertive behavior may be essential to one's development, society tends to approve such conduct in boys, but censures it in girls. She also maintains that the socialization pattern, reinforced again by the educational system, provides much more encouragement for boys than for girls.

Franks and Burtle (1974) write, "Recently it has been argued that women, by virtue of sex role definitions, face a daily routine that is more repetitious, frustrating, emotionally exhausting, and narrow in scope than their masculine counterparts." The generalization: women are depressed. The social roles allotted to women in their subservient posture as secretaries, nurses, and assistants, and especially those duties that attend housewifery and motherhood in the current American social scheme are inherently depressing, according to Frank and Burtle.

Phyllis Chesler (1976), feminist clinical psychologist, writes that women are always mourning for what they never had—namely, a positive conception of their own possibilities. She asks you to picture the educated young woman still nourishing plans of graduate school and career, but faced in reality with the "low status tasks" of housekeeping and child-raising and submissive attention to her husband's needs. Her mourning, that is, her depression, is merely an intensification of traits which normal socialization processes induce in women: passivity, dependence, self-depreciation, self-sacrifice, naivete, fearfulness, failure. It is a woman's style of responding to stress."

Sociologist Jessie Bernard has argued that depression, among other problems of women, can be attributed to the "bad deal" they get in marriage and that more married than unmarried women tend to be bothered by feelings of depression, unhappy most of the time . . . sometimes feeling they are about to go to pieces. Marriage makes women increasingly helpless, submissive and conservative, demands more adjustment on the part of wives than of husbands, and "neuters" women sexually. Rarely, she says, has a woman had the opportunity to direct her own life, to realize her personal conception of happiness and fulfillment.

Other writers state that it is undeniably true that women have been offered throughout history only the narrowest range of alternatives in choosing their lifestyles. Many feminists maintain that a woman's biggest problem is overcoming dependency. Stereotypically, women are viewed as emotional, submissive, excitable, passive, house-oriented, not at all adventurous, and showing a strong need for security and dependency.

But there is some encouraging news, for there is evidence that women are generally happier and healthier than their counterparts of 20 years ago. According to a study at Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, the incidence of depression in women ages 35 to 55 has declined. But as women have become less depressed, men have become more so, according to the same studies. Among the most content, according to research on women lawyers, are married mothers holding down challenging professional jobs.

I smiled a little as I read a recent newspaper article citing an unnamed Nevada prison psychologist who asserts that "'sexism' in the courts protects most women from prison unless they are diagnosed as psychopaths. Many female career criminals stay out of prison by playing on the sympathies of the courts, blaming their situation on abusive men or the children they have at home. A man accused of the same

offense would go to prison. Apparently, women generally have better verbal ability and can use this with the sexism to stay out of prison!

Now, more specifically what is being said about Mormon women? I have either read or heard the following statements in recent months:

"The Mormon woman . . ."

1. . . is taught to be subservient to her husband, her father, or her brothers.

2. . . is confused because she is supposed to fit into the stereotype of the Miss Patty Perfect, yet these characteristics she is supposed to acquire are less valued by the culture in which she lives than are those of the opposite sex.

3. . . is taught that she is less important than the male.

4. . . has been brought up to be respectful of and obedient to the priesthood, but too often has internalized that to mean being subservient to all men.

5. . . has been acted upon, told what to do, and when and how to do it most of her life.

6. . . is conditioned to be silent: "Don't complain, you are the key to your family's happiness." Standing up for their rights or voicing their ideas or opinions is not acceptable.

7. . . believes she is not really a human being until she becomes a wife and mother; without a man and/or children, she is incomplete.

8. . . is taught that she is worthy only as an adjunct to someone else.

9. . . is taught all her life that if a relationship isn't working, it is her fault.

Ponder for a moment. Do these statements strike you as accurate for most Mormon women in your acquaintance? If they are true for some, are they true for *all*?

It is the generalizing, the stereotyping, that offends me—not only because, like all generalizations, they are not universally true, but because they have not been true in my own experience. *Some* Mormon women may fit some of the above generalizations, but I do not believe it is even close to the

majority, let alone "all." I have asked myself this question many times as I have listened to statements such as those cited: "Where are all these docile, unhappy, subservient, brow-beaten women?"

The women in my life have been very different. For example, at a recent family reunion, they told of my grandmother as representing a large family of sisters. This grandmother pioneered, with my grandfather, a small town in Nevada. At the reunion they said of her, "She was the town midwife, delivering hundreds of babies. She, with her eight-year-old son, the eldest child of six, ran a farm and a dairy while her husband was serving a mission for three years in England. She also pulled teeth for the townspeople, as needed. She was the president of the Church auxiliaries and town council, and she started the state 4-H program. It was said of her that she could have organized the Saints and led them from Nauvoo to the Great Salt Lake Valley as effectively as Brigham Young himself." Subservient? Silent? Denied her rights? I'd like to see anyone try.

And she was not at all unique. Mormon pioneer women were the first real feminists. They cast the first official female vote in 1870, formed the first international women's organization and the first public health service program, and elected the first female state senator in the nation as well as the first town mayor. We could list hundreds of examples of Mormon women whose spunk, courage, fortitude, and self-reliance played a crucial role in our history. A friend who lectures frequently about our Mormon women assures us that they did more than quilt. They built homes, dug irrigation ditches, sheared sheep, grew and harvested wheat and other crops, and established Utah's first silk industry, department store, and a school for the deaf and blind.

My question is: Did their daughters, granddaughters, and great-granddaughters turn into wimps somewhere along the line? I cannot buy it; espe-

cially since that description does not fit the women I observe day after day in my neighborhood, at school, at Church, at work, and at social gatherings. My women colleagues at BYU seem assured, successful, and happy. Most of them aren't mad at men, as far as I can tell. I observe the women in my ordinary, middle-class neighborhood, and each woman distinguishes herself in some way. They are in mostly intact families. Their husbands do not subjugate them. To be honest, statements made about "Mormon women" have been puzzling to me.

I have thought of myself as a fairly typical Mormon woman. I can never remember being silent, subservient, or fearful. My father thought I could do anything and often said so. My uncles, brother, and teachers from first grade through graduate school were all supportive. My husband has encouraged me constantly. I do not see myself so differently from other Mormon women. I am, if you will, on the soapbox for the Mormon woman who does not fit the silent, subservient, depressed stereotype. But to be fair, perhaps my experience is the aberration. Could I be deluded? In an attempt to gather some data to determine if my perceptions were indeed peculiar, I prepared a questionnaire which was designed to tap some of the attitudes and experiences of a number of Mormon women. The questionnaire was anonymous, so the women had no reason not to tell the truth. One group was composed of 44 single adult women, ranging in age from 22 to 48. Virtually all held jobs. Another group comprised 38 adult females, mostly married, a few single, from ages 21 to 76. Some of the married women also held jobs.

I was seriously trying to ignore my own biases and learn more about Mormon women. These are some of the results:

In your opinion do men generally treat women as equals? Sixty-eight percent of the singles said "usually" or "sometimes," while marrieds said "usually" 67 percent of the time.

Do men have it easier than women? Sixty-four percent of the singles said "occasionally," while 55 percent of the marrieds agreed.

Do you wish you had been born a man? Sixty-six percent of singles and 87 percent of marrieds answered, "Never."

Do you feel encouraged by Church leaders to develop fully your skills and abilities? Eighty percent of singles and 89 percent of marrieds answered "usually" or "always."

Have you felt the need to hide your intellect and talents to be accepted by a man or men? Eighty-five percent of singles answered "never" or "occasionally," while 87 percent of marrieds answered "never" or "occasionally."

Were you taught by your father to like and respect yourself? The singles answered "never" 18 percent, "occasionally" 27 percent, "usually" 25 percent, and "always" 20 percent. Seventy-nine percent of the marrieds answered "always."

Do you feel pressure to fit someone else's idea of the "ideal woman"? Fifty-five percent of the singles answered "occasionally," while 53 percent of the marrieds answered the same way.

Other questions indicated that for the most part this group had not been mistreated by men, had not been criticized for their goals and aspirations by men or women, and that both their mother and father had positive attitudes about the talents and capabilities of women.

In addition to my questionnaire, I have also taken opportunities to have numerous conversations over the past few months with women, both in and out of AMCAP, both in and out of our profession, both single and married. One friend, a single woman, well-liked by both her female and male colleagues, said: "We need to help men respond to us in more effective ways. Women should express feelings and ideas openly. As a single woman, I believe men are confused as to how to respond to me, and perhaps to most other women these days. Many single women know that friendship with male co-workers is

sometimes misinterpreted. For many years in my work I was extremely lonely because the men didn't understand the acceptability of just dropping into my office to talk."

Another said, "I think it is very difficult for men to know what to do with regard to women. They sometimes feel threatened and misunderstood. I believe these are far more wrenching times for men than for women."

I recently read a plaintive letter to the editor in a newspaper from a newly divorced man: "I am so lonely. When women are in my position they can read a dozen self-help books, designed just for them. Their friends and family gather around to help them through it. I have no one. I don't feel strong at all."

I talked to a married woman who is a very capable graduate student with a large family. Her experience in life was similar to mine. She had never felt resentment for her intelligence and achievements, only encouragement and support from her husband and family members. Yet, this woman's daughter, in her twenties with a master's degree, does not feel she always received the recognition and support she should have from the men in her career situation. This young woman is evidence that there is certainly cause for concern and some Mormon women indeed have had experiences very different from my own. They have some valid information to report and, again, they have every right to say how they feel and what they need. But *they are not the spokeswomen for all of us.*

In the recent issue of *BYU Today*, Sue Bergin writes of "The Expanding Role of Women in Education" (October 1984). She interviewed some 25 BYU faculty, staff, administrators, and students and turned up an almost unanimous feeling that substantial progress has been made at BYU in giving women every opportunity to excel in any field and in viewing women on campus as serious students and professionals. Mary Ann Q. Wood, BYU professor of law, said, "I've never had a negative experience in terms of being a woman.

It just isn't an issue." I take this as evidence of my own view. Marilyn Arnold said, "Everybody knows that women should have equal opportunity and also equal responsibility." The writer quotes another bright young professional woman on campus who noted that 15 years ago, when she was an 18-year-old freshman, there was incredibly intense pressure to find a mate, but said she had seen a dramatic difference in the past few years. The policies of the top administration are not the remaining problem, but rather the more subtle discrimination felt from some teachers and male students. Many of the women interviewed and quoted are confident, accomplished persons who have secured a place of esteem at the university.

Now, I can fit all this nicely in my own biases and life experiences, but one woman I interviewed added an interesting dimension. I have asked her to come today. Her name is Pamela Bell, a mother, wife, and graduate student at BYU. She speaks from a different point of view than I do, but nevertheless she has something to say of importance in, perhaps, understanding the stereotype of the "subservient, frustrated Mormon woman."

Pam Bell

As a young girl I was raised to believe that the talents needed to be a career woman and self-sufficient were to be prized. When I joined the Church, I saw it as a choice to forego that lifestyle because I heard the Church saying that a woman's place is in the home while the husband's duties were to provide and protect. I did not realize that being a wife and a mother would require totally different skills and talents for which I had neither training nor inclination.

Although I was bewildered when my bishop and stake president got the giggles when I told them my major, which at the time was math and engineering, I was amazed when my fiancé, who was then on a mission in cold, wintry Wisconsin, wrote me, "Why don't you knit me a scarf?" and meant

it. What made him think I knew anything about knitting?

After we married, I went through a whole loaf of bread trying to get two unburnt slices of toast for our first breakfast.

For ten years, I drove myself crazy trying to fit into the new mold. Finally, I realized I'd been trying to put a size 7 foot in a size 5 shoe. I just didn't fit. At first, I felt it was because I just wasn't celestial material. Then, I began to understand why I wasn't "her," that fictitious ideal I'd composed for myself, why I could never be her. My experiences, my personality, my talents—all that I was—combined to make me different, unique—not just different from that ideal, but different from every other living creature. I discovered something wonderful; I was me, and that wasn't so bad. Ever since, I've had a pretty good time being me. I've had a lot of success at it too. For me, there seems to be three important issues:

1. Equality vs. individuality
2. Competition and conformity in women
3. The Cinderella syndrome.

Egalitarians say we should all be able to be equal in our expectations of life and our ability to experience it. Can we believe this ideology of complete equality, or is it, after all, a fantasy? I say it is a fantasy. No two people are equal, not in genetic composition, body development, life experiences, reasoning, socialization, talents, or interpersonal skills. Even if we do share some things in common, perceptual differences would surely separate us, for none of us are born into the same circumstances nor do we see things exactly the same.

And yet, there are those who continually encourage us to deny our own uniqueness in favor of striving for some false conformity towards "normality." This kind of external pressure often puts women in competition with other women, which is the second problem.

Who dictates the rules of the competition? It is the proverbial "they." "They" who tell us what we ought to be, how we should live, what we must do

and what we have to be like to be called "normal"—and all with "No questions, please." No one wants to explain why, because chances are "they" don't know. "That's just the way we do things around here."

The best example of "they's" are advertisers, fashion merchandisers, politicians, movie producers and their stars, educators, and other spokesmen in our authority-ridden culture.

Thirty people work with lighting, and make-up, making sure everyone stands in the right place, wears the right color, and gives just the right effect. Yet we look at television and say, "That's what I need to look like and be like." Well, they don't even look like "that."

We do this to ourselves with real people too. By looking at people we admire and judging ourselves against them at their public best, without knowing what's going on inside them or in their lives, we build a false normality by which to judge ourselves.

Too many women feel this competition toward an ideal in the way they present themselves to others—not only in the way they perform, but how they look.

One summer I watched commercials, studying them to try to get an idea of what they were saying to women about themselves. One soft-drink commercial said it all. As a voice-over said, "It looks . . ." (the camera focused on a girl in a bikini, from neck to knee and you heard whistles), "and it tastes" (then you saw a man from the neck up drinking the product) " . . . great!" The message: What women look like is important. What men do is important.

In my opinion, because of this competition between women to perform and to look good, too, women find their friendship circles dwindling, their support systems weakening, and their social and business networks less functional than those of their male counterparts.

Many women experience stress and disillusionment because life hasn't met their expectations.

This is the Cinderella syndrome—

a woman's beliefs that some Prince Charming will take care of her and her children so she'll never have to worry. He'll provide economic security, spiritual strength, priesthood direction in the home, and she'll do her part (as Patty Perfect) by being supportive, happy, and creative. When these expectations are not met, Cinderella experiences "stress," and the feeling that she has very little immediate control over what's happening in her life. Some LDS women react to this "stress" by inactivity or passivity in the Church. The women's list for a Mormon man has three items: priesthood, provider, and protector. "All he has to do is live up to these three things and my dreams will come true," she thinks. But her list for Mormon women is enormous, and every time he doesn't do something on his list, her list gets longer. Then when she goes to Relief Society and hears that everything depends on her, she sees her list getting longer again. She's thinking, "I'm surviving on the border of insanity now. I can't do one more thing. Don't ask me." One way of handling it is to stop going to Relief Society.

When women find themselves in stressful situations, their perceptions change. They become more sensitive to issues that strike close to their wounds. They often feel as if other women are not dealing with reality if they don't acknowledge the same stresses. Even worse, they sometimes believe themselves to be the only Mormon woman who does not have a perfect life.

We have a tendency to write out roles (mentally) like job descriptions. We carry a whole list of expectations with each new role—all I must be if I'm a doctor, a bishop's wife, a woman in Church, etc.

In Utah County with the reduction in the work force at Geneva Steel, many men in my ward who had provided well for their families found themselves out of a job with no hope of finding another for a long period of time. Most businesses would not hire them because everyone felt that Geneva would call them back to work and then these men

would, of course, return. With their men out of work, women were forced to go on assistance programs or get jobs themselves—which most of them eventually did. Now the men found themselves at home where they felt of little worth. Because it was not their "role" to help with parenting or homemaking, they left everything from the wife's former role still up to her. The woman came home from a work situation she hadn't bargained for to a husband who had left everything for her to do and children who did the same. Needless to say, women felt great anger and resentment because they saw themselves as victims with no choice, having made no decisions about a commitment to this new life. The depressed husband and the overburdened wife both developed a high level of guilt which left them vulnerable to the reactions of others around them. One Relief Society president in our stake, where we had a high percentage of Geneva layoffs, said stake leaders were trying to figure out how to help these women because they were all cracking up, and no one could understand why.

How did this happen? I think the inflexibility is part of the issue. Last year, I noticed this for the first time, probably because I myself was in a situation where I had to be out of the home. For Mother's Day, our ward had the most elaborate program you've ever seen. They had the chapel decorated with flowers and gave the usual plants and presents. But along with that they sang songs and had a child of every age carry a beautifully wrapped package to the pulpit to tell what gift their mother had given to them, right up to a man 30-some years old, whose mother was in the audience visiting. It was a real tear-jerker. You should have heard all the mothers were given credit for. In contrast, on Father's Day, the last speaker before the prayer reminded the congregation after sacrament meeting that it was Father's Day and to say something nice to their dad. I could have cried. Then we wonder why we cannot get men in the Church to feel that anything

they do in the home, including parenting their own children, is of worth.

The General Authorities tell us we are partners; they enumerate the important duties of life as being the same for both partners. However, my experience has been that the culture dictates and rewards another pattern. We often forget that the gospel is for the individual.

Della Mae Rasmussen

There you have it! On the one hand, we hear that Mormon women (with no qualifier, such as some Mormon women) are subservient, quiet, obedient, depressed. On the other, some of us are heard to say, "Things look fine to me. No man ever made me feel down-trodden. What's the problem?" The truth for the majority, no doubt, lies somewhere in between. Generalizations are made by both sides. This is destructive, in my opinion, to all relationships: male to female, female to female, and male to male.

I asked Pam where she got the idea, after she joined the Church, that she had to become a totally different person. She said she didn't really know. I guess "they" said so! The experiences of Pam Bell have apparently shown her more frustrated, depressed, over-worked women than has my own. Certainly, there are all types in the lives of all of us. True, there are striving, over-structured perfectionists among us, trying to do everything right. One young woman client said to me recently, "I am so glad I have come to the point where I don't have to be wonderful every minute of every day. Tell them at AMCAP that the Pursuit of Excellence program for the Young Women was the worst thing that ever came into my life." For her, that was the last straw, because she forgot the "pursuit" part! She was indeed trying to be everything for everybody. But all these overwrought perfectionists are not Mormon women. They are to be found everywhere. But let's not generalize about the sorry lot of Mormon women. Believe it or not, many of them feel wonderful, they like themselves,

and are free to make choices and be responsible for them! Let us see individuals, not stereotypes.

One more issue of some importance might be the question alluded to by Pam Bell of whether women support women. A close friend of mine in the Utah State Legislature states in no uncertain terms that men support women far better than women do. Men listen, she says. "They respect women's ideas, they are willing to work together to solve problems and do committee work." She has not found other women nearly so easy to work with.

How can we build bridges between men and women? One way that appeals to me is that women do not take on the role of put-down, subservient female. Sonya Friedman's *Men Are Just Desserts* (1983) argues that the best a woman can ask for herself is the ability to take care of herself. She maintains that "all [note the overused generalization again] women, at one time or another, blame men for what's wrong with their lives, and as a result, don't do for themselves. No man can give a woman her life or live it for her. To expect it is to be disappointed. To live our own lives with control and direction means an end to the fantasy of being cared for and the beginning of the reality of taking care of ourselves. Then, can the best possible relationship be built between men and women."

Women outlive men by more than seven years on the average, so any woman would seem foolish if she did not prepare herself to be self-sufficient.

Let us seek more understanding and unity, as well as confidence in one another. Again, I quote from Neely (1981):

This is a period when men and women are more than ever in need of a deeper understanding of each other. Within the past decade or so, the subject of gender identification has become one of enormous controversy. In the pursuit of sexual equality and in the attempt to abolish sexual stereotypes, the very real differences between men and women

have been ignored, suppressed, denied, and disputed. Now, we are compelled to take a serious second look at these distinctions and to accept and understand them for the sake of our cultural values, emotion health, and our sexuality itself.

It is popular to say that one sex was always oppressed or punished or exploited, when the more accurate truth is that people lived life the best they could and dealt with a historical imperative. Cultures endure and survive when there is a rather distinct division of sexual labor. Might we not pause and say to ourselves once more, *Vive la difference*? Each needs the other during life's journey if we are to become whole. We need each other terribly.

Now, more specifically, what can we do as AMCAP members as we seek more understanding, unity, and confidence in one another? Importantly, I think we could elect more women to offices. Only a few women in proportion to men have been elected to office in our AMCAP organization. In every case I know of, if a man and a woman opposed each other on the AMCAP ballot, the man won. Even women do not vote for women. But I want to tell you that my experience with the advisory board has been totally positive. A man on the board even suggested at one point that we change the by-laws of AMCAP so that it was a requirement that women hold a proportionate number of offices. The men have been totally supportive and a pleasure to serve with. Yet, we cannot simply assume that things are going along quite well and "don't rock the boat," because many of our intelligent, competent female colleagues are not now counted among our AMCAP numbers.

What other steps might we take to promote greater unity and mutual respect?

1. Let none of us, male or female, feign weakness. If you dislike being ignored in staff meeting, say so. Do not accept less than excellent treatment. Don't pout. Speak up firmly and kindly.

2. Let all of us examine our male-

female attitudes as professionals. Do you honestly believe that men and women can be equally as effective as professionals? Do you refer clients to one gender as often as the other? Would you prefer one over the other if a family member needed help? Why?

3. Let each of us make a positive attempt to fulfill friendship-comradeship needs for one another in personal, Church, family, and professional life.

4. Let us lower our voices and reason together, not judge each other.

5. Let's encourage each other to actively participate in discussions, presentations, research, particularly in AMCAP, for we have so much to learn from both men and women.

6. Let us extend an invitation to those we know to join or rejoin us in AMCAP.

7. And above all, let us cease to generalize about "Mormon women" or anyone else.

The actor, Peter Ustinov, says it well:

The relationships between the sexes are so inextricably fouled up by wits, cynics, wiseacres, philosophers, psychologists, psychiatrists, and finally, Women's Lib, that it takes the best part of a lifetime to find out that the general has no bearing whatever on the particular. Those who maintain the link exists between generalities and the individual are like explorers who lose heart in the face of a natural barrier and never penetrate into the hinterland where people are people, and not merely slaves to a physical apparatus which has slanted minds into channels dictated by convention. (Quoted in Neely, 1981, p. 22.)

As often as not we can throw out all the data and start from scratch to deal with one person, whether male or female. St. Paul wrote in Corinthians 7:5 and Ephesians 4:25, "Do not deny yourselves to one another . . . Then throw off falsehood; speak the truth to each other, for all of us are parts of one body."

I feel so strongly that we have wondrous opportunities in our lives and our profession, on an individual

basis, to ask our fellow beings, male or female, how they feel and *really mean it*.

Della Mae Rasmussen is a member of the counseling faculty of Counseling and Personal Services, Brigham Young University and immediate past president of AMCAP.

References

- Bergin, Sue. "The Expanding Role of Women in Education," *BYU Today*, October 1984.
- Bernard, Jessie. *Future of Marriage*, Yale University Press, 1982.
- Block, Jeanne H. *Sex Role Identity and Ego Development*, Jossey-Bass, 1984.
- Chesler, Phyllis. *Women, Money and Power*, Morrow, 1976.
- Franks, Violet, and Burtle, Vassanti. *Women in Therapy: New Psycho-therapies for a Changing Society*, Brunner/Mazel, 1974.
- Kessler-Harris, Alice. *Out to Work: A History of Wage-earning Women in the U.S.*, Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Neely, James C. *Gender: The Myth of Equality*, Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 1981.
- U. S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1984

WOMEN AND THE HELPING PROFESSIONS: A JUDICIAL VIEW

**THE HONORABLE
JUDGE CHRISTINE M. DURHAM**
Presented at the AMCAP Convention
4 October 1984

May I ask your indulgence if I impose on you some of the issues that arise in the context of my profession. I do so in part because, like most professionals who step out of their own professional neighborhood into someone else's, it is easy for me to be intimidated by the theory and doctrine of another discipline. In order to avoid that, I will attempt to intimidate by using some of my own theory and jargon.

One of the themes of my remarks this morning is that of risk, and the introduction given by Dr. MacMurray is extremely relevant to that theme. The risks I am talking about are those undertaken by women who must encounter, at various junctions of their lives, the helping professions in one capacity or another. These women do so often at extraordinarily high risk to themselves: personal risk, physical risk, and for many and sometimes in extreme ways, financial risk. By helping professions, I mean the members of those professions whose work involves personal problem solving, decision making, or active intervention of some kind involving the core of another human being's life. These helping professions make decisions in ways that effect some change for good or ill in the lives of persons seeking assistance. This somewhat limited definition includes the medical profession, those who are involved in the treatment of physical, emotional, or mental ailments; the legal profession, including my own subset, the judiciary; and finally, education,

since the essence of teaching is an attempt to bring change into the lives of human beings.

Of course, anyone seeking help from members of one of these helping professions is taking a risk, but I suggest that women, who in many instances have been socialized to dependence, to defer to authority, and to avoid personal responsibility, are taking extra risks. You all know the Cinderella fairy tale. I recently read an essay written a few years ago by a single Latter-day Saint woman in her thirties who talked about her own Cinderella fantasy. Growing up, she had believed that she was a princess in disguise and that all it would take was a prince, a party, and a dress converging at the right moment to remove her disguise and permit her to live happily ever after. She pointed out that not only had she not encountered any princes, but as of now she had not even met any frogs—although a few rats had come into her life. The Cinderella fantasy, however, does not end with the notion of Prince Charming, the party, and the dress converging at the right time. The fairy tale ends, as you will recall, with the phrase "and they lived happily ever after."

Many women are socialized to believe that, if they can find a prince, they will indeed live happily ever after. Many promises, spoken and unspoken, are assumed within that fairy tale. Thus, women who come to the helping professions for assistance in problem solving are, in many instances, also being forced to deal with the denial of everything they had been raised to believe—namely, that they will never need that kind of help. They are already in the process of dealing with their lost myths, with their lost assumptions, with broken promises, and with the resulting bitterness. When they ask us for help, they

run the risk of being disappointed, thrown back on what they perceive as their own helplessness. They run the risk of being mistreated; abuse that could be prevented if they were dealt with as adults.

I am particularly sensitive to the risks women take in seeking legal and medical services. If you have any trouble identifying with this kind of vulnerability, just think about the last time you had to take your car in to get that funny noise fixed. We are all dependent on the expertise of others when we venture outside of our own areas of competence; we all experience a certain sense of helplessness. But it is much magnified when the field of expertise, such as medicine or law, has its own language, vocabulary, history—even unique tools and instruments which appear entirely foreign and very intimidating to people coming in from the outside. Women seeking help also run the risk of being exploited by unethical practitioners in our disciplines. We have an obligation and responsibility to police our disciplines to minimize that risk.

Finally, women asking assistance run the risk of being damaged in some very fundamental ways. They risk their self-esteem when they trust a system which sometimes acknowledges their group identity as women rather than their individuality. I am talking about the kinds of subtle sexism—the attitudes and practices—which categorize people and their attitudes, responses, abilities, options, and behavior on the basis of their gender, rather than on the basis of accurate and independent data.

In a recent major survey by Dr. Alice I. Baumgartner, two thousand children in Colorado were interviewed respecting their attitudes about the opposite sex. They were asked questions such as, "If you woke up tomorrow and discovered that you were a boy or a girl, how would your life be different?" In summarizing the results of that survey, researchers used the word "contempt" to describe how children, in grades three through twelve, from both metropolitan and small rural communities,

felt about being female. Now these are not Mormon children, these are not Utah children. They are American children from another state. Listen to some of the things they said:

"It wouldn't be fun," said a fourth-grade boy, "if I woke up and I was a girl. I'd hope it was a bad dream and I'd go back to sleep."

A sixth-grade boy wrote, "If I were a girl, everybody would be better than me because boys are better than girls."

The girls agreed. "If I were a boy I could do more stuff better than I do it now," said one third-grader.

"People would take my decisions and my beliefs more seriously," said an eleventh-grade girl.

"If I were a boy my whole life would be easier," claimed a sixth-grader.

"I would be treated better, I would get paid more, and be able to do more things," said a fourth-grade girl.

Now you know if we had the boys saying similar things about being girls and the girls saying similar things about being boys, maybe we could draw the inference that the grass is simply greener on the other side. But to these two thousand school children in Colorado, the grass grows greener very consistently on the boys' side of the fence.

The boys, asked to think about being girls, talked about how long it would take them to get ready for school, how important and how hard it would be to be as gorgeous as they needed to be, how much they would hate being jeered at if they were not gorgeous or not gorgeous enough. In fact, they felt that jeering would occur whether or not they were gorgeous, and they worried about that. The girls commented that as boys they would not have to be "neat." They would not have to worry about how they looked or take so much time getting ready for school. Now, as a parent of an 11-year-old boy, I take that with a grain of salt—his every hair has to be in place before he leaves the house, but there is a clear message in the responses of the Colorado children. In this study, not one girl expressed a

hostile reaction to activities which she perceived as male. However, most of the boys did have critical or hostile reactions to "women's work" or any female activities, whether they involved school, play, home chores, marriage, or eventual choice of occupation. Their general view was summed up in the words of one boy who said, "Girls can't do anything that's fun," and the depressing words of the girl who said that her expectation as a female was "to be nothing."

Girls said if they were boys, they would be professional athletes, the president, architects, scientists, mechanics. Most of the boys said if they were girls they would be married and would not work. Forced to imagine what they would do if they were married and working outside the home, they listed secretary and nurse most often. They also named cocktail waitress, social worker, airline stewardess, interior decorator, model, beauty queen, and even prostitute as possibilities. Both sexes, interestingly enough, named truck driver, computer programmer, doctor, and lawyer, an indication that at least some of these professions are coming to be perceived as open to both men and women although they are traditionally male dominated.

Asked about how their behavior would differ, if their gender changed, the children's responses were clear. The boys said they would have to be nicer and there was a long list of things that they couldn't do. They could not climb trees, throw spit balls, have pocket knives, play football or basketball, or have live snakes. The girls seemed to know that boys are expected to conceal their feelings and saw that as one of the few disadvantages. "If I were a boy, I would have to stay calm and cool whenever something happened." But the girls also had a long list of things being a boy would allow them to do that they felt they could not do now.

These two thousand children from Colorado also had different perceptions about how the world around them would treat them if they were to change

their sex. "I might be shown that someone cares how I do in school," said one girl. "My father would like me better," said another.

The belief among boys was that, if they were girls, they would have to fear for their safety. "I would have to know how to handle all the drunk guys and the rapists," said an eighth-grade boy. "I would have to be around other girls all the time for safety." "The teacher would favor me," said one boy. While the boys complained of being unfairly singled out for discipline in school, the girls complained of being ignored. The girls' attitudes are supported by a great deal of other research, most of which you are probably familiar with. For girls the price of conformity is anonymity. The boys get reprimanded, but they also get more praise and attention.

Now, that study was done during the past two years. We are not talking about 10 years ago or 20 years ago. We are talking about a generation of children who will begin their lives as adults in the next decade. So we are talking about pervasive, subtle perceptions which—despite all our efforts to combat legal discrimination and overt sexism in the schools and elsewhere—continue to influence our children and our family life.

I think there are historical reasons that make the helping professions and their members particularly vulnerable to the kind of subtle sexism that is still a problem in our society. These professions are ancient in their traditions, lore, language, and some methods. In addition, until very recently, they have always been predominantly male. Times are changing. We see the changes even in the perceptions of these children regarding some of the professions. But change is slow and little boys who think about little girls in the way the boys in Baumgartner's study do, too often grow up to become professional men who think the same way about the limitations and the obligations of being female. Likewise, the little girls who think the way the girls in that study think grow up to become women with attitudes still

influenced by their childhood perceptions.

Let me discuss briefly some examples close to home. The other day, I had a casual encounter with a young woman who taught several of my children in nursery school and of whom I was always very fond. I asked her how things were going, and she almost burst into tears right there on the sidewalk. She explained to me that things were not going well at all for her. Her husband of 12 years had recently fallen in love with another woman and deserted her, and she was in the process of a divorce. What she wanted to talk about was the immense discomfort, fear, and apprehension that she experienced as she anticipated her court appearances during the divorce proceedings. I tried to reassure her, but I found that my ability to do so was somewhat limited. Although my own related experience has been from a position of control and power of the court system, some of her apprehension and concern was justified. I will disclose to you candidly that sexism, both subtle and overt, is still extremely common in the courts of this country. It takes many forms. It may be in the language of judges and supervisors in court who refer to women—whether they be witnesses or potential jurors or, even on occasion, lawyers—as “girls.” That may not seem like a big thing, but when a man refers to a grown woman as a girl, what has happened? There has been a diminution in her stature, and a relationship of superiority/inferiority has been established. There are other subtle things relating to language—for instance, judges and courtroom personnel who address women by first names and men by surname. Again, instead of a relationship of parity and equality, a relationship of male power and authority versus female helplessness is established.

Sexist or sexually-oriented jokes and put-downs unfortunately are not unknown in the courtrooms of this country. I can remember one of the first trials which I undertook in the state of Utah—which I won. After the trial, the

judge came over to the bar and said, “Mrs. Durham, you did the best job I’ve ever seen a woman lawyer do in my courtroom.” I ask you, was that a compliment or a put-down? Comments on personal appearance and attractiveness are also a very subtle thing, and there are occasions when the niceties of human interaction call for appropriate comments. But if the one woman in a group—whatever it may be—is singled out for being the prettiest one there or for upgrading the general appearance of the group, she is being identified in her sexual identity and not in her professional or business identity. She is not being identified in the context of the purpose for which she has come to that gathering.

There are other ways in which sexism is still a problem in the courts in this country. Dr. MacMurray referred to the problem of spouse abuse and domestic violence. Just as the efforts to identify those incidents are very recent, the responsiveness of the legal system to such violence in this country is also extraordinarily recent. Utah has attempted to deal with the domestic violence problem in a statutory context only within the last five years. Interestingly enough, when that statute was initially passed, among other members of my profession, I consistently met with jokes which attributed the responsibility for the abuse to the victim.

There is also a tremendous resistance to becoming involved. I know judges who frankly refused to listen to spouse-abuse complaints because the first statute gave litigants the specific authority to represent themselves. It is difficult for a lawyer or judge to deal with someone who is representing himself or herself. Lay people do not know the rules of evidence; they do not understand the procedural requirements of a court, and they can disrupt your schedule drastically because of the extra time that they take to go through the system. But I would suggest that one reason why spouse-abuse problems were discounted and ignored by many members of my profession is that they

were — by and large — women's problems.

Sexism in the courts is a problem in still other ways. In sentencing, research shows that females receive lighter sentences than male offenders for similar offenses, and they get more non-custodial or probationary sentences. However, female offenders who are incarcerated generally serve longer periods of time than male offenders for similar offenses. In the area of personal injury, where individuals sue because someone has committed a negligent act that has harmed them in some way, awards given by judges and juries are significantly lower when women are the injured parties. I was a little shocked recently to participate in a conversation with a lawyer who had tried a personal injury case involving the wrongful death of a 16-year-old girl. It was a products liability case involving toxic shock syndrome. In his research on jury awards for the value of a 16-year-old girl, he had discovered that in our region such awards are between one-fourth and one-half the size of the awards given for a 16-year-old boy. That means that the juries, our peers, value 16-year-old girls at somewhere between one-half and one-fourth the worth of 16-year-old boys. Placing economic value on the life of a human being is problematic to begin with, but that the discrepancy is so extensive is shocking.

Finally, between values assigned to male and female lives, there are the matrimonial issues which many of us have to deal with so often. I am sure that a great deal of your work, like a great deal of mine, deals directly with the dissolution of marriage and with the personal and legal problems encountered by people going through that process. As a case in point, let me describe to you briefly what happens economically to women in a divorce. The summary of findings of the governor's task force on integrating women into the work place in the state of Utah found that women comprise more than 41 percent of the work force in our state. That percentage is consistently increas-

ing. Most women, whether they are married or single, work because of economic necessity. Forty-five percent, or nearly half, of all the women who are working in this state are either single or separated. In other words, they are responsible to a very large degree for their own support and sometimes for that of an entire household. Two-income households have nearly doubled in the last 20 years, which means more women who are still married are also working outside the home. Additional women work in support of displaced workers—husbands who are unemployed due to technological advances or economic problems.

The average woman in our state works for 26 years of her life span, over double what that figure was 30 years ago (Governor's Task Force 1984, 2). They are employed primarily in secondary or part-time positions, which provide little pay, few benefits, inadequate family support systems, and limited opportunity for advancement. Institutional structures based on stereotyping deprive women of economic independence and deny the work place their potential. Families headed by females comprise the fastest growing segment of the poverty population in this state as well as throughout the country. In Utah, the number of families with female heads of household has grown by 10 percent during the last decade, and nearly half of those families with children under 18 headed by females live below federal and state guidelines for poverty. Both in Utah and nationwide this is a rapidly accelerating problem.

Recently, a very significant study was done in California which extensively viewed its reversed divorce laws (Weitzman, 1981). The revisions were designed to eliminate the concept of fault, minimize acrimony, eliminate some of the mudslinging, and try to turn court proceedings into more evenly balanced, less emotional places for resolving economic and financial matters rather than providing a forum for people to work out the personal difficulties which led them to divorce in the first

place. Unfortunately, this study did not attempt to assess people's personal satisfaction with the changes in the law. It did discover, however, that women have incurred significant economic disadvantage by the change. For example, the earning capacity of a spouse, usually the husband, is typically worth much more than any of the tangible assets of the marriage. That is the thing both parties had really invested in during the course of a marriage of any length at all. The study discovered that pensions and retirement benefits, extremely significant factors in the marriage, were very often discounted at an extremely high level in divorce proceedings. It discovered that in the state of California only 17 percent—that is, less than one in five—of women who were awarded personal support, spousal support, or alimony ever received one dime.

That means, among other things, that expectations of self-sufficiency for divorced women—especially after a marriage of any length and especially in view of the kind of statistics that we have just talked about in the state of Utah on the kinds of employment available and the kinds of training many women have—are extremely grim. It is true that the no-fault divorce law in California established a new norm of self-sufficiency for younger women who are capable of supporting themselves after divorce. In theory, however, the law is supposed to insure support and protection for those women who have been married for a long time. Women are raised to believe that someone will take care of them financially. Everything we know about divorce and the court system suggests that the promise is not kept in the divorce settlement, even with respect to child support. There is an implicit assumption on the part of courts making these kinds of awards that women are in a position to find a job and become self-sufficient.

There is a peculiar paradox here, and I have heard it described as the high cost of feminism. The paradox is that, as women have struggled over the last decade to equalize their access to the

work place and economic self-sufficiency, they have as a matter of statistical fact failed dismally, for many reasons. One of these is sexism, and another has to do with the economy and lifestyle choices. Notwithstanding that failure, many of our institutions, and particularly our judicial institutions, are assuming that the effort has been successful and are predicated assessments, awards, and allocation of property in matrimonial disputes on that basis. Therein lies the paradox. Women are literally paying a high price, because of unequal access and disparate standards of living, for the legal equality they have fought so hard to obtain. It is interesting, too, to look at the alternatives to spouse-support or self-support. I was a little discouraged to find out that a woman's chance of remarriage after divorce when she is under the age of 30 is about 75 percent, which is not so bad. But, between the ages of 30 and 40, it drops to 50 percent, and after the age of 40, for those women least able to fend for themselves if they have been out of the market place during the duration of a lengthy marriage, it drops by half again, down to about 20 percent. I guess there is a sense in which—notwithstanding what Ronald Reagan says—it does not pay to get old.

I do not mean to barrage you with statistics, especially since I am sure each of you has an anecdote either to illustrate one of my points or refute it, but the statistical considerations are important for two reasons. First, they demonstrate some of the ways in which my profession is failing to help women. Second, they illustrate one of the ways in which your profession is susceptible to failure as well. Too many women in my view are maimed in spirit by their encounters with our respective professions. Sometimes part of the problem is judges, lawyers, counselors, and therapists who are too ready to assign blame and to increase guilt because women do not function well under the stress of family problems, particularly the stress of family dissolution. During my tenure on the trial court, I often

heard evaluations from counselors who seemed far too ready, in my view, to interpret normal reaction to stress as significant character disorders which rendered a woman unfit for custodial responsibilities. Economic deprivation for instance is a very destructive force. Any of us who have encountered it, even second-hand, can attest to that.

In short, what I am saying is that there is a tremendous danger that women will be made to feel that they are crazy or that they are not functioning adequately in the context of circumstances which would make anyone crazy. One would be crazy not to be crazy, especially when facing the awesome kind of economic problems that many women must contemplate when they are suffering familial dissolution or stress.

My indictment of my own profession is based on a familiarity I lack with yours, but I do not want to let you off the hook. You exercise enormous power and authority in your relationship with patients and clients. You know it, and they know it. You study it and attempt to understand it, and they feel it. That is so because of the bonding necessary for successful therapy. If you do not become intimate with a person's problems and a person's needs, you will not be in a position to offer help to that person. So the risk is a necessary function of the work that you do.

But how sensitive are you to the world women live in? How empathic are you to the messages that women receive? Do you unwittingly make assumptions and are those assumptions based on your own experience or, worse yet, on your experience with your own wives, nieces, and daughters? It is not fair to make assumptions on the basis of personal experience until your experience has expanded to include the scope, breadth, and depth of someone like the Savior. I expect that the Savior is the only human being who has ever lived on the earth who was capable and worthy to make assumptions on the basis of inferences rather than overt and objective data about what is in the heart

of other human beings.

Do you unwittingly make assumptions which may reinforce some women's sense of their own limitations, or are you always careful to respond to people in terms of their life experience, their circumstances, and their individual needs rather than in terms of general assumptions or stereotypes, about who and what women are, or men are, and can do? The risks that women take when they ask us for help should not include the risk that we will apply generalizations or stereotypes or that we will reinforce the "I think I can't" mode which emerges in so much of women's socialization. Our society is by no means ready to free itself from long-held notions about the roles of men and women. At the same time, however, I think both sexes are encountering increasing difficulty in accepting the limitations of rigid roles. The traditional reinforcements that society has used are not working as well as they used to.

It was in 1973 that a justice of the United States Supreme Court wrote in a case involving a question of legal sex discrimination that the pedestal upon which women have historically been placed reveals itself upon closer inspection all too often to be a cage (Brennan, 1973). Another essay on that same subject observes:

The hidden message to women on a pedestal is that their work is valued because it must be done but that it is beneath the talents of men to do it. People on pedestals are sometimes held in awe. They are also loved, cherished, and protected. They are not respected as doers because they are held out of the mainstream, are measured by a shorter ruler, thinking of life in terms of its limitations instead of its opportunities. People on pedestals never get to do the work they need to do in order to learn what they *can* do. People on pedestals, and most of those people are women, are growing up thinking they *can't*. (Shepard, 1983)

When women survive the necessary risks of their dealings with us in the helping professions, they grow. That is

what risk-taking is all about. You know more about that than I. The job, however, for those of us who help people solve their problems is to do everything possible to see that the problem solving process does not diminish their capacities in any way but enlarges them. We, the experts, have skills which make us powerful, for good or ill. This is particularly true of you, because your skills relate so closely to the intimate sectors of human life. You often exercise great influence, and with such influence—as I hope you all feel very deeply—comes enormous responsibility.

In 1 Samuel 16:7 we learn a very important lesson: “. . . the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.” Those attempting to help can never be of real service to those in need if they fail to strive to look upon the heart. From the scriptures we also learn, “It is the nature and disposition of almost all men, as soon as they get a little authority . . . [that] they will immediately begin to exercise unrighteous dominion.” (D&C 121:39) In that same revelation there is a wonderful discussion of the proper exercise of power in human lives. I think that discussion is equally applicable both to members of the helping professions as well as bearers of the priesthood: “No power or influence can or ought to be

maintained. . . only by persuasion, by long-suffering, by gentleness and meekness unfeigned; by kindness, and pure knowledge, which shall greatly enlarge the soul without hypocrisy, and without guile. . . .” (D&C 121:41–42) What a beautiful notion, that the soul may be enlarged by kindness and pure knowledge.

As I think of all the helping professions, yours strives most to combine kindness and pure knowledge. We work a great deal in my profession on pure knowledge, but I do not always see a striving for kindness. I hope that these attributes — kindness and pure knowledge—may continue to characterize your work with the women and with the men who seek your help.

Christine M. Durham is a justice of the Utah Supreme Court.

References

- Brennan, J. *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677, 684 (1973).
- Governor's Task Force on Integrating Women into the Workforce. *Utah Women in Economic Crisis*. Salt Lake City: State Dept. of Community and Economic Development, June 1984. p.2.
- Shepard, Karen. Editorial: “I Think I Can't,” *Network*, July 1983.
- Weitzman, The Economics of Divorce: Social and Economic Consequences of Property, Alimony and Child Support Awards, *UCLA Law Review* 28(1981): 1181.

WOMEN AND ROLES: TRANSCENDING DEFINITIONS¹

FRANCINE R. BENNION, M.A.
A panel presentation at the AMCAP
Convention 4 October 1984; pan-
elists included Russell Osguthorpe,
Ida Smith, Merlin Myers, and
Carolyn Rasmus.

Members of our panel have no experience as professional psychotherapists or counselors. We differ from each other in viewpoint and academic training, but are united in our great interest in what women do and who women are. Recognizing that we have neither training nor experience for the work you do, we hope that we might perhaps enrich or extend some of your own frameworks for understanding women who come to you for help.

The theme of your conference is, "The work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever. And my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation . . ." (Isaiah 32:17—18) Speaking of events preceding that peaceable habitation, Isaiah says earlier, "In that day every man shall cast away his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which your own hands have made unto you for sin." (Isaiah 31:7)

The people whom Isaiah was addressing made idols of wood and silver and gold. We, with more advanced sophistication, make idols of ideas we have created, of frameworks we have devised for seeing things. Having created a convenient way to describe something, we sometimes treat that description as a self-existent thing itself, an entity to which we give our belief or faith. We see examples in many of the concepts we hold about the nature of human beings. For example, after some

psychologists devised a measure they called I.Q., others came to think of I.Q. as a thing a person has, rather than as a quantitative measure of some tasks a person has done. I.Q. is now commonly spoken of not as a measurement but as the thing measured.

Another example: the Greeks, among others, spoke of mind as an entity distinct from body, and now we routinely assume we all have minds and bodies, distinct and separate entities. So engrained in our very language are the concepts of mind and body, "physical" and "mental," that it is difficult for most occidentals to think of a person as a single living being not divided into parts. Terms invented to conveniently describe us now determine what we think we are.

The concept of role has been devised to represent conveniently the particular relationships a person has with others, or to represent a particular set of tasks or functions. However, we now hear of "woman's role" or "women's roles" not as convenient descriptions of relationships and tasks but rather as things in themselves: the role is what a woman is, or should be—a woman can be adequately understood or defined in terms of role tasks and role relationships. The concept of role is becoming an idol to which undue homage is paid.

I like Elder Hanks' quote from Nora in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*: "I am a human being first." Many of our women feel they are not human beings first. They are roles.

Though problems exist because of particular roles assigned to women, more profoundly destructive, I believe, are the problems which come of thinking of women primarily in terms of any role, of defining women primarily as role-players. I would like to suggest

some of these problems.

A major problem is the loss of personal identity. A former Relief Society president, married to a stake president, said, "I feel I'm only a place-taker." She is the hostess for visiting authorities at stake conference, she serves supper to widows when her husband invites them all to a dinner, and she is the one who is honored when the Young Women need a special guest. Anybody, she feels, could be playing the role. What troubles her is that to those whom she cares about and is serving, she is "the wife," not a person.

Women who feel themselves to be place takers, and men who regard them as such, feel that women playing the same role are interchangeable. Devastating loneliness is experienced by women with only "role identity" in important relationships. I heard this summer of a young woman who has eight-week-old twins and three other children under the age of five and a half. She has not been getting much sleep, she has been very tired, and she has experienced considerable stress. She has no energy, nor desire to do anything, nor sense of ability to do anything. Her husband goes to school in the day and works at night. When her mother phoned one day and asked, "How are you?", she answered, "I'm not okay. I'm not well." Late that night, reporting the conversation to her husband, she repeated to him, "I'm not okay. I'm not well, I wonder if I'm depressed." He replied, "There's nothing wrong with you. You can do it. My mother did." The husband seemed to perceive women in the mother role as interchangeable. The woman playing that role for his children was not to be considered in terms of her own thoughts, her own feelings, her own circumstance, or her own needs. She was simply occupying the same role his mother did.

Women who feel themselves to be primarily role-players may begin to regard others also as role-players and relate to them as such. I don't know how many Relief Society presidents you see who are concerned primarily with being

a perfect role-player. Instead of looking at needs of the women and how the organization could serve them, such leaders are concerned with being a perfect role model, with being poised and impressive, with matching or exceeding the achievements of other Relief Society presidents, with doing everything beautifully. Though she wants to be a good administrator, and though she may do much that is good, such a woman does not serve her sisters in the same way as does a human being who uses the role as a means of serving other human beings. I have heard more than one sister echo the words of my friend who said, "I sit in Relief Society and think, I shouldn't be here. They've all got clean houses. They are all perfect. What's wrong with me?" I asked this woman to show me through her home, and she reluctantly did so. It was quite orderly and clean, with signs here and there of being lived in. The problem was not really with housekeeping. Many such women see neither themselves nor others as living breathing individuals in legitimate struggle with the complexities of being human. They see themselves and others as role-players.

In addition to loss of personal identity and warm human exchange, a second problem is that a role and its virtues may seem synonymous and inseparable: if you are playing the role, you have its virtues; if you are not playing the role, you don't have the virtues. For example, a woman chose to marry a man though she knew he could not beget children. She married him because she loved him. After she had been married for a couple of years, she sat in Relief Society next to a young woman having trouble with a crying baby. Seeing the woman's fatigue, she offered to hold the baby for a while, but the mother refused: "No. You can't do it. You aren't a mother." Because she was not occupying the mother role, her neighbor assumed she lacked tenderness and skill to comfort a troubled child.

We frequently encounter the confusion and judgments that grow from

such thinking. I've known more than one woman who went by the book, paid tithing, had home evening, and made sure the children made their beds and went to all their meetings. I'm thinking of one such mother whose teenage daughter ran away from home and got involved in drugs. The mother said tearfully, "I did everything I was supposed to. What more could I have done?" She could have listened to her daughter, could have known her daughter—at least that is what the daughter reported. The woman had ceased to be a person who was her mother, and had instead become a perfect role player. She really had done everything that she perceived as part of that role, and was heart-broken to discover that neither all virtues nor expected rewards were synonymous with the role she had played.

There are of course many reasons a woman's best efforts may not make her perfect in a role she is trying to play. A third way of seeing role problems is in terms of context, or rather lack of context. When women are spoken of as roles, the assumed context is often either a vacuum or Utopia. There is no past or future, there are no other persons affecting how the role can be played, and worst of all, there is no larger framework for transcending problems with the role.

Two young women this summer have become profoundly depressed, one requiring hospitalization. Both are bright, educated, beautiful, talented, and intent on living the Gospel. After three years or so of marriage to rising young professionals active in the Church, these women lacked the activity, the rewards, and the sense of being to which they had been accustomed. There had been progress, satisfaction, and recognition in athletic ability, talent, or first-rate scholarship, but there was little in staying home all week changing diapers or hoping the husband would have an hour's time with them. As wives and mothers, they were playing roles they had expected to play, wanted to play, and thought themselves prepared to

play. However, the women had no adequate context in which to place contrast between what they were experiencing now and what they had experienced in the past.

The context provided by other persons is often left out of role definitions for women. For example, one prescription our women hear is, "A woman sets the tone in a home." What does that say to the woman allowed to say only, "Yes, dear," or "Yes, Daddy!"? There is a 19-year-old woman who is earning her own living, but still living at home. One night, she left a public celebration and went for a ride with friends without asking her parents' permission—something not immoral, unethical, or even disobedient, but something of her own choosing, her own initiative. When she returned 35 minutes later, her parents took her straight home, where her father expressed his concern for her by ripping her dress, breaking a framed photo of her, abusing her verbally and emotionally, and finally by announcing, "From now on, you have two choices: 'Yes, Daddy,' or leave." What kind of resources will a woman like that have for setting the tone in her own marriage? You may say that this is an exception. I wish it were, but I know many middle-aged wives who are living not as loving and loyal mature persons but as dependents who wonder why they are not happy when they are playing "Yes, dear" roles so well.

Motherhood is often defined without the context actually provided by real live children. A young woman from a family of 14 looked forward to being a mother. She chose to marry young, and now at 28 is the mother of six. I saw her at a party and asked, "How are you doing?" "Not very well," she said. "I'm finding there is almost nothing about being a mother that I like." She went on to say that the only time she has a sense of happiness is the one night a week she gets away from home and goes to the Genealogy Library.

Whatever the complexities of a given role, a woman can better address

them if she can step outside the role to look at her struggles and capacity for growth in the context of a world where she and others have agency, experience change, and are subject to natural laws and limitations of mortality. However, if there is no such larger context, if role problems must be solved only with the bounds of the role itself, a woman may be helplessly paralyzed.

A fourth problem: when one defines what a particular role is, one is also defining what the role is not. For example, the role of woman in supporting priesthood-holders is usually defined in a hierarchical way: women are underneath, holding up the priesthood. This definition excludes other kinds of support—for instance, that found in an arch, where each side supports the other. It also excludes the concept of space-time vectors in which a vehicle stays on course because of the balancing of forces or components. Because we customarily use a top-bottom definition for the woman's role in supporting priesthood-holders, other useful concepts of support are excluded.

A fifth problem with role-playing is that the value of a person often depends on the value of the role. In a hierarchical society, which we have as Mormons and Americans, the seeming value of a role is derived from its place in the hierarchy. That becomes very confusing for men and women who feel that because women's roles are relatively low in the hierarchy, a woman has relatively little value.

A sixth problem: one who thinks of herself as a role-player and who constructs the ideal role from several sources (for example, her mother and her mother-in-law) may combine elements which are mutually exclusive, or which together exceed human capability. Many women do manage to combine conflicting or excessive elements in their personal role definitions. Most must choose either to attempt all and achieve only mediocre results, or to do some things well and others inadequately or not at all. Either course is unacceptable if a prime component in

the personal role is either consistent excellence or perfection.

A seventh problem, and the last I'll mention here, is that role definition of women usually ignores the importance of personal interpretations, interpretations integral to the way in which roles are either defined or played. For all the trouble it causes, I would not want to do away with that capacity for diverse perception and interpretation which God preserves for us. We must keep that capacity in mind if we are to speak or listen productively and if we are to avoid the errors which come with any kind of stereotype. There are serious problems with thinking of women primarily or exclusively in terms of role. When persons encounter difficulty, complexity, or change, they need a transcendent definition of themselves as agents who can address the matter. They are not helped by role limitations, which may contribute to their simply wishing problems didn't exist, or to their feeling themselves a failure or oppressed victim, a captive cricket which can wriggle its limbs but never escape the cage.

Though the concept of *role* has its uses, we would do well to remember that it is a concept of our own making, a convenient way to represent some tasks and relationships for individuals. I do not know how well in our day we will manage to cast away the idol which *role* has become, and thereby approach a more peaceable habitation. I do not know how perfectly we may come to imitate Christ in regarding qualities of being as transcending the niches which societies create for their own convenience. I do believe that if we are to live well, we must learn to understand ourselves and each other as live agents, not merely as place-takers or role-players.

¹This address and the three that follow were all part of a panel discussion on Women and the Church.

Sister Bennion is a former member of the General Relief Society Board and mother of three and a former faculty member of Ohio State and Brigham Young Universities.

ROLES AND ROLE MODELS: A SURVEY OF ISSUES IN GENDER EQUITY

RUSSELL T. OSGUTHORPE, Ph.D.,
and IDA SMITH, B.S.

It is a commonly accepted fact that a person's gender has profound effects on a person's life. A man may choose to spend significant time and money pursuing career preparation because he wants to be able to generate enough income to support a family. A woman may have less concern over career preparation because she sees herself being supported by a husband. But these are perceptions each of us holds about the implications of our *own* gender. What about the perceptions we hold about *other men* or *other women*? How do those ideas affect the way we perceive the role of husband or wife, or the way we perceive others in pursuit of their life goals, or the way we choose those individuals after whom we would like to pattern our life? The purpose of the research we will discuss in this paper was to uncover answers to questions like these.

The research began in 1982 with the development of a questionnaire to be administered to BYU students. The questionnaire consisted of 11 sections of "fixed response" items using scales or multiple choice formats. Within these 11 sections a total of 91 individual items were included. Some of the items focused directly on university life, while others dealt with the broader effects of gender on marriage and family relationships. In addition to the 91 scaled items, the questionnaire contained 10 free response items, allowing students to explain the reasons behind their answers to the scaled items. Although all of the data have been thoroughly analyzed, including careful coding of all

free response items, in this paper we will discuss only highlights of the results obtained on three items dealing with the effects of gender on roles and role models.

When the study was completed, a total of 343 women and 375 men had participated in the research, most of them unmarried Mormon undergraduates. The majority of the questionnaires were administered in religion classes which are required courses for all students. Thus, the make-up of the sample was similar to the make-up of the entire student population at BYU. Demographic data were collected for each respondent, allowing researchers to construct a sample which matched that of the BYU student population. Further information on the sample and procedures used in the study can be obtained by contacting the authors.

Husband/Wife Roles

The first question we will discuss asked students to project for their own marriage how family-related tasks would be shared by husband and wife. While the results comparing womens' with mens' responses were interesting, we will focus only on the combined results in this paper. From Table I it can be seen that students varied greatly in their perceptions of the roles of husband and wife. On four of the six items, at least some respondents felt that the task would be carried out exclusively by the husband. For example, nearly one-third of the students said that the husband would be the only one to conduct personal interviews with the children, while about one in five students said that the task would be equally shared by both husband and wife. It is also clear from Table I that both women and men tend to place more responsibility on the husband for most family-related tasks—even those that have traditionally been associated with the mother (e.g., "Set a loving tone in the home"). Note that even though there was a column entitled "wife entirely," the column was never used by students. It should be

TABLE I.
Mean percentages for all respondents regarding preferences for husband/wife tasks.

| Task | Role Preference | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| | Husband entirely | Husband more than Wife | Husband and Wife the same | Wife more than Husband Wife entirely |
| Leading scripture study | 4% | 45% | 51% | |
| Conducting family home evening | 13% | 57% | 29% | |
| Conducting personal interview with children | 29% | 49% | 21% | |
| Keeping order and assigning tasks in the home | | 8% | 52% | 39% |
| Making decisions regarding church contributions | 2% | 21% | 76% | |
| Set loving tone in the home | | 3% | 75% | 22% |

mentioned that a number of versions of tem were used in pilot experiments—all with the same results. Students frequently saw the husband taking a major load in family responsibilities, and usually saw the wife taking a less prominent role.

Many implications could be drawn from the results obtained on this first question. One of the most obvious is that the variance among students' perceptions could have profound effects on a marriage relationship. For example, a male student who consistently responded in the "husband entirely" column may marry a female student who consistently responded in the "husband and wife the same" column. Because their responses indicate their expectations of self, as well as their expectations of their spouse, the amount of agreement would have special significance for their marriage relationship. The shift to the "husband more than wife" side of the scale also has clear implications for marriage. From written responses given elsewhere in the questionnaire, we got the distinct impression

that some male students would have often felt more comfortable with a more shared view of family tasks, but felt that it was their responsibility to do everything associated with the home—even though they perceived that their wife would be spending much more time in the home than would be possible for them.

Personal Life Goals

One of the items on the questionnaire was designed specifically for BYU use, but may have important implications for us all. The question asked respondents to rate the importance of various reasons why students choose to come to BYU. Students were asked to rate the importance of their own reasons, as well as those of other women and other men. Although the question included several reasons, such as "Find a spouse" or "Get a broad, well-rounded education," we will only focus here on the reason entitled, "Prepare for a career."

From Table II it can be seen that when women and men speak of their

TABLE II.

Mean percentages for women and men rating themselves, other men and other women regarding the importance of career preparation as a reason for enrolling at BYU.

| Rating Category | Level of Importance | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|----------------------|----|
| | Most Important 1 | 2 | 3 | Least Important 4 | 5 |
| Men about themselves | 74% | 20% | 4% | | |
| Women about other men | 69% | 23% | 6% | | |
| Men about other men | 45% | 41% | 1% | 2% | |
| Women about themselves | 46% | 32% | 14% | 6% | 2% |
| Women about other women | 4% | 25% | 42% | 25% | 5% |
| Men about other women | 6% | 17% | 37% | 31% | 9% |

own reasons for coming to BYU, they cite career preparation as one of their most important reasons. A total of 94 percent of the men and 78 percent of the women rated career preparation with a 1 or a 2 ("most important"). However, women differed from men in how they rated men's reasons for coming to BYU. Women consistently rated *other men* as men had rated themselves. Men say that they, themselves, are serious students and women agree. When *men* are asked to rate other men, however, they are not quite as certain that career preparation is as important a motivation for other men as it is for themselves.

The most dramatic differences were obtained on the ratings for *other women's* reasons for coming to BYU. Both men and women tend to trivialize the reason for *other women's* attendance at BYU. While 78 percent of the women said that career preparation was one of their primary reasons for coming to BYU (rated 1 or 2), they felt that only 29 percent of *other women* thought of it as a primary reason. Men said that only 23 percent of *women* came to BYU primarily to prepare for a career. In fact, men said that fully 40 percent of BYU female students think of career preparation as one of their *least important* reasons for coming to the school, compared with only 8 percent of the women,

themselves, say that it was one of their own *least important* reasons.

The discrepancies noted between self-perceptions and perceptions of others may have important implications for each of us as we pursue our own life goals. How free are women really to pursue academically challenging programs, when others (both men and women) tend to view them as less serious students? Are women viewed as simply trying to "prove something," when they speak of a graduate program as one of their goals? When we counsel these students, we are dealing with their own desires, mixed with what they believe is appropriate for them, as defined by their perceptions of others and how those perceptions might affect them socially? There are even implications about intellectual isolation when a woman says that "I am a serious student, but most *other women* are here for the social life."

The data clearly indicate that not only are stereotypes are indeed different for men than for women. BYU has long had the image of being a marriage mill, and that image still seems to be very much alive. However, the stereotype has a much stronger effect on the perceptions we hold for women than for those we hold for men. Students can assume that many men will marry during their college years, but feel that

TABLE III.
Mean percentages for women and men regarding their perceptions of the degree of influence of selected male and female role models.

| Role Model | Respondents | Amount of Influence | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------------|------|-------------|------------|---------------|
| | | Great deal | Some | Very Little | Not at all | Unknown to me |
| Christ | Women | 94% | 6% | | | |
| | Men | 91% | 7% | | | |
| Mary | Women | 65% | 30% | 5% | 1% | |
| | Men | 16% | 48% | 26% | 9% | |
| Spencer W. Kimball | Women | 93% | 5% | | | |
| | Men | 84% | 14% | | | |
| Camilla Kimball | Women | 54% | 30% | 8% | 6% | 2% |
| | Men | 12% | 36% | 29% | 19% | 4% |

marriage was not their primary reason for enrolling. Women, however, do not have the same luxury. For the woman to be a serious student means that she must not be as interested as she "should" be in being married.

Role Models

Modeling plays a part in the development of each of us. Parents notice early in their child's life the tendency to mimic the behaviors of Mommy or Daddy. As we mature, our modeling often becomes more a part of our conscious decisions. But are the decisions different for men and women Do men and women selected similar role models? The item on the questionnaire addressing this issue is found in Table III. In essence, students were asked to estimate the amount of influence a number of individuals had had in their lives. The first list of people was drawn from the scriptures and the second from prominent modern-day church figures. The abbreviated results shown in Table III indicate that women and much more flexible than men in their selection of role models. Women freely select both men and women as people they seek to emulate. There was a slight trend in the data to show that women generally have stronger role models than men, regardless of whether the model is male or female. For example, women were

more likely to select "great deal" of influence than "some" for a number of modern-day church figures, such as President Spencer W. Kimball (see Table III.)

On the other hand, men rarely select women as their most influential role models. Camilla E. Kimball illustrates this point. Fully 54 percent of the women said that Sister Kimball had a "great deal" of influence in their life, compared with only 12 percent of the men selecting her in the same category. For some reason, it seems intuitively obvious that men would not select *women* for their role models. Why then is it equally so intuitive that women would readily select *men* as theirs? The data, of course, do not give clear answers concerning the whys, but the data definitely indicate that men are much more restricted in their choice of role models, than are women. In most cases, the only woman perceived as having a *great influence* in a man's life is his own mother.

The questions raised by the results of the role model data are as interesting as any answers that may come from the data. For example, why are men so reluctant to look up to women? Do men view it as a sign of weakness? Why are women, for that matter, so eager to look up to so many—both men and women? Whatever the answers to these ques-

tions, there is little doubt that we are again dealing in part with culturally transmitted ideas and sanctions.

The implications for everyday life are abundant. President Jeffrey Holland in his welcome speech to the faculty at the beginning of the 1984 school year gave some strong counsel to men who had voiced frustration in their assignment to work for a woman supervisor. He emphasized that the problem had little to do with "rights" and much to do with simple Christian behavior. Many could easily dismiss the problem because men "just aren't used to working for a woman." But the data collected in this study would suggest that the problem goes deeper than that. Men not only lack practice in reporting to a woman, they also lack experience in looking to women as role models.

Conclusion

The implications of this study for LDS relationships obviously go far beyond students at BYU. Students who were questioned came from every part of the country—bringing their stereotyped perceptions with them from their own families and upbringing. Many of those stereotypes are likely reinforced on campus, both in and out of the classroom.

Some of the most crucial questions raised by this study are: 1) How do you achieve an equals relationship in marriage where stereotyped role perceptions may act as roadblocks? 2) Given correct circumstances, is it really possible for a woman to have equal access to education—and therefore to achieving her goals—on college campuses, BYU included? And if not, what steps need to be taken to ensure womens' equal access to education? 3) What are we not doing—or doing wrong—that seems to make it so difficult for our young men to *look up* to a woman? Finally, 4) What can we do in our homes, counseling sessions, and classrooms to reduce the effects of stereotypes on both women and men? These and other questions raised by this study deserve our immediate contemplation, as well as

further research.

Russ Osguthorpe is Associate professor of Educational Psychology. Sister Smith was the Founding Director of the Women's Research Institute and is currently Director of Alumni Continuing Education at Brigham Young University.

SOME SOCIAL STRUCTURAL CORRELATES OF THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE MODERN WORLD

MERLIN G. MYERS, Ph.D.

In his great poem, *Jerusalem*, William Blake (1961) notes:

If Perceptive Organs vary, Objects of Perception seem to vary: If the Perceptive Organs close, their Objects seem to close also. "Consider this, O mortal Man, O worm of sixty winters," said Los, "Consider Sexual Orientation and hide thee in the dust."

If such a genius as William Blake can make this observation regarding our topic today, I am apprehensive concerning what warrant I have for entering the discussion. I am made to recall the words, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

As Social Anthropologists, we feel that the roles of men and women in any society are the product of the total culture. They are interlaced with the themes and ethical values of that culture. For example, in many parts of the world and formerly in our own country, the domestic organization was the extended family. This was the collective cooperating unit not only for economic purposes, but for religious and even many political purposes as well. The

members of this kin group did not always occupy a single dwelling, but usually shared a common homestead or neighborhood. Gender roles were separate and well-defined. All the men of the unit were involved in male pursuits, and a set of correlated activities characterized the lives of women. Life went on in a kind of balanced reciprocity. Even today this is the nature of social life in contemporary, non-industrial societies and also, to a limited extent, in agrarian America.

With the rise and spread of factory industrialism and the all-purpose, free market, all this has changed. The unit of production has been separated from the unit of consumption. The extended family, with its balanced reciprocity and well-defined complementary roles, has been torn apart at its very foundation. Both men and women are thus affected.

With the fragmentation of the extended family, a *man* is in large measure deprived of the context that establishes his identity as a man. He is drawn as an individual out of the domestic scene to supply energy factors or skills to factories, business firms, or other market entities in return for a personal money wage. The nature of his status is changed. He has a greater degree of personal freedom, but the ties with the group which formerly defined his identity as a person generally, and as a man in particular, have been obliterated. He is not now important for *who* he is, but for *what* he does. This is somewhat like being transformed from a person to a thing. Many of his personal attributes can be ignored, and he can be assigned a number. With the dispersion of his children from the now abbreviated domestic unit for school, and later for work, etc., the setting for his masculine role as father is further diminished, and his personal importance is further attenuated.

As the forces generated by industrialization and the all-purpose market have extended their influences, the importance of individuals, and nearly everything else, has been assigned a money value. (I am told that the U.S.

Supreme Court has in certain cases awarded damages in the amount of \$400,000 when life has been lost due to personal negligence.) Personal identity is as temporary and fleeting as the money that determines it.

Let us now see what this means for the *woman*. The begetting and bearing of children does not produce gain in the currently accepted monetary sense of the word. Rather, this may put strain on what gain is available, or may impede the freedom and mobility of a woman in her quest for gain. She is thus caught in the very unevitable position of having the most decisive attributes of her femininity denegated by the society in which she lives. They become an obstacle to her achieving worth.

Women have sought to alter this circumstance, among other ways, by entering the market place. They have done this indiscriminately—entering occupations held by men. This has put stress on the already fragile position of men and has aggravated their already tenuous circumstance.

William Blake (1961) expresses it in this way:

There is a throne in every man, it is the
Throne of God; This woman has claimed
as her own, and man is no more!

Man's position is fragile from the start, and this taking-over (as it were) of his last domain is often the final blow to his identity. Yet, who can blame women for desiring "a place in the sun"?

Balanced reciprocity or exchange is desirable and has, in some measure, at different times and places, been achieved. But we are caught in the paradox of the modern industrial/market world. Led by the hope of less stressful effort and the prospect of material bounty, we discover that the means of attaining "the good life" also entails conflict.

Seldom do we have an analytical appreciation of the forces at work in our social lives. We can gain this appreciation only with great effort and keen perception. The Church itself seems to partake of this paradox. Likely on the basis of the fundamentally important

teaching of Free Agency, the Church champions the "free market." At the same time it encourages its women members to stay close to the domestic scene. But it is the free market, more than any single force—by breaking down the extended family networks and by assigning money value even to life itself—that draws women away from the home. So, *who* is to blame? Is *anyone* to blame? Who is the chauvinist? If there is an adversary (and I believe there is), he must take great delight in the confusion and conflict thus generated.

Evans-Pritchard (1965), in writing about the position of women in non-industrial society as compared to our own, notes that the question of the equality of the sexes would have no meaning for an Azande woman. If what the enquirer had in mind with this question became clear to her, she would puzzle, "How could two beings so different ever be equal?" And let us be clear about it, men and women are different in some very profound ways. We should be thankfully aware of that!

Evans-Pritchard says further that the question of equality is fundamentally a moral question rather than an economic one, and ultimately must come to rest upon some code of ethics. Many of the difficulties that arise in the relationship between men and women are inherent to their very being. They are the same kind of problems that arise in nearly every situation and department of social life.

They cannot be resolved by insistence on absolute equality, but only by the recognition of differences and then by the exercise of charity and the acknowledgment of authority. Otherwise antagonism is unavoidable and peaceful, harmonious social life is impossible. Far from the acceptance of authority entailing inferiority, it expresses the only true form of equality obtainable in human relationships—an *equality of service*. (Evans-Pritchard [1965], p. 56)

We find a good example of this among the Iroquois Indians. The women have the role of selecting chiefs and also

of deposing them for malfeasance. When I questioned the men about this, they told me, "The women are they who know the hearts of them; they will make a better choice than we." But the men still occupy the throne—they are the administrators. Here is an exceptionally fine example of a nicely balanced set of roles, each serving the other for the good of all.

Rather than snipe, chide, and compete with one another and thus drive each other into neurotic behaviors such as those accompanying emasculation anxiety among men and the despising of womanly attributes among women, ought we not seek to identify the contexts and the ways in which we can serve and sacrifice one for another? It would be interesting to see the result of this kind of creative enterprise.

References

- Blake, William. *Complete Poetry and Prose*. Edited by Jeffrey Kaynes. London: None Such Library, zz61.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. *The Position of Women in Primitive Society*. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.
- Merlin Myers is professor of anthropology at Brigham Young University.

ROLES OR MISSIONS?

CAROLYN J. RASMUS, Ed.D.

I preface my remarks by sharing with you my initial response to the title, "Women's Roles in Relationship to the Church." It was negative. I believe the idea of roles suggests defining what a woman should be or do in a pre-determined, preconceived way. When I hear language about how women should think or act, I sense restriction and confinement. Talk of "roles" suggests to me neat little boxes, and I don't care

much for that.

A dictionary definition of role notes "the proper functioning of a person in a socially accepted or expected behavior or pattern." That suggests the idea of a role as a means rather than an end; we often prescribe roles or expectations, or suggest what people ought to be like. Such categorizing takes choices away from people and is antithetical to everything I understand about the restored gospel.

The principle of free agency seems central to the restored gospel and may, in fact, be one of its distinguishing characteristics. I struggle to understand completely what that means for me and also what it suggests about my interaction with others. I am convinced, however, that the process of struggling with those understandings determines what we'll find out about who we are and what we are about in an ultimate sense.

If I suggest that we not talk about roles, though, I believe I need to suggest an alternative. How might we talk about women in the context of the restored gospel or in relationship to the Church? My own experience has led me to conclude that mortality was not meant to be simple. The scriptures tell us plainly that there must be opposition in all things (2 Nephi 2:11). The Doctrine and Covenants adds that we must be tried in all things (D&C 136:31).

But what language might be appropriate as we talk of women and the restored gospel? I'd like to propose that we talk about women's mission or missions, suggesting neither an assigned nor a self-imposed duty or task. I also find myself thinking of responsibilities. What are our responsibilities as women? I think it not insignificant that when our prophet, Spencer W. Kimball, spoke for the first time to the women of the Church in 1978 the title of his talk was, "The Privileges and Responsibilities of Sisters." He did not address roles. He talked about privileges and responsibilities.

The theme for this conference is a beautiful one: "And the work of right-

eousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever. And my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation and quiet resting places." (Isaiah 32:17-19) We all know that this world is not a peaceful place. It is complex, confusing, sometimes frustrating, often difficult; but I believe that what we are about—and particularly what you are about as a helping profession—is to find ways in which we help men and women live and cope and, indeed, find peace, happiness, and satisfaction within a gospel context. I believe that is possible.

Part of my personal concern about the idea of roles is that it connotes a static state, and we live in a changing, global society. We are indeed a worldwide Church. Cultures vary; our society is being transformed. My parents, who are still living, were born when there was no electricity, no automobiles, and no airplanes. They have experienced many changes. Obviously, we are all affected by change. There are some indicators of changes that impact on women tremendously and affect the ways in which women and men relate to each other. Within the last 20 years, the divorce rate has almost quadrupled. Church divorce statistics parallel the national figures, though at a lower rate. Between 1954 and 1969 the number of women heads of families increased by 40 percent. That number grew another 22 percent between 1970 and 1976. In 1920 the typical working woman was single, under thirty, and from the working class. Fifty years later in 1970, most all women in the working force were married, over two-thirds had children, and more than half were over forty.

There are many other changes. The point is that the world, and our Mormon culture, are changing. We are an extremely diverse people. At the same time, however, we are united. That unity comes from our beliefs about the restored gospel and its doctrines. The fundamental doctrine of free agency means that our history is filled with people who have made diverse choices and stood firm on those choices. Let me

call to your memory Thomas More and Martin Luther. I love Luther's statement, "I cannot and I will not retract anything, since it is neither safe nor right to go against conscience. I cannot do otherwise." In 1984, Barbara McClintock received the Nobel Prize for her pioneering work in genetics. At the age of 80, referring to her experiences of more than 30 years ago, she noted, "They said I was crazy, absolutely mad, but when you know you are right you don't care." Deeply meaningful to me is the statement of the Prophet Joseph Smith who, like Paul before King Agrippa, testified of his vision. "He had seen a vision, he knew he had, and all the persecution under heaven could not make it otherwise; and though they should persecute him unto death, yet he knew, and would know to his latest breath, that he had both seen a light and heard a voice speaking unto him, and all the world could not make him think or believe otherwise. So it was with me" (Joseph Smith History 1:24-25). I share these examples simply because they show us people who were not trying to fit themselves into a predetermined role. These people did not say, "If I act this way, it will be socially acceptable." In fact, in the illustrations I have given, their behavior was *not* socially acceptable. To Thomas More and Joseph Smith, their stands ultimately brought death.

They were people of conscience. They knew not only who they were but what they were about.

My personal experience suggests that very hard struggles surround us. Roles are easy . . . just tell me what to do or to be. "This is the way you ought to be," it says, "and if you do XYZ, everything will work out just wonderfully for you." Accepting a predetermined role can be a way of not dealing with the hard questions. In contrast, having a sense of mission means accepting struggles and coming to understand our responsibility as Latter-day Saints and then having the moral courage to make our actions consistent with our knowledge of right and wrong. For me, that process—that struggle of getting to that point—is what life is all about. It has nothing to do with roles and everything to do with responsibilities. We did, in fact, accept mortality and discipleship as our earthly mission. We did commit to stand as a witness of Him. For me, our responsibility is to be about finding ways to contribute to and build and defend this Latter-day kingdom. Then this work of righteousness shall indeed be peace.

Carolyn Rasmus is serving as the Executive Assistant to the Young Women General President of the Church while on leave from her position at BYU as Executive Assistant to the President.

MORMON FORMS OF PSYCHOPATHOLOGY

LOUIS A. MOENCH, M.D.

Presented at the AMCAP Convention
5 October 1984

Sir William Osler, one of the grand old physicians in the history of American medicine, worked his medical magic on the wards of the Old Philadelphia General Hospital where I also worked as a resident with variable success, but very little magic. The hospital has in recent years seen its luster diminished. Yet Osler's ghost still walked the corridors and inspired us.

The Penn medical students knew him best as the object of a sign in the library extolling one of his virtues and calculated to teach a lesson in ethics. It read, "Sir William Osler did not steal library materials!" I admired him for another reason—an astute observation of his which I am using as a departure point for this presentation. He said, "It is more important to know what kind of patient has the disease than what kind of disease the patient has" (Rome, 1983, p. 751). A question interesting to me is, "Is there a Mormon kind of patient?"

The non-Mormon world has tended to see Mormons as all alike. Thus, an outsider's view of Mormons may become his distorted view of you. His view of you may become his distorted view of Mormons. It is human nature to lump ideologies unlike one's own all together as if they were the same (e.g., the Rockefeller/Jewish/Communist/homosexual/fluoridation conspiracy, and to see ideologies similar to one's own as different in important ways (e.g., Utah Mormons versus California Mormons). We must avoid a common error of drawing overly general conclusions from

individual cases. We should heed the caution attributed to Robert Shelton, grand dragon or imperial wizard or some such thing of the Ku Klux Klan. In pointing out how we fail to recognize the uniqueness of the various Klans, he is said to have explained, "It's like putting a bunch of mixed nuts all in the same bag and saying they're all the same kind of nuts!"

We have recently had a spate of categorizations of Mormons by Mormons, included among them the following: Iron rod versus Liahona Mormons (Poll, 1967); true believers versus closet doubters (Burton, 1982); compliant-dependent Mormons (having failed to resolve separation anxiety) versus social-organizational Mormons (unable to master castration anxiety) versus the few transcendent-integrated Mormons (who have no more anxiety [Stout, 1982]); and the usual distinctions between active and jack Mormons or converts and "lifers." I don't propose to add any well thought-out new categories, though I will remind you of the only truly valid categorization of people I know: the world is made up of two kinds of people—those who see the world as made up of two kinds of people and those who don't.

Historical Categorizations

Given those cautions, is there a Mormon kind of patient after all? *Anatomically*, the answer used to be yes. Consider this observation by the Assistant Surgeon of the United States Army, Dr. Robert Bartholow, in the Surgeon General's Statistical Report for 1860. With a keen medical eye he had detected while in Utah the emergence of a new race, the offspring of polygamist marriages, which he characterized thus: The "Mormon expression or style" is "an expression of compounded sen-

suality, cunning, suspicion, and a smirking self-conceit. The yellow, sunken, cadaverous visage; the greenish colored eyes; the thick, protuberant lips; the low forehead; the light, yellowish hair; and the lank, angular person, constitute an appearance so characteristic of the new race, the production of polygamy, as to distinguish them at a glance (In Bush, 1979, p. 66). The report made its way into several medical journals, popular periodicals, and newspapers.

A number of authors wrote of the striking lack of beauty among the Mormon women, to which Brigham Young did not dissent. Instead, he cited this observation as proof that Mormon polygamy could not have been carnally motivated (Bush, 1979). Perhaps the most scurrilous attack on Mormon women's attractions came from Mark Twain, albeit with tongue in cheek, who observed that any man who would marry one, let alone 60 of these "poor, ungainly, and pathetically homely creatures" deserved not the harsh censure, but the applause of mankind (1872, pp. 117-18). Even an early encyclopedia describes Salt Lake City as noted for its wide streets and its homely women!

Mormon eyes in particular were different. Representative was this description from a writer in 1858 *Harper's Weekly*: "I have never yet seen a Mormon but that something ailed his eyes. They are sunken, or dark, or ghastly, or glaring. There is certainly some mania in all Mormon eyes; none of them can look you straight or steadily in the face" (In Bunker and Bitton, 1979, p. 115). The narrow canthus or almond-shaped aperture of which Brigham Young's eyes were considered the prototype was a sure sign of promiscuity. In this Brigham was grouped with the hog, the wild boar, the dog, the cat, every species of serpent and all of the ape tribes, "all known to be promiscuous in their attachments" (In Bunker and Bitton, 1979, p. 118). The Mormon lifestyle turned women into "haggard, weary, slatternly women, with lackluster eyes and wan, shapeless faces, hanging listlessly over their gates, or sitting idly in the sun-

light, perhaps nursing their yelling babies—all such women looking alike depressed, degraded, miserable, hopeless, soulless" (In Bunker and Bitton, 1979, p. 118).

Physiologically, Mormons have also been observed as different. Mormon elders' eyes, particularly those of Joseph Smith, were widely known to have the power to entrance young women and entire mobs into helpless submission. In a typical turn-of-the-century novel, Winifred Graham's *Ezra the Mormon*, Ezra the Mormon Elder was "the very nature to attract Thora—[he was] a man in whose eyes the power of dominion shone." When Thora's father tried to separate the young couple, he brought his cane down on the Mormon elder's shoulder, who "made no signs of feeling pain; he just stood and fixed his assailant with an eye of steel." He slipped his arm through Thora's. "The girl looked dazed and helpless. She tried to speak, but her trembling lips failed to frame a word. 'She's mesmerized,' half shrieked her father" (In Bunker and Bitton, 1975, p. 160). At one confrontation between Joseph Smith and a Palmyra mob, Vardis Fisher in *Children of God* describes one man who, slowly withdrawing, with his gaze on Joseph's face, spoke out of sudden awe, "Look at his eyes! Men, look at his eyes!" The men soon departed, and "Joseph was left alone, a man courageous and fearless, whose eyes, whose strange intense directness, had abashed his enemies" (In Bunker and Bitton, 1975, p. 160).

Even more notable than Mormon eyes was the Mormon male's amazing sexual stamina—so amazing, in fact, that for the purchase price of Mormon Elder Wafers or a box of Brigham Young pills, even an impotent gentile could partake in the good life (Bush, 1977, p. 89).

Mormons and Health

In more modern times, Mormon physiology has been shown to be different from that of the general populace in longevity and quality of health.

Dr. Joseph Lyon has published statistics showing that, despite the increased incidence of leukemias in Southern Utah following the years of the Nevada nuclear bomb testing, Mormons in Utah as well as in California have strikingly lower incidences of various cancers. These include cancers that can be attributed to tobacco smoking and to sexual promiscuity, but also some that are related to neither, such as liver and kidney cancers, and thus far have no explanation (Lyon and Nelson, 1979).

Mormons are sociologically different. Joseph F. Smith once observed that a religion which could not save a man temporarily and make him prosperous could not save him spiritually and make him exalted (In Bowen, p. 36). Tests of temporal salvation should bear some relationship to tests of good physical and mental health as well as prosperity.

Defining what constitutes physical and mental health is difficult. Parameters that have been measured include education level, per capita income, divorce rates, alcoholism rates, venereal disease rates, suicide rates, etc. Statistics for Utah, often considered representative of statistics for Mormons, are more inspiring than frequent letters to the editor of the *Salt Lake Tribune* would have us believe. Utah is not above the national average, but forty-sixth in alcoholism rate (American Demographics, 1983). Utah's teen/young adult suicide rate is above the national average, but this is true of all 11 Western states, among which Utah places next to lowest (Seiden, 1984, p. 970). While Utah's divorce rate is indeed slightly higher than the national average, a factor likely skewing the data is that, in Utah, a large percentage of pregnant teenage girls marry, not a popular recourse in other states. These marriages tend to fail at higher rates, as well. A breakdown by counties shows the divorce rate in Utah County, presumably a bastion of gospel living, to be much lower than either the national average or Salt Lake County, presumably a den of relative iniquity (Langlois, 1981, pp. 15-18.) However, some sociologists find the exclusion of

the less-than-good Mormons (in this case those in Salt Lake County) untenable. A comparison of Mormon "best" to non-Mormon "average" says less about the health-promoting aspects of a Mormon lifestyle than comparison of Mormon-best with non-Mormon-best; for instance, the divorce rate among devout, church-going Catholics. Carried to the extreme of meaninglessness, we might be tempted to extol Mormon sexual morality by comparing out-of-wedlock pregnancies among good Mormon girls with the national average, defining "good Mormon girls" as virgins, and arriving at a tautological zero percent sexual immorality for this group. Dr. Lyon's quote of Pappworth is good enough to be passed on: "Medical statistics are like bikinis, concealing that which is vital while revealing much that is interesting" (1979, p. 95).

Recent attention to depression has included the Spendlove study which found that Mormon women are depressed, but no more nor less than other women (Spendlove, West, and Stanish, 1984, pp. 491-95), and the Burgoyne study (1977) which suggested that overt paradoxes in their belief system make them so.

Having pointed out some of the difficulties in formal studies of the effect of an LDS lifestyle on all-around health, I will attempt, instead, to relate some informal observations, some personal, some borrowed, of psychopathology as it manifests itself in religion-related thought and behavior patterns.

Religious Manifestations of Psychopathology

I recently hospitalized a Mormon bishop whose emotional fervor in conducting a funeral was followed by a sleepless night, agitation, a sexual interlude with his wife which made him feel "exalted," insistence that his children stand naked outdoors in the snow at 5:00 A.M. to be exalted with him, and his throwing objects out of the closed windows.

In the hospital he continued to testify in King James English and a loud

voice, and to give solemn pronouncements by priesthood authority, punctuated by the not-too-gentle laying on of large hands, the crumpling of bed mattresses, and the shattering of drinking glasses in confusing his physical with his spiritual strength. He was a big man and seemed to be entertaining the notion of rearranging me next.

A nonreligiously inclined nurse commented what a shame it was that devotion to religion had this effect on people. Eventually, as lithium took effect, the patient was eager to go home on a pass to plow snow from the church parking lot, to conduct required interviews, and to spread the gospel of medication to distressed Saints in his ward, all the while extolling the virtues of his treaters and counselors.

A nonreligious psychiatrist, observing this, asked, "He's still manic, isn't he?" I replied, "No, he's back to baseline bishop; that's the way bishops are." During his psychotic state, the nurse confused his religion with his illness. In his recovered state, the doctor confused his illness with his religion. The line between religious thought or behavior and mental disorder is sometimes thin.

Does Mormon religion predispose one to psychopathology? The answer is no. But just as one's personality traits become exaggerated under stress and illness, what is already important to one may become the focus or matrix upon which one's symptoms become evident. What factors in a Mormon orientation contribute to the matrix?

Evangelism

Any church seeking to spread the gospel through missionary efforts is likely to find a disproportionate share of converts among people dissatisfied with their adaptation to life or unsuccessful at it for a variety of reasons, including mental illness or personality disorder. In the case of LDS conversion, the enormous amount of attention missionaries give potential converts would be attractive not only to the "honest in heart" but to passive-dependent per-

sonalities, people ostracized from their social group, or those with a narcissistic bent for the limelight. This may be thought of as analogous to the "potato Mormons" of postwar Germany who joined the Church for the effect of its welfare program on their empty stomachs. The need for filling the empty spaces in one's psyche is also great.

K.L., a 23-year-old, unmarried LDS convert of five years, was a girl with this need. Ostracized by her family, she moved into the home of a generous Relief Society president, a large home in an old, upper-class neighborhood. There, a peculiarity or two surfaced. Her poetry—sometimes good, always romantic—was difficult to comprehend, and she walked through the house with garlic bulbs and honey between her toes. Her explanation was simple: garlic to ward off cold viruses and honey to keep the garlic bulbs in place.

One day the Relief Society president drove into her driveway and noticed a young boy staring at a second-story window. At the window stood her seemingly oblivious house guest, striking poses utterly nude. Horrified, she ran upstairs, shouting, "Karen, what on earth are you doing?" The girl, continuing to pose in front of the mirror, nonchalantly replied, "You can see the resemblance, can't you? I've traced my genealogy back to Venus!"

Her next stop was my office. There, she disclosed her conviction that her bosses at the medical research department where she worked were infatuated with her. The evidence was erased messages on the blackboards, visible only to herself, and faintly overheard phone conversations. My diagnosis was Clerambault's Syndrome, a rare, schizophrenia-like delusional belief that one is the object of passionate love by an inattentive and not well known other. Her investigation of the Church had been characterized by a great deal of attention from two missionaries. Her desperate need to be accepted for the only feminine trait that she knew much of—allure—led her hopes of salvation from two missionaries to two researchers

through the paragon of allure, the Venus de Milo, with whose femininity she could identify.

Trust in Miracles and Mistrust of Medicine

Faith in the intervention of a personal god is certainly commendable. What is less commendable, is the too-frequent view that God must intervene even when adequate human intervention is available. Patients who have been promised in blessings that they will recover from illness, if they exercise faith, worry that to turn then to medical doctors for treatment would be a denial of faith in the efficacy of the blessing or the Lord's power to heal.

One patient faced with this dilemma was B.E., a seriously and psychotically involuntarily depressed 75-year-old woman who had great difficulty tolerating several antidepressants that had been serially tried. She was given a blessing in which she was promised recovery. We urged hospitalization for electroconvulsive treatment, which for this type of depression is safe, rapid, and more effective than medication. To consent, she felt, would jeopardize her standing with the Lord as a result of the blessing. Meanwhile she became progressively more incapable of exercising faith, getting out of bed, or even thinking logically. Her husband finally brought her into the hospital, creating enormous guilt in her, or rather shifting its focus, since every trivial thing she did now seemed to evoke enormous guilt. Within seven days and with electroconvulsive treatment, she was virtually depression-free.

Parenthetically, I recall a real dilemma as an intern when asked, as we frequently were, to anoint and bless our own patients. It was difficult to lay aside our knowledge of the medical aspects of the case and listen for the Spirit. My fellow LDS house officers and I solved the dilemma by a cop-out of sorts. We would bless each others' patients willingly when asked, but not our own. But individually, I often prayed for my own, and for their intern.

Public reinforcement of a related attitude is the convention of exalting the Lord's power by devaluing the medical profession in testimony meeting with statements such as these: "The doctor didn't know what to do for me." "All the doctors were fooled." "The doctor said it was impossible." "They said they have never seen a case like mine." "Everyone had given up hope."

Because anecdotes of treatment successes and failures in illness circulate freely and with the overtones of spirituality, many a patient's decision regarding medical care is made on the basis not of prudence, but of consensus within the group. Word of mouth recommendations by Latter-day Saints lead people to quacks and quack medicine. A new phenomenon along the Wasatch Front, involving LDS as well as others, is the development of quasi-cocaine addiction on procaine under the name Gerovital.

A tragic illustration of religious faith in quackery is the case of D.S., a recently married 22-year-old girl with lupus, an ultimately terminal multi-organ disease. She was taking a relatively low dose of prednisone when admitted to the hospital with the psychotic delusion that she was married to Christ. Despite her gradual improvement with treatment, her husband was not satisfied. He knew of a good sister who claimed to have cured her own child of lupus by natural means. He wanted his wife to see the woman. The dangers of abrupt discontinuance of steroids were strongly emphasized to the patient and her husband, who were aware of them anyway as the patient's older sister, also on prednisone for lupus, had discontinued it abruptly and almost died. The husband insisted his wife be discharged from the hospital contrary to medical advice. The wife, not psychotic enough to meet criteria for involuntary commitment, but not a strong enough person to oppose her husband's fanaticism, misidentified as priesthood authority, passively went with him to the natural healer. Two weeks later, I received a phone call from a police sergeant, want-

ing to know what I could tell him about a certain D.S. who had died that morning and whose husband was tight-lipped as to the circumstances. A full and untouched bottle of prednisone was found in her bedroom.

Spirituality or Supernaturalism

Many Latter-day Saints, like other sincere people, operate out of a set of superstitions rather than religious belief. This tendency may manifest itself in such simple ways as mistaking wishful thinking for answer to prayer, or such complex ways as dissociative reactions, autohypnosis, or overt psychosis. These are often misinterpreted as possession states, to be treated by casting out demons. Searching for evil spirits to banish from a schizophrenic psychosis is a futile task, demoralizing the giver of the blessing when it doesn't work, and heaping guilt upon the suffering of the victim. Casting out devils has appeal for some, but far less efficacy than a little antipsychotic medication.

The terrifying possibilities of this misconception are shown in the case of L.R., a 26-year-old married college student, who was nearing graduation and preparing to be a seminary teacher. One week he was very moved when he picked up a hitchhiker and discovered in their conversation that the hitchhiker's father, though not LDS, had been paying tithing. He took that to mean something of considerable significance, if nothing more specific than its demonstration of the unusual presence of "the Spirit" that week.

Other similar experiences were taken to be spiritual manifestations over the next few days. One night, after watching *Mary Poppins* on television, he noticed in the credits names very similar to Nephite names. He was amazed. Then he felt the presence of someone entering the room. He quietly locked the door so the presence would remain, thoroughly convinced that it was one of the Three Nephites. In the intensity of the moment, he became aware that his faith was to be tested, as had been suggested by an overzealous religion

teacher, in the same manner as Abraham of old. He got a knife from the kitchen, entered the room of his nine-month-old son, took the baby from the crib, and placed him on the dressing table. He raised the knife and closed his eyes. Unable to reenact Abraham's part, he was relieved as he opened his eyes to see that the baby had moved, a sign he regarded as divine intervention. He returned the baby to the crib and left.

Soon the anxious feeling came over him that he had not been adequately tested. Even though the baby may have moved by heavenly means, his hand had to be stayed in order for the test to be genuine. He returned to the room, repeated the scene. This time the baby did not move nor was the father's hand stayed. He was dumbfounded as the knife hit its mark, causing his little son to scream.

Then it became clear that the requirements of the test were different. He was meant to sacrifice his son as God had sacrificed His Only Begotten Son, and then to sacrifice himself. He drew the knife across his own body in a ritualistic manner. His wife, entering the room, saw the blood and ran for the assistance of the couple downstairs. As the young couple came up, he received that the test had changed again. Rather than join his son in heaven, he was to heal him. The neighbors and his wife knelt with him in a prayer circle, his son in the center. He had already cancelled the ambulance his wife had called, since an ambulance would negate the test. Twice the neighbors got him into the car to take him to the hospital. Twice he got out and returned to the room. Over the next two hours, more blessings were said, he reassured them by the power of his priesthood that everything would be all right, and eventually they all retired to bed. At 4:00 A.M. he called the bishop: "Bishop, do you have enough faith to raise my son from the dead?" The psychotic delusion of the young man is obvious. One wonders not so much about him as about the other three presumably sane adults in that room that night, and their understand-

ing of priesthood power.

Authoritarianism

The expected response to an authoritarian system is obedience. The progression of learning in the temple endowment begins with obedience. It does not end with obedience. Presumably, once obedience is mastered, there are more ascendent principles to learn. Too many Mormons seem to suffer from developmental arrest with obedience, always looking up for direction. Medically, one might think of obedience as the chief trait of a good patient, compliant and ready to do just what the doctor ordered. However, this patient, when given options in the treatment process, says, "You're the doctor," and when given tasks that require his own effort, says, "I was hoping you just had some kind of pill that would take care of it." One doesn't easily help a patient who wants not help but a take-over. We have benefitted recently by the wisdom of Norman Cousins, former editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature*, in his book *Anatomy of an Illness* (1979). He not only found a healing spirit, humor, to be essential in the apparent cure of his ankylosing spondylitis, but he emphasized that the patient must ultimately be in charge of his own health, with his doctor as advisor and collaborator. As a rheumatologist friend of mine tells his patients who want him to take over, "It's difficult for me to be more interested in your illness than you are."

Another manifestation of authoritarianism is regarding Joseph Smith's and Brigham Young's herbal recommendations as divine in origin. One might just as logically find a statement by Joseph or Brigham recommending travel by horseback and conclude that the car and airplane are anti-gospel. Thompsonian herbal medicine is still the standard of a good many Mormons as documented by Lee Smith (1979), including some in high places whose use of herbs lends the apparent stamp of approval. One such highly placed patient was recently hospitalized and

found to be on 26 different herbs, at least six of which were potentially toxic and could have caused his symptoms.

Authoritarianism can mean that patients delay needed psychiatric treatment because their personal physician or bishop recommends against it.

The desire to be in authoritative hands affects treatment. A common religious belief between treater and patient often impresses more than medical credentials, especially in psychiatry. Many LDS patients search for clues of a psychiatrist's stance toward religion, assuming rightly or wrongly that this also identifies his values, and wrongly, his desire to impose those values on his patient or to judge his patients by them. (Both imposition and judging are antithetical to psychiatry.) Scanning ploys include looking for a temple garment line, remarking, "I don't know if you are LDS, but . . .," followed by a pause and a hope for the gap to be filled in, listening for identifying jargon, or even directly inquiring as to the psychiatrist's current Church job. There are situations in which I definitely believe a psychiatric patient should see a psychiatrist of the same religious persuasion. But in situations where the treatment is primarily biological, as much of psychiatry is nowadays, or does not require considerable awareness of LDS culture and values, I believe it makes little difference. In 1963, an attempt was made in the Utah legislature to mandate noninfluence by therapists in public mental health centers on the patient's religious beliefs. A schizophrenic's delusional belief that he was called of God to save the world from his mother-in-law, whom he regarded as a sorceress and deserving of death, could not have been interfered with under this law.

Authoritarianism leads to obsessive compulsiveness and inappropriate guilt. What are the features of the obsessive compulsive personality? These are people who see the world through facts, logic, and reason. They discount the data by which their opposites, hysterical personalities, experience their world—

through hunches, intuitions, inspirations, and feelings. Obsessiveness is characterized by industrious activity; performance of duty; restraint of anger, aggression, and sexuality; conscientiousness; orderliness; perfectionism; meticulousness; and frugality. What personality characteristics are typically valued by Mormons? Psychiatrist Marlene Payne (1980) observes that they are the same. Obsessives tend to see most questions, including neutral ones, as moral. They agree with the hymn, "There's a right and a wrong to every question." Mormons need to realize that some decisions are not between right and wrong, but between A and B, or one good and another good.

Some, warned by another hymn that "angels above us are silent notes taking," are in such fear of making a wrong decision that they can't decide at all until all the facts are in. There is rarely a situation in which all the facts are in. Agonizing over the wording of a letter so that the fifth revision is sent a month late, or standing at the ice cream counter indecisively weighing the pros and cons of vanilla versus peppermint fudge, or changing clothes three times before settling on something to wear to work are typical dilemmas. I often have to emphasize to patients that moral decisions are those on which God has an opinion. I suspect he does not care which tie one wears to work.

Obsessives commonly avoid decisions by seeking endless counsel from Church authorities. Elder Packer called this behavior "going on the spiritual dole" (1978, p. 91). Unfortunately, indecisive obsessives can always find those who are very willing to boldly step in and decide for those who won't. These people represent another variety of obsessiveness, characterized by rigidity. They are happy to determine truth and right for everyone.

Consider the example of a 40-year-old marginally mentally retarded mother of six, whose husband's intellectual capacity was not greater than hers. She was admitted to the hospital

with a self-inflicted stab wound of the abdomen which missed her pregnant uterus. Having already exceeded the number of children she had the capacity to care for, she could not face the prospect of another baby. A bishop counseled her that birth control was always wrong, and wrong for everyone, and that she could avoid another child only through sexual abstinence, which, curiously, he did not consider birth control. Marital harmony deteriorated, and tensions arose between husband and wife. Relenting once, she accepted his advances, resulting in the present pregnancy. Whatever needs the bishop's authoritarian pronouncements served, they did not serve hers.

Obsessive people are quick to spot wrongs. Sometimes, as in scrupulosity syndrome, the wrongs are seen to reside in others. One sister, for example, regularly criticized the ward chorister's choice of a sacrament hymn if it did not mention sacrament or atonement. More often, the wrongs are found in themselves. They strive for perfection, becoming demoralized when not reaching it right now, and feel enormously guilty. A religion imposing rigid rules of conduct, and straight and narrow ways to approval from God, is bound to make guilt a major issue.

Now guilt can be an enormously beneficial experience, producing growth and transforming one's life. Neurotic guilt, which self-condemns, devalues, and brings into doubt one's acceptability before God, does not lead to growth but rather obstructs growth. In the King James Bible, Jesus admonishes in Matthew 5:48, "Be ye therefore perfect even as your father which is in heaven is perfect." Lowell Bennion has pointed out to me the beauty and good sense of the New English Bible's translation, "There must be no limit to your goodness, as your Heavenly Father's goodness knows no bounds."

Neurotic guilt motivated F.D., a 24-year-old returned missionary. He was referred for treatment by a General Authority, the last and highest in a succession of priesthood leaders he had

sought out, looking for and receiving absolution for a terrible transgressions which occurred while on his mission. Yet the absolution was never effective.

As a missionary in a backward country, he had sought treatment from a medical doctor for fever and weakness. He was diagnosed as having liver disease and given medication. The next morning he felt so utterly dysphoric that he left his companion, went to the mountains, crawled into a small crevasse, buried himself with leaves, and waited to die. After awhile, finding himself still buried but very much alive, to his dismay, he arose, went down the mountain, rejoined his companion, and discovered a time span he could not account for. Wondering what he could have done during that time, he began to worry about all the possibilities, the worst being sexual transgression. He soon mentally converted a possibility into a probability, and a probability into a certainty, despite knowing not a single female in the town who could have been a partner. He confessed to the mission president who, though disbelieving, ultimately agreed with the elder's urgent request to send him home three weeks early because he could keep nothing on his mind but the thought of the potential-sin-turned-certain-sin.

Or consider the guilt which plagued O.V., a 32-year-old executive secretary and mother of four. She was admitted to the hospital through the emergency room in a psychotic state, which injuries from a suicide attempt, haunted by the delusional belief that she was becoming Satan. When she was 16, in an impoverished, alcoholic, single-parent family, she derived virtually her only source of self-esteem from seminary activity where she was an officer. A lesson strongly emphasized the blessings of paying tithing. The patient paid tithing on a meager babysitting wage that week. Soon afterward, she obtained a regular babysitting job which put spending money in her pocket. Excited, she convinced her mother to tithe. Her mother received an unexpected promotion with a considerable increase in

salary. At age 32, she saw that her motive for paying tithing was to obtain blessings, consistent with pulpit rhetoric. Enormous guilt followed when she realized that the true purpose of tithing included such things as learning charity and taking care of the poor, but not material return on investment. Feeling so guilty that she had hoped for and, in fact, received material blessings from her tithe offering, she concluded that she must be evil in nature and must end her life before she became even more so.

A.E., a 32-year-old single school teacher who had completed a Church mission death with guilt differently. Having difficulty with postmission loneliness, she discovered a sense of intimacy through autoerotic fantasy. Eventually hospitalized when depression interfered with her ability to teach, she confided her embarrassing secret to her psychiatrist and added that her bishop had threatened to excommunicate her for it. This punishment clearly seemed to exceed the sin. A phone call to the bishop revealed that he had not threatened her church membership for masturbation, but rather for her penchant for confessing it to everyone. Indeed, by then, she had disclosed her secret to most of the patients on the ward as well as to a good share of the members in her ward.

Passive-aggressiveness is another common response to authority. Psychiatrist K-Lynn Paul tells the story of a priesthood quorum in which all six members discussed and five agreed on an activity for the following Saturday morning, one member dissenting. On that Saturday morning, only one person arrived for the activity—the person who had dissented (1977, p. 86). Most of us give some degree of lip service to church principles, practices, and programs which we disavow by our actions. Such actions may include stubbornness, obstructionism, pouting, procrastination, inefficiency, intentional mediocrity, lateness, laziness, or agreement to do what one has no intention of doing—the purpose being to reflect disagreement or hostility one doesn't dare

express openly.

If we are unable to voice our opinion or gain consideration of it, we can retaliate through drinking or through indifference to the offending person. If we are angry at our spouse, overtime work or dedication to a hobby becomes an enticing mistress. If we are unhappy with our position, excusing ourselves from performing obligations through medical complaints is also common.

Passive-aggression is often the recourse if confrontation is absolutely unacceptable. Many Mormons feel that way about confrontation. Priesthood manuals counsel against anger. A Church president is quoted as saying there is no reason for a harsh word ever to pass between husband and wife. Some leaders view criticism as a threat. Those who speak out are regarded with suspicion. Their testimonies are seen as shallow and their sense of propriety lacking. Yet this willingness to express dissatisfaction, observes Paul (1979) may have been what led a Saint out of his former church and into the LDS Church. Without freedom of members to interact honestly, says Paul, a new leader never knows whom he can count on.

Psychodynamic theory postulates that obsessive-compulsive character traits develop from a need to limit emotions and instincts, the expression of which would be devastating. A variety of defenses can be used, the most severe of which are compulsive rituals to maintain rigid control lest unacceptable impulses be expressed.

Such rituals were employed by M.W., a religious and wholesome-appearing, recently married homemaker of 26. She would make her home as secure as possible every night by a ritual of checking danger zones again and again before she could put herself and her anxiety to bed. The stove dials and water faucets had to be turned off half a dozen times each before she could be absolutely certain the house was safe from fire or flood. Her front door lock was turned repeatedly to preclude break-in. Searching in psychotherapy for the origins of these symbolic at-

tempts to control her inner world with its destructive impulses, she recalled several events of which these two were typical. One summer weekend in her teens, she and her parents returned from an outing at the seashore to find the coffee pot turned on and red hot, the water having long since boiled away. Her mother, the only coffee maker/drinker in the family, poured vicious and unending accusations and blame on her. Somehow, she had been expected to check. The other significant incident was at the time of her engagement to a young man not of her faith. Her mother, mortified that her daughter would marry outside her religion, exclaimed she would rather be dead than attend such a wedding. The patient, in a rare moment of courage, persisted with the marriage plans. A month later, her mother died of a widely disseminated malignant tumor discovered two weeks after the wedding. The patient's dutiful checking ritual each night served as her attempt to undo her near-disastrous disobedience to her mother regarding coffee pots and her fatal disobedience regarding marriage. At the same time, checking against fire, flood, and break-in was a symbolic way to keep in check her fiery flood of unconscious anger toward her mother, seeing to it that her feelings never would break into consciousness.

Meticulous concern for minor detail, for the trivia of life, allows one to avoid life's major issues. In like manner, a whirlwind of activity may have the purpose of avoiding emotion and closeness. Many Mormons feel guilty if they do not attend Church meetings, keep a journal, grow a garden, exercise, do genealogy, read the scriptures and Church magazines, have family home evening, volunteer in the community, develop talents, keep home and yard up, and be a good neighbor and a good citizen. While the idle mind may be the devil's workshop, frenetic activity is the exorcist of emotion.

A telling example is that of a sister in one of the highest positions of responsibility in a general Church auxil-

ary. One morning she encountered her daughter and infant granddaughter on the sidewalk in the neighborhood where both resided. After chatting for a few minutes, the grandmother looked at her watch, exclaimed, "I guess I'd better quit wasting my time!" and hurried on.

More problematic is the case of a 32-year-old mother of four who taught piano lessons, wrote road shows, produced community pageants, became the crisis line for neighbors, and generally involved herself in activity from sunrise to sundown and beyond. If she did not keep busy in this way, she preoccupied herself with every minor lump and bump she could detect on her own skin, or that of her husband or children. The need for reassurance was endless. Yes, the bump was there a year ago; no, the lump had not grown in size; no, the mole had not turned darker; yes, swollen glands are common with a cold, etc. Her preoccupation with cancer was only one such ruminative activity. In testimony meeting she wanted to bear witness of knowing for a certainty, but found herself, instead, merely believing strongly. Trying to recall a past feeling she accepted as the confirmation of the Holy Ghost, she then began to regard her "believing" testimony as a denial of that "knowing" confirmation. Aware that "denying the Holy Ghost" relegated one to outer darkness, her arrival in my office, just this side of outer darkness in her mind, was a response to her overwhelming fear that her less-than-certain statement of testimony made her a son of perdition.

Inflexibility

Where religion neatly and tidily explains everything, there is little room to doubt and great capacity for high expectations. Some Latter-day Saints believe that any problem can be solved by using gospel methods and any blessing can be obtained by understanding and applying the principles upon which it is predicated. The Lord must intervene as we bind him by doing what he says. Such expectations, attested to again and again by fellow Saints, may lead

those who fail to prosper to search their souls with Job's home teachers for the great wrong, or to be demoralized by the Calvinistic conclusion that only they among the elders' quorum or neighborhood block were not elected to grace. Some, so used to the meticulously rigid fitting of every piece into its proper place, abandon the whole puzzle on encountering a nonfitting piece.

This is what happened to M.B., a young physician and father of three who had led a charmed life. Handsome, athletic, personable, kind and loving, he was a National Merit Scholar and special Presidential Scholar at the university where his graduation GPA was 3.95. Marrying a classmate of a very different personality style and background because he "thought [he] could help her," he then departed for medical school at one of the nation's most prestigious universities. Tension in the marriage was dealt with through good-natured, patient, long-suffering attitudes while devotion to religious principle and Church activity remained high. However, the long-awaited blessings did not follow obedience. The marital differences did not improve. In his discouragement over unmet expectations for a happy ending, silence in response to prayer and disillusionment over what he had once felt was a revelatory stamp of approval on his betrothal, he proved unusually susceptible to the charms of a young nurse at the hospital of his residency. Having no flexibility in his rigid scheme of neatly packaged understanding to account for the failed blessing, he threw over his temple marriage, wife, and children and left town with the nurse.

Conclusion

While religion can be used as a growth-producing, soul-expanding system, it can also be used neurotically. In *The Future of an Illusion*, Freud called religion "the universal obsessional neurosis of humanity," or "a system of wishful illusions together with a disavowal of reality" (In Clark, 1978, p. 26). Psychiatrist Owen Clark reminds

us he was basically agreeing with Joseph Smith, who revealed that "all their creeds were an abomination in God's sight; that those professors were all corrupt." Freud explained that he "was concerned much less with the deepest sources of religious feeling than with what the common man understands by his religion—with a system of doctrines and promises which, on the one hand, explains to him the riddles of this world with enviable completeness, and on the other, assures him that a careful Providence will watch over his life and will compensate him in a future existence for any frustrations he suffers here" (Clark, 1978, p. 74). He saw religion as bringing upon mankind the same kinds of restrictions as neurosis brings upon an individual and was aware of the use of religious dogma historically to keep an ignorant populace under control.

Physicians have, I believe, a special obligation to reject the nineteenth-century reductionism of natural phenomena which influenced Freud and Darwin and seems to pervade science to the present day. The view that all that exists is matter and all that occurs is motion suggests that human beings are a meaningless flicker in the blind careening of the cosmos. We regard people as body, mind, and spirit, and have therefore an obligation to treat all of people—mind and spirit as well as body. Pictures of prophets and temples on walls of some practitioners' offices have been used to influence a patient's spirit, but this attempt to claim virtue by association is out of place. However, the absence of any semblance of spiritual concern gives just as strong a message and just as false that "religion is not spoken here." An invitation to discuss spiritual concerns if he chooses can be offered a patient in a number of ways. One gastroenterologist colleague of mine does it with his wall decor—not blatantly with prophets and temples but subtly with an inverted triangle symbolizing the Trinity, under which is the inscription, "God loves you. Pass it on." In my own office, an impressionist painting serves the same purpose. To

the spiritually inclined, it looks like a church; to the spiritually disinterested, a lighthouse.

Religion in general, and LDS religion in particular, does not cause mental disorder. However, because of its central position in a believer's life, it often becomes the matrix upon which psychopathology finds its expression. It may be the ideology by which one rationalizes his neurotic style of living. It may provide the forms and symbols through which psychotic thought disorder and perceptual distortions are expressed. It may precipitate distress leading to breakdown of ability to live effectively. It may just as readily provide the structure that channels creative energy in peaceful and desirable directions, the communal support which buoys one up under discouragement and despair, the affirmation of one's individual worth, the opportunity and direction for growth and personal fulfillment, and the anxiety-ameliorating answers to the existential questions of life's meaning. Whether the impact of religion upon our physical, mental, and spiritual health is positive or negative is undetermined in the general case, but in the specific case, we have some choice.

Louis Moench is a psychiatrist at LDS and St. Mark's Hospitals. He teaches at the University of Utah School of Medicine, and is a Sunday School teacher in his ward. He and his wife Debie have three children.

American Demographics, December 1983, p. 37.

Burgoyne & Burgoyne: "Conflict Secondary to Overt Paradoxes in Belief Systems: The Mormon Women Example." *The Journal of Operational Psychiatry*, 1977, 8 (2), 39-45.

Burton, Jeff, "The Phenomenon of the Closet Doubter," *Sunstone*, Sept.-Oct. 1982, 7 (5), 35-38.

Bush, Lester, "Mormon Elder Wafers," *Dialogue*, Spring 1977, 10 (2), 89.

Cousins, Norman, *Anatomy of an Illness*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1979.

Fisher, Vardis, *Children of God*, New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1939, p. 30, as quoted in Bunker and Bitton, "Mesmerism."

- Freud, Sigmund, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*. James Strachey (trans). Vol XXI p. 43, as quoted in Owen Clark, "Freud as Friend of the Gospel," *Dialogue*, 1978, 11 (3), 26.
- Graham, Winifred [Cory], *Ezra the Mormon*. London: Everett & Co., 1908, p. 19, as quoted in Bunker and Bitton, "Mesmerism and Mormonism," *BYU Studies*, Winter 1975, 15 (2), 160.
- Harper's Weekly* 2 (4 Dec. 1858): 72, as quoted in Gary L. Bunker and Davis Bitton, "Polygamous Eyes: A Note on Mormon Physiognomy," *Dialogue*, 1979, 12 (3), 115.
- Langlois, Larry, "Marital Dissolution and Family Solidarity," *Journal of the Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists*, 1981, 7 (2), 15-18.
- Lawson, Ed., Statistical Report, p. 301-2, as quoted in Lester Bush, "A Peculiar People," *Dialogue* 1979, 12 (3), 66.
- Lyon, Joseph L., and Steven Nelson, "Mormon Health," *Dialogue* 1979, 12 (3), 87-92.
- McCarthy, Justin, "Lochinvar in Salt Lake," *Harper's Weekly* 15 (22 July 1871): 675, as quoted in Bunker and Bitton, p. 118.
- Osler, William, as quoted by Howard P. Rome, "Personal Reflections," *Psychiatric Annals* 1983, 13 (10), 751.
- Packer, Boyd K., "Solving Emotional Problems in the Lord's Own Way," *Ensign*, May 1978, 91.
- Payne, Marlene, "The Obsessive-Compulsive Mormon," *Dialogue*, 1980, 13 (2), 166.
- Paul, K-Lynn, "Passive Aggression and the Believer," *Dialogue*, 1977, 10 (4), 86-91.
- Poll, Richard, "What the Church Means to People Like Me," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 1967, 2 (4), 108.
- Seiden, Richard H., "Death in the West—A Regional Analysis of Youthful Suicide Rate," *The Western Journal of Medicine*, 140 (6), 970.
- Smith, Joseph, *The Pearl of Great Price*, 2:19.
- Smith, Joseph F., *Outwest Magazine*, Vol. 23, 1905, 242.
- Smith, N. Lee, "Herbal Remedies: God's Medicine?" *Dialogue*, 1979, 12 (3), 36-60.
- Spendlove, David, Dee West, and William Stanish, "Risk Factors in the Prevalence of Depression in Mormon Women," *Social Science & Medicine*, 1984, 18 (6), 491-495.
- Stanton, Mary O., *Encyclopedia of Face and Form Reading*. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Company, 1895, 358-359, as quoted in Bunker and Bitton, 115-116.
- Stout, Jan, "The Spectrum of Religious Beliefs and Behaviors in the Mormon Community." Lecture given at the Sunstone Theological Symposium, Salt Lake City, 1983.
- Twain, Mark, *Roughing It*. Hartford, Conn.: American Publishing Co, 1872, 117-118.
- U.S. Census, 1980.

DEALING WITH INFERTILITY PROBLEMS

**ROBERT TAYLOR, M.D. &
JAYNE EDGREN TAYLOR, M.S.W.
Presented at the AMCAP Convention
5 October 1984**

I am a physician, an internist, not an infertility specialist. My wife is a social worker at the Primary Children's Medical Center. Both of us have done some work with infertility groups with the Salt Lake Agency of LDS Social Services. In the next hour, we will outline a number of aspects of infertility and discuss how it affects the LDS couple.

I would like to open with a scenario that may be familiar to you:

When Ron and Brenda were married they assumed many things. Both had been raised in the Church, attended Church universities, gone on missions, and always planned to raise a Church-oriented family. As time went on, Brenda did not become pregnant. They consulted medical experts who indicated that their chances of having children were slim. Their initial reaction was one of shock and disbelief. How could what they had always desired in righteousness be denied them? Despite continuous fasting and prayer, Brenda did not become pregnant. The medical tests were humiliating, tedious, and expensive for the couple.

Brenda developed feelings of depression, helplessness, and isolation. They intensified as her friends became pregnant, gave birth, and mothered little ones. She felt a special sense of isolation as the topics of pregnancy, the birth process, and children were discussed among her friends.

She found very few empathic friends and relatives. Some were insensitive, and many shared advice and folklore freely. Occasionally she would go home from Relief Society or other gatherings feeling depressed and even bitter toward those who were pregnant or who had children. As she attempted to explain her predicament, she thought of past mistakes and sins she thought she had repented of. She felt guilt, unworthiness, and spiritual inadequacy.

Ron experienced similar feelings. He dwelt on past mistakes and questioned his worthiness and even his manhood. At Church meetings he was taught the importance of being a good father and he felt frustrated about being excluded from this role. In this state of despair and disappointment, communication between Ron and Brenda was difficult, and their ability to comfort each other was seriously impaired. They were in the awkward position of blaming themselves, each other, and the Lord.

This fictional situation may actually occur more often than we realize. An estimated 10 to 15 percent of the population are infertile in some way or another. In the Church, this would come out to about five people per ward.

The American Fertility Society defines an infertile couple as one which has been unable to achieve a successful pregnancy after one year of having sexual relations without using contraception. Sterility is the appropriate term when a person's reproductive capabilities have been judged irreversibly nonfunctional.

When we first attempted to learn about infertility, largely because of our personal situation, we wrote to Brigham Young University, the University of Utah, and LDS Social Services to see if

any studies had been done on infertile people in the LDS culture or the LDS Church. All responses were negative. We wrote to an LDS leader and psychologist in California who responded, "My observation, based on a great deal of vicarious experience, is that this must be the toughest culture in the Western world in which to have that problem." Now, why would that be? Why is it so tough for Latter-day Saints to deal with infertility?

We think there may be a number of reasons, the first being Church doctrine with its emphasis on birth and families. We are taught that we come to earth to gain a body. A woman's role in the birth process is given great emphasis and is an important part of our doctrine. We hear about it every day and every week in our Church. If you are a Mormon and a woman, you must bear children.

The second reason is related to what we believe our role will be in the eternities. Our eternal role — and goal—is being parents. We believe that Heavenly Father is a father and Heavenly Mother is a mother and that we will eventually, if we are righteous, have an opportunity for eternal propagation. This doctrine puts incredible pressure on someone who is infertile, who is willing and ready, but unable to have children. The pressure is exerted in hundreds of simple, subtle ways.

In the Old Testament, Adam and Eve are instructed to multiply and replenish the earth. In Old Testament times, this is emphasized in innumerable ways. A woman who was unable to bear children is compared to barren ground. Jacob's wife Rachel implored, "Give me children or else I die" (Genesis 30:1). In other words, she felt she would rather be dead than barren. An interesting section in First Samuel describes another infertile woman named Hannah.

... The Lord hath shut up her womb.
And her adversary also provoked her
sore, for to make her fret ... therefore,
she wept and did not eat ... And she was
in bitterness of soul, and prayed unto the

Lord, and wept sore (1 Samuel 1:5-7, 10).

In our day strong emphasis is given to pregnancy and birth, not just to nurturing and mothering. N. Eldon Tanner said, "One of woman's greatest privileges, blessings, and opportunities is to be a co-partner with God in bringing spirit children into the world. What a glorious concept, no greater honor can be given" (Tanner, 1973). Those who are infertile have a hard time dealing with such messages. Many kinds of material can cause pain. For example, Boyd K. Packer's outstanding pamphlet written for the youth about the importance of keeping clean morally contains some interesting statements. Listen and imagine you are infertile.

The power of creation is given to virtually every individual who is born into mortality. Someday you will hold a little boy or a little girl in your arms and know that two of you have acted in partnership with our Heavenly Father in creating a life. Our Heavenly Father has bestowed his choicest gift upon you, this power of creation. I picture you with little children about you and see your love growing with them" (Packer, 1973).

In Church one day, our daughter said, "Someday I will be a mother." We didn't tell her that. It's just something she absorbed.

Perhaps we ought to think about teaching our youth that 10 or 15 percent of them may not have children biologically, and other option may need to be explored.

For LDS couples, a real crisis can be the struggle of faith versus acceptance of infertility. Very few infertile couples have not pleaded with God, trying to have enough faith to bear children, especially when many are given blessings that tell them if they have enough faith they will have children. This creates an interesting and painful paradox. If you have enough faith you will have children, and yet if you are trying to have faith to have the children, you may have difficulty in accepting infertility and trying to resolve it.

Another point is closely related and deals with the cultural aspects of Mormonism and infertility. The priesthood holder may not be as affected as a woman, but indirectly there is an underlying sense that the more children you have, the more "arrows in your quiver." Some men communicate the idea to an infertile man that his virility is somehow questioned. In fast and testimony meeting, the infertile couple see a father bless a baby and the mother afterwards stand to bear her testimony about how wonderful it is to bring this child into the world. Much of Relief Society teaching assumes motherhood in the examples used even if the topic is not motherhood. An infertile couple must frequently deal with pressure from their parents who desire grandchildren.

Jayne Taylor

A large portion of our lives as Latter-day Saints centers on reproduction, parenthood, and raising children.

When couples become aware that reproduction is delayed or unattainable, they enter a stage of emotional crisis—the crisis of infertility (Platt, et al., 1973). The emotions include feelings of surprise, denial, frustration, anger, guilt, and typically isolation. Another initial reaction is the sense of helplessness and anger at losing control over one's life plan and body. This reaction is particularly true of people who are goal-oriented and people who need to have control over their lives. The feelings of one or both partners may negatively interfere with many areas of their marriage such as communication, sexual adjustment, and the whole quality of their life. A common fear for an infertile couple is that the fertile partner might abandon the infertile one, or worse, stay in the relationship resentfully. Some even make offers of divorce or say such provoking things as, "Well, if you had married someone else, you would have a family by now" (Mazor, 1979). The fertile partner may hide his or her disappointment and anger instead of dealing honestly with his or her feelings. Often

we find that single people who know they are infertile will retreat from relationships or keep them superficial because they don't want this dreadful secret to be out. Married people may do the same.

Infertility can also reactivate unresolved past feelings of danger or loss. Sexuality can become extremely threatened. One Relief Society sister told an infertile woman, "You are not really a woman until you have borne a child."

The next phase following the initial shock centers on body image and self-worth. Feelings of worthlessness, defectiveness, and shame are common. People become preoccupied with the infertility workup, formulate theories about why this has happened to them, why they are defective, and why they are denied something that the rest of the world can take for granted. Barbara Menning, the past National Resolve president, said,

There's a sense of loneliness and isolation in infertility that defies description. The couple frequently feel they have no one to turn to, but each other. Family and friends are often reluctant to discuss such a personal and inherently sexual problem. If they do listen, they seem to answer with platitudes and misinformation born of generations of mythology and superstition. Somehow worthiness and pregnancy get conflated (Menning, 1975).

Because of these feelings of failure and inadequacy, it is hard for a couple to discuss this with anybody. Defense mechanisms are often set up to deal with family and friends. A man and a woman often feel damaged and defective. I have heard women describe themselves as feeling hollow or empty. One woman described herself as looking like Hiroshima after the bomb. Men describe themselves as castrated or talk about intercourse as shooting blanks.

These feelings of defectiveness go further. Many people comment that they cannot do anything right. One woman was unable to work on her doctoral dissertation; she said that her mind was sterile also. I had a very hard time going

back for my master's degree until I had resolved some of my feelings about infertility. Somehow it affected my whole inner self. The monthly menstrual cycle is a terrible reminder and an enormous tension builds up towards the end of each cycle. Many women feel a deep depression verging on despair when menstruation begins. This intensity lessens over time, yet it is still always there as a reminder.

The next phase involves mourning the loss of the children a couple will never biologically have. This is a very difficult task because the loss is so vague. It is hard to define a potential. There are no funerals, no rituals to help the bereaved. It is an invisible process. I work in an intensive care unit with parents who lose children. For the most part, they have a lot of support systems—family actually present, support from family members not physically present, people who work with them, support groups, and a funeral that helps them through the grief process. But people who are infertile may have no one to talk to.

The final step is that of resolution. The couple must now redefine their sexuality so that procreation is not a central point and work at regaining a healthy self-image.

Conclusive knowledge can help people who know there is absolutely no chance of ever becoming pregnant. They can close the chapter, go through the grief process, and continue with their lives. One woman I talked to recently had had a hysterectomy after years of trying to become pregnant. She was surprised at the relief she felt knowing that she couldn't become pregnant. There are many cases of infertile women who have had tubal ligations just so they can't get pregnant.

The couple must assess their inner resources and decide what they are going to do in the absence of biological children. Sometimes this has to become a joint decision on which they can both agree, or the relationship will not last—or if it does, it will be unhappy. If you continue to have faith, does that mean

you continue to go to the doctors?

The nonresolution of infertility can be a leading cause of failure in adoptive placements. Adoption may symbolize one's inadequacy in reproduction, and the presence of the child will actually be seen as a narcissistic injury for a couple who has not worked through that infertility. The point is, adoption does not cure infertility. Anecdotal evidence to the contrary, the statistics simply do not show that adoption cures infertility. Adoption and infertility are two different issues.

Failure to grieve is the most common block to resolution and the easiest to help. Every person has losses. We all have losses. It is very useful to give people permission to grieve. They must realize and acknowledge that a loss of great magnitude has taken place and that to grieve is normal. Also, grief runs a predictable course, and the pain does lessen as time goes on. A social support system to help is really important. I'd recommend the National Organization of Resolve which is very active in Utah. Also, the LDS Social Services here in Salt Lake can be a support system for people going through the adoption process.

In summary, the challenges to most infertile individuals/couples, and particularly those in the LDS culture, are very significant and far-reaching, in part due to many contributory cultural factors. Most people in the resolution of those challenges go through the steps of emotional crisis, mourning, and resolution. A social support system is very helpful in the successful resolution. As we remain mindful of these points, we can make a significant contribution to those suffering with infertility.

References

- Mazor, M. "Barren couples." *Psychology Today*, 1979, p. 101.
- Menning, B. "The infertile couple: A plea for advocacy." *Child Welfare*, 1975, 54, 454-459
- Packer, Boyd K. "Why stay morally clean." The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1973.
- Platt, J., I. Ficher, and M. Silver. "Infertile couples." *Fertility and Sterility*, 1973, 24, 972-976.
- Tanner, N. Eldon. *Ensign*, January, 1973. pp. 7-8.

HERITAGE OF NIGHTMARES: THERAPY FOR THE ADULT WOMAN MOLESTED IN CHILDHOOD

GERRY HANNI, MSW

**Presented at the AMCAP Convention
5 October 1984**

The reported and verified number of cases of child sexual abuse in Utah increased 200 percent from 1982 to 1984.¹ This incidence of increase is generally in line with nationally reported increases. It also coincides with our experience at the Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center (ISAT) in Salt Lake City where I work. ISAT opened in the fall of 1983 with an anticipated caseload of 90 clients during the first year. In fact, over 400 received treatment during that time, and we have to date served nearly 900 clients including a number of adult women who were molested in childhood.

The National Center of Child Abuse in Washington, D.C., is probably the best source for statistics on child abuse, but the data collection period has not been long enough for us to appraise reliability. However, current estimates are that one out of eight to ten families in the United States are involved in incest, and that one out of four to five women will be sexually abused by the time they reach sixteen. Our experience in the Salt Lake Valley indicates that those statistics, high though they seem, are not out of line. Some people treating sexual abuse in Utah feel that the rate of incest is higher here than in other locales. I feel that Utah is probably about the same as national averages but that Utah's reporting and legal systems are uncovering a great deal more than is reported in other states. Utah statistics

indicate no differences between the LDS and non-LDS population. The social implications of such statistics are staggering: 80 percent of inmates at Utah State prison are victims of physical or sexual abuse. Alcoholism and drug abuse, prostitution, and dependent families all have a high correlation to sexual abuse. In addition, the problem is multi-generational as male victims often become abusers and female victims tend to marry offenders.

The legal definition of incest or child abuse in Utah is: "any sexual activity between a child and an adult ranging from exhibitionism to intercourse and including nudity, genital exposure, observation of the child, kissing in a lingering and intimate way, fondling, masturbation, fellatio, digital or penile penetration of the anus or rectal opening, digital penetration of the vagina, penile penetration of the vagina, or dry intercourse when adult rubs his penis against the child's genital or rectal area."

Incest is defined by Utah law as any of the above behaviors between a child and adult of close blood relationship or one who has assumed a parental role to the child. A relationship with the mother's live-in boyfriend is therefore considered an incestuous relationship. It is important for the adult woman to understand these legal definitions of incest or abuse because if she has tried to tell someone about her experience, typically this person "played it down." A bishop, an attorney, a professional, or certainly her mother may have said to her, "Well, it wasn't intercourse." Naturally, she would then have wondered if she were overreacting.

The total context in which sexual molestation was performed is as sig-

nificant as the act itself. The victim's age, length of time over which the abuse occurred, use of violence or threat, the child's total support system, and, more important than any other factor, the relationship to the offender in terms of intimacy and trust are critical variables. Many mothers focus on the details of what happened, as a way of avoiding taking action. Several mothers have told me, "If there had been penetration, I would divorce him," or, "If there had been penetration, I know the Church should do something, but because there was not . . ." It is devastating to a child to be treated this way. It remains devastating to her as an adult.

Here is an example of the difference context makes. One woman had repressed totally the fact that she was raped at the age of three and that this same offender repeatedly raped her as she was growing up, using considerable violence. These episodes ended at age 20. She is now age 35. As you can imagine, she was severely traumatized. However, I also treated a woman in her late twenties whose father, outside her bedroom door, had fondled her breast and french-kissed her once. Only once. That single incident so shattered her concept of the universe and the people she trusted that she was traumatized nearly as much as the woman who had lived through years of violence and rape.

An interesting fact about incest is its historical status as the universal taboo. Most cultures, primitive or otherwise, have proscribed incest. Psychological or physical incest has been a matter of intense interest for some great writers in Western civilization. The stories of Absalom in the Bible, Oedipus, Electra, Phaedra, Antigone in Greek literature, Hamlet (in which a question of psychological incest may be implied between Hamlet and his mother), down to contemporary writers like Eugene O'Neill, Tennessee Williams, William Faulkner, and the current Broadway hits of Sam Shepherd, all focus on incest. It is as if writers have wanted to examine this dark force within us. I am not going

to explore why this force is so powerful, but Freud's Oedipal theory asserts that every child has sexual feelings for the parent of the opposite sex. Both the lay public and professionals generally accept this theory as a description of psychological reality. A useful challenge to that "accepted fact" is Jeffrey Mason's (1984) new book which claims that Freud misinterpreted the reports of incest which were reported almost universally from those first women with whom he worked. At first Freud recorded these events as factual but later generated his theories of penis envy and the Oedipal complex to explain the data as wish fantasies. Given the number of victims that we see and the amount of incest now being reported, I find the real-life experience of victims to be a more probable explanation of adult women's reported memories than hypothesizing explicit sexual fantasies. Yes, little boys want to marry Mommy and little girls want to set up housekeeping and have Daddy's baby, but, in my opinion, young children do not have any kind of explicit sexual fantasy unless they have been introduced to sexual experience. A number of adult women have told me, "I don't know where it came from, but at four years old I can remember masturbating, and I had all these sexual fantasies. I must have been an evil child." Every time we have sorted through those memories, we have uncovered a sexual incident that occurred before the fantasies began. Granted, children will explore their own bodies and those of other children. They know what feels good. They are sensual and physical, but they do not come up with sexually explicit behaviors unless they have been taught these actions. Little boys cannot and do not, out of a vacuum, fantasize about inserting their penis into the vagina of the mother (or another little girl) unless somebody has taught them that behavior. They do not invent homosexual behavior unless they are taught it. A little girl may be flirtatious, she may be charming, and she may really play up to all the men in her life, but she will not be sexually se-

ductive until a much older age unless she has been taught to be so.

The relevance of this perspective for the victimized woman as an adult is the question of responsibility and blame. She goes to her therapist, to her bishop, to her mother, to her friends, and even though those people say, "Oh honey, that is terrible. It wasn't your fault," there is often an underlying message: "Why didn't you stop it? Why weren't you responsible? You need to be forgiven." This is a very damaging message. Most of our clients have struggled with it all of their lives. These women feel tremendously guilty, especially if they enjoyed it, responded physically and enjoyed the pleasure of their bodies—or if sexuality was the only way to get attention and approval from their father, in which case the child may have sometimes asked for continued sexual activity. I try to be absolutely unambiguous on this point in therapy no matter what covert messages they may have received. In an LDS context, in the eyes of the Lord, in my opinion, a child is sexually innocent until he or she is taught sexual behavior, analytical theory notwithstanding.

I believe that Freud was correct, however, in observing that the abhorrence of incest does seem to be nearly universal—not, as Freud says, because we have such a strong unconscious desire toward incest that we must repress and sublimate our drives, nor even because of the biological implications of pregnancy within a close relationship—but because of the sustained systemic devastation incest inflicts on family structure. Not only does the individual suffer, but the whole concept of the family is damaged irretrievably. When mother/daughter, adult/child boundaries are breached, self-identity is almost impossible to develop without tremendous confusion. The child has no way of perceiving herself and of gradually building self-confidence as an adult if she is pushed into the adult role of being a sexual rival to her mother, the being on whom she is most dependent. Women simply cannot be robbed of

their childhood and survive intact. Small wonder that they are confused about every aspect of their world, for incest violates the most basic trust a child has. If parents don't protect, who does? If parents don't insure a safe world, who does? How does the child ever recover that kind of trust?

These then are the basic issues for the adult female victim: trust, intimacy, betrayal, abandonment, and guilt. It is, for the victim, as if someone took a big black marker and ex'd her out, saying in effect, "You are an object. You do not exist except to fulfill my needs. You have no personhood in yourself."

Psychologically, she may feel she has been betrayed by both parents. Although most of the women I have worked with have recognized their anger at the father's or stepfather's betrayal, they also experience—sometimes without recognizing it—a burning rage against their mothers for failing to protect them, for abandoning them, for failing to provide emotional nurturance. Blame of mothers may in reality be unfounded, but most adult women do feel this anger at their mother.

The symptoms these women present include sexual dysfunction, which may include extreme frigidity, sexual aversion, or promiscuous behavior. One of my active LDS clients, for example, was married in the temple and has seven children but sought therapy because she had finally reached the point of saying, "I've had enough. I don't care if I lose the celestial kingdom. I don't care if I lose my children. I don't care what happens. I will never again have sex." Friends and family members showered her with good advice: "You know what you have to do. You can't expect a man to live that way." They had no way of acknowledging the depth of her aversion or the causes of such extreme sexual dysfunction.

Other symptoms in the adult survivor include suicidal ideation and chronic depression, substance abuse, somatic complaints and hysterical reactions, especially abdominal pain, gynecological problems and premenstrual

syndrome, learned helplessness, extreme passivity and dependence coupled with intense inner rage, low self-esteem, guilt and self-blame, nightmares and sleep disturbances, borderline personality, psychosis, schizoid tendencies, a history of adolescent acting-out including running away, extreme ambivalence, including hatred and fear of the father and also at the same time fear of his rejection, feelings of anger, betrayal, and rejection about the mother, distorted body image and dislike of body, detachment, lack of female friends, distance in all relationships, inability to trust or seek intimacy, difficulty in touching or being touched, and dissociation.

The effects of sexual abuse are not something usually outgrown. This woman suffers from a confusion of sex and love. If her daughter happens to be a sexual abuse victim, she often reacts with rage against her. Adult victims experience obsessive thinking about sexual objects or about the old abuse, flashbacks, and constant sexual fantasizing. It is as if everything in their world is seen somehow through sex-colored glasses.

For all their passivity and dependence, adult survivors seem to me to have a core that resists control, because control has been such a central issue in the abuse experience. It is extremely important as therapists to let them know early on that they are in charge, that you will only go as fast as they wish, that you are not going to intrude on this inner core except as they permit it.

In therapy, it is very difficult for these women to process new data or to identify emotions. They guard themselves against the pain of reliving their feelings, and they also will not be controlled. They often insist on a woman therapist, even though men can often be very effective with them. I think part of their resistance to male therapists is not only the embarrassment of the sexual issues and feeling that no man could understand, but also a tremendous need to be mothered. These women almost always experienced a lack of mothering along with the sexual abuse. The thera-

pist has to be very patient about their need for unconditional approval and their ultra-sensitivity to rejection.

Another factor in therapy is that the therapist must guard against a tendency to condemn the perpetrator too strongly in an initial reaction of sympathy and support for the victim. This may sound paradoxical, but these women almost always have a tremendous need, after they work through their anger and hatred, for approval from the perpetrator and for the love they never really got from him.

I have rarely seen an adult woman victim who did not have strong religious questions. Without fail these women ask, "Why me? Why was I picked out of the family? What is wrong with me?" They also ask, "Why did God let this happen?" At some level, they feel outraged at themselves, at the offender, at their mother, and at God. Just giving them permission to work through religious conflict is, in itself, very helpful. Usually they have been given pat answers. Forgiveness is, in my opinion, for an LDS woman, an ultimate issue, whether it's forgiveness of self, the offender, or God. The proximate issues are the anger and betrayal. They must deal with their rage before they can move on and ultimately be free in a forgiveness process. I have seen women move through passivity and self-hate to rage to forgiveness. For the religiously oriented woman, feeling the love of the Lord can help tremendously in the healing process.

In the remainder of this presentation, I should like to focus upon specific issues of treatment and some possible techniques which have proved helpful in providing therapy. The severity of symptoms for adults molested as children vary widely, but adult victims are usually voluntary clients, able to commit themselves to treatment, and willing to try to face the problem. As therapists, we try to help them place the responsibility where it belongs and realize that they can get over the experience. Individual therapy can't address all the issues—guilt, lack of a positive self-

image, depression, mistrust of men, inadequate social skills, a compulsion to get involved with unworthy men, sexual dysfunction, bitterness toward the offender and her mother—so we prefer to establish a good experience with individual therapy first and then go into group work. Many issues are raised with groups which increase a client's sense of anxiety beyond the point of resolution in a group. Then, she can go back to her individual therapist. We recommend time-limited groups because they help the group stay on the path and emphasize that the incest issue can be explored and put away. The first sessions are used for designing goals and telling personal stories in detail. These goals often involve recovering memory, improving their relationships, improving their self-esteem, sharing the secret with family members, and possibly confronting the offender. The next stage is the mid-point where the group focuses on how to achieve the goal and on role-playing to help the individuals rehearse desired actions. If each hears reports of successful confrontation or disclosure it helps her go forward with her plans. The ultimate purpose is to help these women who are still reacting like helpless children to become confident as adults.

The two major affective results of incest are guilt and anger. Either individual or group therapy must focus on the fact that it is both safe and desirable to express these emotions. A trusting relationship with the therapist, plus the time and setting to diffuse the heightened anxiety, must be available.

Here are ten examples of methods to encourage catharsis or ventilation of emotion:

1. Writing the undelivered letter. This letter can be to the offender or to the mother. It should deal with feelings as well as facts. It is beneficial for the individual to read it aloud to the group or to the therapist—with full vocal inflections.

2. Journal writing as a directed activity. The reason it should be directed is that the emphasis needs to be on

remembering and recording the abuse along with associated feelings and affects. Otherwise, extraneous detail will fill the pages, and that is not the point. A record of significant occurrences at different life stages is also valuable—a directed life history that helps the clinician understand lifestyle patterns. Sentence stubs and questionnaires can be used for recall and to help reach deeper levels. For example, use such things as open-ended sentences. "When I remember Dad, I think . . . I remember Mother saying . . . I want to tell Dad . . . or, I see myself as . . ." Either written responses or verbal responses will help a client get in touch with her feelings.

3. Art. Art has been traditionally used with children; however, this technique can also be used with adult women to help make implicit feelings explicit. It allows victims to give symbolic expression to conflict and impulses. Drawing the offender, or drawing a self-portrait at the age the abuse first began, is very therapeutic. We also find it effective to draw a floor plan of the room or rooms where the abuse took place, coupled with verbal descriptions.

Also, the mandala drawing is a technique which is a rendering of the self. Within an outlying circle, the participant draws marks, forms, or shapes in various colors, starting in the center and working outwards to represent her inner self. She then turns the sheet over and writes what she did, what she revealed about herself, and how she felt while doing it.

4. Poetry. Especially poems with regular rhythms where the focus is on sound rather than on content, and nonsense poetry are helpful because of stimulating the emotional response. Writing poetry either in group or individual therapy unburdens and reduces anxiety.

5. Gestalt techniques. The empty-chair exercise involves asking the victim to face the perpetrator or her mother. It is important to create a tension-free atmosphere with breathing exercises and deep muscle relaxation before using this technique. A variation is using two

chairs and having the victim alternate sitting in them, speaking for herself and then responding as the offender or her mother.

6. Written dialogue between parts of the self. For example, the victim may choose a dialogue between the controlled self and the out-of-control self or between the self and body parts that are disliked because they were part of the abuse. One client talked so much about her hands and how she hated them, that we decided to do a verbal dialogue. She took the part of herself, and I took the part of her hands. As we talked, she suddenly broke down and cried uncontrollably for a long time, and finally said the reason she hated her hands was because of what they were forced to do when the sexual abuse was taking place.

7. Bibliotherapy. Using first-hand accounts of other incest victims can be helpful in reducing the feelings of isolation and loneliness. There are several on the market. I suggest that you read them first so that you know if it is the type of thing you want your client to read. Some are better than others, but most of them have some material that could be offensive.

8. Positive affirmations to effect positive self-image. The client is asked to repeat to herself several times a day, "I am a good and capable person," or other such phrases. Adele Mayer in her book suggests "the okay script" to alleviate negative feelings about self. She writes a relatively long script full of such things as, "I am a good person," "I am not responsible in any way for what happened sexually between me and my dad." The clients read them each morning and night. Calling herself a "survivor" instead of a "victim" is another way she can give herself a

positive message.

9. Relaxation techniques. They are also important to reduce stress and anxiety. They are based on the theory that it is not possible for the body to experience relaxation and tension at the same time. Guided imagery is very helpful to attain the relaxed state.

10. Assertive behavior. Assertive behavior can aid the client to leave her position as the helpless victim. She responded to her previous role of learned helplessness with disguised anger and passivity. As she learns to make her needs and feelings known to others in an open and honest manner, she can become a more mature person, in charge of herself.

Women who have been sexually molested often experience flashbacks during sexual activity, detracting from their sexual pleasure and contributing to sexual dysfunction. If the flashbacks are severe and accompanied by other sexual dysfunctions, we suggest referral to a sex therapist. Women need to let their partners know that they are experiencing flashbacks and that their response is not due to the partner or the activity. Saying this helps women differentiate the current partner from the traumatic past experience.

There is nothing simple about undoing years of abuse and its consequences, but self-management is the goal. It is an exhilarating experience as a therapist to help another person toward achieving it.

¹Figures compiled by Division of Family Services, Social Services Department, State of Utah, December, 1984.

Gerry Hanni is the mother of five girls and a clinical social worker at the Intermountain Sexual Abuse Center in Salt Lake City.

MILD TO WILD: ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT OF SEXUALLY ABUSED CHILDREN

BARBARA SNOW, DSW

**Presented at the AMCAP Convention
5 October 1984**

Mild to Wild" refers to the spectrum of behaviors sexually abused children may demonstrate in response to their experience: six-year-olds may appear extremely dependent, withdrawn, and tearful, while 16-year-olds may be promiscuous, aggressive, and may "act out" their feelings. Anyone who treats child sexual abuse in any type of setting has to operate from some very basic assumptions. As Mormon counselors and psychotherapists, I think that the first essential assumption is that any child is a potential victim. That seems very elementary; but until you fully accept it, you cannot believe that a child whose father is a stake president, whose mother is involved in a leadership role in an auxiliary, whose family is upper middle-income, upper-education level, is actually telling the truth: that sexual abuse is a reality for the child. Notions about who sexual abusers are must then be reexamined. They do not come only from lower-income families. They are not one race, class, or ethnic group. These people do not have a deviant profile or physical demeanor that signals "abusers." The offender could be anyone.

The second assumption is that children don't lie. The press has recently presented arguments to the contrary. While there may be exceptions to any rule, we as therapists must operate from a position of child advocacy that represents the vast majority of children

who truthfully present their stories. Josephine Buckley, director of the American Bar Association's child-abuse project, responded regarding the recent concern over the credibility of children, "What worries me is that we may go back to the belief that kids can't be believed. And that would be an abuse therapists couldn't cure."

The third assumption is that children are not responsible for the abuse or the disorganization that follows. I think we'd all automatically agree until we start to get persuasive examples to the contrary. For instance, my agency had an adult male offender who came in and described a stressful home situation complicated by an adolescent stepdaughter who walked through the house in negligees. He was "just overcome by it." Well, if you accept that philosophy then you have to also believe that four-year-olds have their way with 35-year-old men. That just isn't the case. Every child has the right to be protected. It is the responsibility of parents to draw limits. I can't turn to a 13-year-old and say, "You should have known his boundaries. Walking around in that little nightgown was more than your father could handle."

The best example I've heard regarding this comes from Nicholas Goth, a pioneer in sex offender treatment. He tells of a perpetrator who explained how a child had approached him while he was asleep on the couch and had masturbated him and that had led to other activity. The child was nine. Nick adds, "The only difficulty I have with your story is, that if she had reached in and touched your wallet, would you have taught her to steal?" The other half of this assumption is that the child is not responsible for the disorganization

which follows disclosing the abuse. Families often get angry at the child. "If she'd only put up with it longer, then she could have been out of the house." "Why didn't she say no? Now everything is blown to pieces." Or, "That's all right. It's good you told. But we'll have to sell the house to raise enough money for a lawyer."

Fourth, it is important not to impose your emotions regarding the experience on the child. When my agency opened two years ago, we as therapists experienced a sense of outrage about what happens to children and a lot of sympathy for how difficult it must be for them. But all children did not interpret the abuse experience as we did. Some children found it to be the most pleasant aspect of a relationship with parents who were disturbed. In a family where a mother might be very cold and rejecting while the father is very nurturing and warm—even if it takes the form of sexually abusive behavior—such an experience may not be traumatic or terribly painful emotionally. A lot of the guilt comes *not* from the fact that "I was engaging in it," but from the fact that "somehow I liked it."

One day, a child came into my office. Her family—an LDS family—consisted of her mother, her father, two adolescent stepsisters, and herself, an eight-year-old who was the child of her mother and second husband. The father was exceptionally disturbed and very violent. With her stepsisters, not only did he engage in full intercourse, but he was very abusive. He tied pillowcases around their heads, gagged them with nylons, and threatened to strangle them all if anyone told. With her, his own child, he was sexually abusive but also very nurturing and gentle.

During one therapy session with all of the girls, the older ones described his behavior and their traumatic experiences. I took the little girl out of the room and we talked about her feelings about what was being said. I tried to give her permission to feel differently about her father if she chose to. Later, I found a paper heart in my office that said,

"Nobody before ever said I could still love him."

Children have such tremendous investment in a parent. Don't underestimate that investment or the affection, or make assumptions of how they feel. This little girl loved her father. She loved him, and she didn't care who he threw pillowcases over. That was somebody else's problem. She loved him.

These then, briefly, represent some basic treatment assumptions. Accepting them requires letting go of a lot of misconceptions. One is that men who abuse children in their own families don't abuse children outside of the home. It was a terribly rude awakening when it became apparent that many of the incestuous fathers we had in treatment had also abused children in their neighborhoods. Another misconception is that the oldest child is the only child in jeopardy. Not true. We've treated many middle children. It often depends on the perpetrator's perception of the child's ability to keep a secret. If you have a very assertive nine-year-old and a complacent 11-year-old, he might choose to abuse the 11-year-old; but if the 11-year-old was assertive, he would likely pick the one that he felt he could most easily intimidate into cooperating with the incest.

Another misconception is that reporting stops the abuse. This misconception is one of the most dangerous of all. Reporting doesn't stop abuse. In the church context, this means that reporting abuse to a bishop or other church authority is not sufficient. The police and child protective services must be notified with the perpetrator then being removed from the home. Sex abuse is sex addiction.

Another misconception is that the younger the child, the less damage from abuse. Other factors, like relationships, seem to be more important. A three-year-old can be traumatized as much as a 14-year-old. It depends on the circumstances.

How do we identify the victims? A lot of the literature lists emotional disturbances, bed-wetting, crying, de-

pendency, and such as symptoms. These symptoms, however, are reactions to such a variety of circumstances that they are not always helpful. For therapists, the most valid and reliable index of abuse is simply child self-report. Although I look for other supporting evidence, I always ask the child directly. All of us in child-care agencies, social services, juvenile court, substance abuse programs, as well as adult-oriented agencies, should ask clients about a history of sexual abuse. Adult women often report being in treatment with a psychiatrist for years without mentioning this issue. We should always ask, "Has anyone ever touched you in a way that made you uncomfortable? Has anyone ever said things to you in a sexual tone that might have made you feel bad?" It floors me how many times children nod yes. And they're often talking about additional incidents I don't even have a record of. I'll be asking about a father and they say "yes" about a cousin. Children may want to give you the information, however they are often threatened about telling and must be gently reassured and gradually persuaded.

Another helpful index is the child's level of sexual knowledge. For instance, the mother of a six-year-old reported that her child had come into the parents' bedroom and asked her in very graphic terms why she wasn't involved in oral sex with the father. The child was very explicit because that was exactly what the father had her do to him. If children say things that are age inappropriate, it's an urgent invitation to investigate further.

A third index is sexual preoccupation—or aversion. Girls report abuse ten times more often than boys, yet in a program we just started for adolescent boys abusing children in their neighborhoods and in their families, we found that almost 90 percent of those boys were former victims. Society's reaction to male sexual abuse has been in marked contrast to that with girls. They ignore symptoms in boys that they'd investigate in girls because a boy is not a deserving victim. He should have had the initiative to say no. Often,

what is actually sexual abuse of a young boy is seen as a passage into manhood. Thus, boys feel unprotected, exploited, and carry the additional fear of homosexuality. I have found that adolescent boys who are preoccupied with homosexuality, or contrastingly completely repelled by it, are often former victims who assume that any male sexual liaison makes them homosexual. Much aggression and physical violence in boys is an effort to reverse that victimization and loss of control they have felt. I treated seven- and nine-year-old boys who had attempted to rape a five-year-old girl. Both the seven- and nine-year-old had been sexual victims of a foster brother. They assaulted the five-year-old in an effort to undo their own experience, to reestablish their identity as other than homosexual, and to regain a sense of control and power.

Promiscuity is another clue to possible abuse that belongs under this index. I always ask: Why all this sexual activity at this age? What started this orientation?

Treatment for the sexually abused child should always begin directly with the child and with a warm relationship. When a young child comes into my office, I ask, "Do you know my name?" or "Who do you think I look like?" and set a tone that is easier for them to respond to. "Do you think I look like a Marion? Do I look like a Jane? Who do I look like?" They laugh a little and respond to me, and they may start to talk. I don't ever use a professional title with children.

Then I ask, "Do you know why you came here today?" That's really interesting. A lot of them think they are coming for class projects. Others thought they were going to Smith's Food King and were dropped off early. They are often not really sure why they are here. And some of them why, but don't want to say.

I make a brief statement of who I am. "I am somebody who works with children—children who have had people touch them in a way that may have confused them or made them feel bad. I

don't want you to be confused or feel bad. So if we can work together, we can talk about this because I want you to know it wasn't your fault." I always interview the child alone. Even if the mother comes—and mothers often do—I never have a mother present at the interview. I interview the child first and get the facts from the child. Furthermore, I would not interview a child outside of my office or on other "less safe" turf. I would never go to a child's home, for instance. In a child's home, you are in the parents' realm. The child feels that the parents are still very powerful and very much in control. Another thing I want to do in the interview is to establish some appropriate physical contact that the child will accept. Some therapists believe that children who have been sexually abused should not be touched in any way. I disagree. I feel that not touching communicates that all touching is negative. I feel a need to establish a benchmark of normalcy as quickly as possible. In one adolescent therapy group, I asked, "What do you most want me to tell counselors about what has been helpful to you?" The answer was repeatedly, "Touch me. Even good touching might make me stiff, but I still really want it."

With a little child, I'll ask, "Would you like to sit on my lap?" Or I touch their arm, or sit by them, or put my arm around them. With men, it is much more difficult. You may have to go slower because we're socialized to see most touching between adults as sexual. As a woman therapist, I have an advantage because women are mothers.

As therapy progresses, I try to seek the details of the abuse. It can be the first or several sessions. One of the easiest ways to do it is the method developed by Suzanne Sgroi. After I get child and have spent some session time warming up, I ask him/her to draw me a picture of the outside of his/her house.

"Now, tell me about your house while you are drawing. Show me the inside of your house. If I walked in this door, could you show me what the inside of your house would look like—

like a floor plan?" You might have to show them examples of a floor plan. "Pretend we walk in your house here. Is your kitchen over here? Where is your couch? When you come out of the living room, where do you go when you want something to eat? Show me where. Do you have a dishwasher in your house? Lauren is your little brother? Where does his bedroom go? Does Lauren's room have a bathroom? Where's your room?" As he draws the parts of his house, memory becomes much more vivid. If I said to the six-year-old, "Hello, I am Dr. Snow, and I'm glad to see to see today. I undersand you have been sexually abused. Would you mind telling me about that?" I wouldn't get much. But once they get into drawing their house, they'll provide lots of details. A child I saw said, "Well, this is my room here, and this is the long hall that we always walk down when Mom's asleep." "Was the sun shining?" I asked. "No, it was very, very dark. I'd have to wake up and we had to be very quiet cause Mom was asleep."

They also point out specific pieces of furniture. One child was abused in the bathtub and I just could not grasp what was going on for a long time. Sometimes I have them put an X where it happened. I always ask, "Could you tell me about the first time?" For many children, the first time was as long as six or seven years ago, so I ask, "Can you remember the last time or whichever time is most vivid that you can focus on?" When they do, then I'll say, "Can you put an X on where it happened?" So maybe the child puts an X here. I'll say, "Now, that's the first time it happened. Do you remember where else it happened?" And you'll start to see progression of the activity over time.

A child may begin by saying, "Well, he just touched me in the garage." "Where did he touch you?" "Oh, he just touched me outside my jeans. Nothing big." So that was in the garage. But as time goes on, she continues, "Well, then later we ended up downstairs in the bedroom." So we are talking about a much more detailed kind of

activity. Look for progression over time through the drawing of the house. It may start out with something like fondling, but there is usually progression. I have very seldom seen an abuser who starts out with fondling and stays with fondling. Sexual abuse is sexual addiction.

I also look for multiple incidents over time. I don't believe stories about the one-time incident because the father drank too much at a party. The more time I spend talking to that child, the one-time drunk incident is really the first time she learned to report, the first time that she thought it was really abusive, but there were almost certainly others.

Then, I ask all kinds of questions about the room. "Where was Mom? Where were your brothers and sisters? What did he say to you when he touched you? Did you have your clothes on? Was it cold in the garage?" Some people have detailed lists for investigations, but children don't follow a script. You need to be flexible enough to pick up on a clue and ask, for instance, "Why did you get a dog?" I had a child tell me, "I got that dog because I did something for my dad."

In addition to the details of the abuse I also need to know how the abuser got the child to comply. The reason it's so important is because that knowledge is the best tool for freeing the child of guilt. One of the biggest questions they deal with is, "Why did I go along with it?" Sometimes they do not report until adulthood or until they are much more developed cognitively. They say things like, "I was crazy to go along with that. Why didn't I just tell him to stop it?" The guilt is tremendous.

Basically, there are four ways, though I use different words depending on the age of the children. The first way that perpetrators gain compliance is by engagement. The perpetrator makes it a game or bribes them. One child was bought off in Slurpees. What lures the child? Sometimes I use that word with kids. "Do you know about fishing, how you put a lure on a hook, and how it

catches a fish? How did your dad catch you? What kind of lure did he use?" Children often look back and say, "Well, it didn't take a lot. It took a nickel." And I say, "Would it take a nickel now?" And they say, "No, no, it would take a lot more than a nickel." They then begin to see that they complied by virtue of being a child.

Second, about 80 percent of the perpetrators we work with use entrapment. Once the child has performed the act, whatever it was, they are trapped. The classic example is the perpetrator who said to the child, "Well, I guess now that we've done it, I'll have to tell your mother." She said, "No, no." "Well, then, we'd better do it again." And the child would say, "Well, I guess so." It was a cycle she couldn't get out of. Lots of times, adolescent boys will submit to some kind of inappropriate photograph, and then the perpetrator says, "Well, I'll just have to show this to your mother, unless. . . ." Sometimes, with adolescents, drugs and alcohol are the trap. I know kids who took marijuana as a payoff. The perpetrator would say, "Well, if you report me for this, I'll have to report you for that. We are both breaking the law." So the child is trapped.

The third way perpetrators sometimes achieve compliance is by threats of harm. "If you won't do this, I'll break both of your arms." The father who put pillowcases over his stepdaughters' heads had told each one, "This could happen to every one of your sisters, and you'll be the last to go because you'll watch all of them die."

The fourth method, which appears to be the least frequent, is the actual use of force.

If children can be helped to identify how the offender gained "cooperation," not "consent," then they may also begin to recognize their innocence.

Barbara Snow conducts training nationwide in child sexual abuse and is the clinical director of the Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center in Salt Lake City.

STRATEGIC FAMILY THERAPY AND MORMON THOUGHT

MARYBETH RAYNES, M.S.

Presented at the AMCAP Convention
4 October, 1984

Mormon therapists, while trying to find effective interventions for their clients, hear strong voices from two worlds: the Church world of doctrine and religious practice and the professional world of research, therapy models, and techniques. The Church is ambivalent at times about the role and efficacy of psychology and psychotherapy while the therapeutic community often looks askance at religious belief and action. As a result, we sometimes have a struggle to find congruent, effective therapy approaches that allow us to synthesize both into an affirmative whole.

Where these two books are concerned, the question is how the strategic family therapy model might apply to Mormon families. This perspective will, I hope, increase the book's utility and stimulate active efforts to integrate our Mormon and therapist halves.

Strategic Family Therapy and Behind the One-Way Mirror: Advances in the Practice of Strategic Therapy, by Cloe Madanes, are recent works on a therapy approach initially developed by her husband, Jay Haley, that emphasizes behavioral injunctions and paradoxical techniques in a ground of family systems theory and Milton Erickson's hypnotherapy strategies. For a good short description of this therapy model, see James C. Hansen and Luciano L'Abate, "The Strategic Therapy of Jay Haley," Chapter 6 in their *Approaches to Family Therapy* (New York: Macmillan, 1982). Madanes remains firmly within the

parameters of Haley's model while contributing creative thought and techniques of her own.

In the first book, she outlines the approach and philosophy of strategic therapy (the model can be used with individuals although it is primarily a family therapy model), and contrasts it with the rest of therapeutic world in a lucid, readable style. Succinctly, this model assumes that most family problems are caused by dysfunctional communication and organization patterns. Imbalanced power alignments receive the most focus, as do ineffectual attempts to move from one family life cycle stage to another in this approach. Additionally, all symptomatic behavior is seen as a metaphor for what is malfunctioning in the family, that is, "What organizational imbalance or unresolved issue is the sick behavior covertly trying to solve?"

The major goal is to create behavior change so that the marital pair are equally aligned, the parents are in power, and the intergenerational boundaries are appropriately drawn (i.e., children are not to assume the parental function of protecting their parents; rather they should be protected by them). In addition to the basic therapy methods of rapport building, empathy, etc., this method advocates always: focusing on the present, not the past; defining all symptoms positively by viewing them as an attempt to be helpful to the family rather than as pathological or as manifestations of a dysfunctional family process (for example a son who throws temper tantrums when his father comes home may be trying to help his father escape some of the pressure from his mother); and finally, placing the therapist in a directive stance in all sessions, but assigning the parents to do all of the therapeutic work at home. There are other techniques, to be

sure, but these are essential.

The author applies these goals and techniques in areas of frequent concern throughout the rest of the book. There are chapters on marital problems, children's problems, parental problems, severe problems of adolescence, and depression, among others. She also devotes several pages of description and dialogue for a valuable number of case studies. Since the wording of a behavioral injunction is critical in this approach, her use of the actual dialogue between therapist and client is helpful. Throughout, she supplies numerous guidelines to the therapist/reader to facilitate integration of the ideas. Her writing is practical and clear, letting the reader engage the ideas rather than struggle with fuzzy sentences and jargon. Just as a skilled sportsperson makes a complicated feat look simple, she makes this method look easy through her unpretentious writing.

Although the title *Behind the One-Way Mirror* implies the use of a therapy technique in which another therapist observes the session and then phones into the session or gives therapy instructions later, it is little discussed in the book. Rather, Madanes extends and expands the theoretical underpinnings and techniques of the strategic approach in this second book, particularly regarding ways to work with the symptom as metaphor. Two elements worth highlighting are the "pretending" technique and the chapter on "Influencing Adults Through Children."

Madanes instructs many clients to pretend to have the symptoms they are already afflicted with, but in a slightly different configuration. In one case study, she instructed a mother who consistently failed to monitor her daughter's diabetes to "play nurse" with her daughter and for the daughter to "play patient." The game approach took away the mother's resistance to the straightforward "be a good mother and take care of your daughter" approach that she had rebelled against in the past.

Her very interesting chapter on

mobilizing children to help put their parents in charge is a breath of fresh air for clinicians who work with very inadequate or dysfunctional parents. Often, children have more insight and energy to change than their parents, and Madanes outlines ways to channel that energy functionally. She cites a mother who was extremely inadequate in a number of ways but, most seriously, rarely provided affection or attention for her children. In one session, after therapy was well under way, the therapist (not always Madanes in her books, and she gives credit by citing names of clinicians) suggested negotiated work agreements at home. After every agreement, the child and mother were asked to hug and kiss to "seal the agreement," thereby giving and getting the needed affection without a direct request. Over a number of such sessions, spontaneous touching began.

The Haley-Madanes strategic approach is, I think, compatible with Mormon thought and custom in a number of ways. A Mormon family, acquainted with Church-directed programs at home and church, would find it quite easy to work with a therapist using this approach. Family members from the first session would find that their problems are taken seriously and immediately considered. Every family member would be treated with respect and credibility. They would find, maybe to their surprise, that they are actually trying to be helpful to each other even though they have problems (greatly relieving for a lot of guilty people). Additionally, family members would find that the therapist is also interested in their extended family including some ancestors, their church, their social life, and their employment situation. Also, there would be little anxiety about who is in charge; the therapist is—just as the bishop is in charge at sacrament meeting and the teacher in charge of a class. The anxiety is reduced even further by the positive, humorous approach of the therapist.

Moreover, the therapist would not spend a lot of time interpreting inner

motivations or psychological problems and diagnosis. Instead, a practical goal with an assignment would be given in the first session for family members to follow throughout the week. For Mormon families who have been given a lot of encouragement and training to engage in positive activities with their family, an injunction to spend time doing something described as helpful would often be welcomed. Also, because the parents are in charge of every behavioral assignment at home, they would see the therapist working to put them back in charge of the family, an aspect that would increase their security.

These elements of strategic family therapy are congruent with an action-oriented Mormon culture that seeks to help people progress and instill in them a good feeling about what they are doing. Also, these therapy techniques underscore some important elements about Mormon families: The parents are to be in charge, they are responsible for teaching and directing their children, people are basically good and helpful to each other, and family cooperation is necessary to solve the problems.

But Mormon families may also find some elements of strategic therapy unsettling. First, strategic therapists do not rely on logic or insight as a technique. Madanes' descriptions of reasoning with clients are usually only to build a groundwork for the behavioral assignments. For Mormon families who want to understand things clearly and logically, "the glory of God is intelligence," the lack of rationale for a given behavior may be frustrating and confusing. I think that insight is not only helpful in providing a foundation for compliance in treatment, but also for clients to use the new learning later to solve additional problems as they emerge.

Some Mormon families are quite likely to perceive some of the techniques as clearly wrong. A couple concerned about their fighting might become quite resistant if told that their fighting is a positive part of their relationship and if given a paradoxical

injunction to continue fighting, but to change a detail or two so that they can do it better. The theoretical underpinning for such an assignment is that when a person is told to take control over something he/she has no control over, the symptom will decrease or change. Many of the paradoxical techniques described in both books are indeed creative and seem to have worked for the families involved. However, some may run against the grain of Mormon belief and action. The therapist should give careful thought to tailoring behavioral assignments to religious values and standards.

Luckily, Madanes does not present the strategic approach in an all-or-none fashion. She does not fall into the common trap of deriding all other methods and promoting her own. Her last chapter of *Behind the One-Way Mirror* is a thoughtful discussion about choosing the right strategy for intervention. She presents guidelines about when to give a straightforward directive and when to "prescribe the symptom," when to emphasize freedom in the family and when to emphasize dependence—along with many other considerations. The longest chapter in the book, it provides a satisfying conclusion to both books by giving the therapist a sense of increased competence about having a number of new techniques and better judgment about when to use them.

Although I found both books intellectually challenging, emotionally rewarding, and fun to read, I found both professionally unsatisfying in a few ways. First, the model, based on a premise that faulty family communication and power balance causes the symptoms, presumes that disorders such as schizophrenia, hyperactivity, and even epileptic seizures are caused by the family. Case examples of cures for each of these disorders are given in the books. I would not argue that the severity of these problems are influenced by dysfunctional family interaction, but I feel it is misleading to assume that families are almost always, if not always the cause. Many times, a disordered

child can cause dysfunctional interaction, not be the result of it. Also, my experience in mental health work has convinced me that many times these and other maladies have a biochemical base and that therapy can do little until the right medication can control some of the biological components. My view is that both medication and therapy are helpful. Learning how to discriminate when and how much of each is needed is crucial professional knowledge.

Next, the simplicity of the techniques and examples give the illusion that strategic therapy is easy to learn and use. Not so, in my experience. It takes a tremendous amount of analysis on one's own and in consultation with others to develop strategies that fit each family. The assignments may look like a cookbook approach to clients, but each recipe must be individually developed. And when is it the right one? To my knowledge, we do not have good data on the outcomes of paradoxical techniques.

Finally, the author recommends this approach for every type of family

problem. She argues that since every assignment is individually tailored, there are no contraindications. Well, frankly, I don't know if that is true or not. I know of families who resist any kind of assignment, others who insist on explanations for everything and thrive on insight, and still others who benefit from an exploration of the past. So my conclusion is to learn the techniques, but not necessarily take the model whole.

Despite these reservations, I wholeheartedly recommend reading these books. They provide a fresh look at some of the knottiest problems in therapy, and the techniques can be easily integrated with other therapy models to provide help for many Mormon families.

Marybeth Raynes is a Clinical Social Worker with the Salt Lake County Division of Mental Health.

References

- Madanes, Cloe. *Strategic family therapy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1981.
- Madanes, Cloe. *Behind the one-way mirror: Advances in the practice of strategic therapy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1984.

IN MEMORIAM VEON G. SMITH (1915–84)

DEAN W. HEPWORTH, Ph.D.

A leader in social work and in marital and family therapy, Veon G. Smith passed away suddenly on November 28, 1984 in Salt Lake City. Veon was loved by all who knew him well. He was a prominent and highly respected educator, author, therapist, and leader in his profession and church.

Veon was born in Malad, Idaho, where he grew up on a dry farm. He humorously attributed his efforts to achieve an advanced education to a compelling desire to escape from that dry farm. Veon earned his bachelor's degree from BYU; and after serving with the military as a counselor in World War II, he completed graduate study at Western Reserve University, where he was awarded the MSSA degree. He subsequently joined the faculty at the University of Utah, where he played a key role in developing the master's program in the Graduate School of Social Work, and remained throughout his career.

As an educator, Veon provided leadership in developing curriculum and teaching courses in casework and marriage counseling. Recognizing his leadership and expertise, his colleagues affectionately referred to him as "Mr. Casework." Students sought his classes because of his expertise in blending theory with the practical application of that theory to clinical situations. His scholarly attainments included a number of articles in professional journals, co-authorship of the book *Improving Therapeutic Communication*, and numerous presentations to national, regional,

and local meetings of professional organizations.

Veon was respected by his faculty colleagues not only for his knowledge but for his wisdom. When the faculty was immersed in difficult and controversial issues, Veon typically provided a thoughtful and reasoned perspective that tended to defuse emotionally charged situations. Veon achieved the rank of full professor and was honored by being appointed Professor Emeritus when he retired in 1981.

Successfully combining the role of educator and clinician, Veon was one of the first social workers to engage in private practice in Utah, a role in which he continued until his death. He was also a member of the traveling mental health team that provided monthly clinical services to five counties in southern Utah for over 15 years. In addition to teaching, Veon served as Director of the Marriage and Family Counseling Bureau of the University of Utah for 20 years. The bureau achieved national recognition under his able leadership.

Veon's contributions to his profession and to the field of marital and family therapy deserve special mention. He was an early organizer and leader of the AAMC (now AAMFT) in Utah and soon attained prominence in the national organization, which led to him being appointed to a national position and later becoming chair of the accrediting body of AAMFT. During the period of his leadership, the Department of HEW vested AAMFT with sole authority to accredit training programs in marital and family therapy in the United States.

It was largely due to Veon's leadership that legislation was passed in Utah regulating the title of social worker and the practice of social work. Subsequent-

ly he successfully spearheaded efforts that culminated in the regulation of practice in marital and family therapy in Utah. Utah was among the first states in the nation to regulate the practice of these professions, and we are indebted to Veon for his dedicated and tireless efforts that resulted in the elevation of the standards of practice and the greater protection to the public. After securing the legislation, Veon served for many years as a member of licensing boards that formulated policy, reviewed applications, and acted upon complaints.

Utahns are also indebted to Veon for the inauguration of marital enrichment programs in our state. Recognizing the value of marital enrichment, Veon invited David and Vera Mace, international leaders of the Association of Couples for Marital Enrichment (ACME) to Utah, where they presented a workshop and instituted procedures to train couples as ACME leaders. A number of local couples completed the training and have since conducted marital enrichment sessions in Utah. Foremost among this group were Veon and his devoted wife, Clyda, who subsequently led many ME sessions for students, faculty members, members in their ward and stake, and other groups.

In AMCAP, Veon participated through the years as an active member, convention presenter, and Journal contributor. (Note his article, "From the Years," in the April 1983 *AMCAP Journal*.) He was a strong advocate of the principles of AMCAP both in public and private. His presence and supporting voice will be much missed.

Veon's leadership abilities extended into his church activities. He

gave generously of his time, talents, and resources, serving as a bishop, a stake high councilor, and holding many other positions of leadership in the Church. He published several articles in Church magazines and also served as a writer for the Church Correlation Committee, collaborating in preparing instructional manuals for the Church. Veon was a spiritual person who inspired others and was beloved by his associates because of the example he set.

In his marital and family life, Veon was a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. He and Clyda achieved a high level of companionship and devotion to one another. During Veon's short years of retirement he and Clyda were inseparable, sharing in leading enrichment groups, counseling together, grandparenting, and traveling. It was obvious to those who knew them well that they mutually enriched their own marriage and rejoiced in being able to help others to do the same. They reared six children and relished their roles as grandparents. One of their children, Gladys, preceded Veon in death. Another son, Veon, Jr., has followed in his father's career footsteps, becoming a clinician, educator, and leader in marital and family therapy. The Veons, Senior and Junior, joined as coauthors of a book on marital therapy, which was nearing completion when Veon, Sr., passed away.

Veon G. Smith was a humble and unassuming man. His legacy to his profession, his students, his clients, his fellow church members, his family, the Graduate School of Social Work, and his many associates, however, attest to his true stature.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF EDITOR, ASSOCIATE EDITORS, AND MEMBERS OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD

Paul Cook

Editor

Burton Kelly

Burton Kelly, Ph.D., is a member of the faculty of Counseling and Personal Services and Professor of Educational Psychology at BYU. His professional interests are ferreting out the principles of human behavior change and associated techniques in the interest of developing a more integrated approach to therapy. He is also interested in integrating the gospel thoroughly into professional theory and practice. He lives on a two-acre farm, loves the outdoors, backpacking, and camping. He is married and has nine children. Two children are currently serving on missions. He is serving as a bishop in his home ward.

Address: 149 SWKT, BYU, Provo, Utah 84602.

Associate Editors

Richard Bednar

Richard Bednar, Ph.D., is Professor of Psychology and Director of the Comprehensive Clinic at Brigham Young University. His professional interests are individual and group psychotherapy, legal and ethical issues in clinical services, and psychopathology. He enjoys racquetball, the outdoors, camping, and related activities. He is married and has three children. His current Church position is bishop of a BYU campus ward.

Address: Comprehensive Clinic, 244 John Taylor Building, BYU, Provo, Utah 84602.

Addie Fuhriman

Addie Fuhriman, Ph.D., is Chairman of Educational Psychology Department at the University of Utah. Her professional interests are psychotherapy, both individual and group. She conducts training and research in the group process and in curative factors in psychotherapy. She is an avid gardener and thoroughly enjoys the outdoors. She has served in the past on the Young Women's General Board of the Church, and is now a Sunday School teacher for the 13-year-olds in her ward.

Address: 327 MBH, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112.

Clyde Parker

Clyde Parker, Ph.D., is a psychologist at the Center for Counseling and Therapeutic Services at McKay-Dee Hospital in Ogden. His professional interests are counseling and psychotherapy. He is past professor of Educational Psychology and Chairman of Social, Psychological, and Philosophical Foundations of Education, University of Minnesota. He enjoys golf, skiing, racquetball, and other sports. He is married with four children and does temple work as his Church assignment.

Address: 3939 Harrison Blvd., Ogden, Utah 84409.

Paul Cook

Paul Cook, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Elementary Education at Brigham Young University, has professional interests in psychotherapy, classroom management and instruction, educational supervision, consultation in mental health fields and education,

education in developing countries, and the integration of gospel principles into theory and practice. He conducts a small private practice as a psychologist, enjoys camping and world travel, music, electronic gadgets and cars. He is married and has four children. He is currently serving as counselor in his ward bishopric.

Address: 210R MCKB, BYU, Provo, Utah 84602.

Bruce Brown

Bruce Brown, Ph.D., is Professor of Psychology at Brigham Young University. His professional interests are in the psychology of language, personality theory, vocal paralanguage, research in second language acquisition, reflection of emotion in voice, and cross-cultural comparisons in stereotypes. He loves racquetball and skiing (jet skiing and snow). He is married and has nine daughters and one son. He is currently serving as priests quorum advisor in his home ward.

Address: 1126 SWKT, BYU, Provo, Utah 84602.

Marybeth Raynes

Marybeth Raynes works half-time as a clinical social worker for the Salt Lake County Mental Health Association and half-time in private practice. She also serves as a Clinical Instructor of Social Work in the Graduate School of the University of Utah. Her professional interests are marriage and family therapy, depression, anxiety in both men and women, and sex therapy. She conducts workshops and gives speeches in marriage and family relations, sexuality, and teenage sexuality. She has done writings on single people in the Church, power in Mormon marriages, and sexuality. She enjoys calligraphy, artwork, piano, and reading about religion, comparative religions, and therapy. She is married with four children and is an active Church worker.

Address: 24 M Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

FORTHCOMING PROFESSIONAL CONVENTIONS

S. Brent Scharman and C. Ross Clement

**Christian Association for
Psychological Studies**

April 17–21, 1985

Grand Rapids, Michigan

For information, write to:

Charles Fridsma

6850 So. Division Avenue

Grand Rapids, MI 49508

**Recognition & Management of
Critical Incidents in Short-Term
Group Psychotherapy**

April 18–20, 1985

Park City, Utah

(801) 378-3989

\$100.00

Richard Bednar, Robert Dies, Gary

Burlingame

**The Utah Division of
the American Association for Marriage
and Family Therapy**

April 19–20, 1985

Salt Lake City, Utah

For information, call:

Dr. Marsha Stroup

(801) 278-9141 (work)

(801) 943-9704 (home)

American Association of Suicidology

April 18–21, 1985

Toronto, Canada

For information, write to:

Julie Perlman

American Association of Suicidology

2459 South Ash Street

Denver, CO 80222

Western Psychological Association

April 18–21, 1985

San Jose, California

May 1–6, 1986

Seattle, Washington

April 23–26, 1987

Long Beach, California

For information, write to:

Robert A. Hicks

Department of Psychology

San Jose State University

San Jose, CA 95192

**Interdisciplinary Approaches
to Mental Health**

April 20–24, 1985

New York City, New York

For information, write to:

American Orthopsychiatric
Association

19 West 44th Street

Suite 1616

New York, NY 10036

**Aging in America—
Achievement, Promise**

April 21–24, 1985

San Francisco, California

For information, write to:

National Council on the Aging, Inc.

West Wing 100

600 Maryland Avenue, SW

Washington, DC 20024

**Rocky Mountain
Psychological Association**

April 24–27, 1985

Tucson, Arizona

For information, write to:

Marvin W. Kahn

Department of Psychology

University of Arizona

Tucson, AZ 85721

**Convening of
Crisis Intervention Personnel**

April 26–28, 1985

Chicago, Illinois

For information, write to:

Barry S. Greenwald

c/o In-Touch Hotline

Student Counseling Service

University of Illinois at Chicago

P.O. Box 4348

Chicago, IL 60680

The M.M.P.I.: A Powerful

Ally for Therapists

by Charles S. Newmark, Ph.D.

May 4, 1985

Salt Lake Sheraton

255 South West Temple

Salt Lake City, UT 84101

\$75.00

(919) 942-5249

The Utah Psychological Association

May 11, 1985

Salt Lake Hilton

For information, write to:

Utah Psychological Association

4095 Sunset View Drive

Salt Lake City, UT 84124.

**The National Association
of Social Workers**

May 29–June 1, 1985

Sheraton–Boston Hotel

Prudential Center

Boston, MA 02199

For information, write to:

NASW Conference Office

7981 Eastern Avenue

Silver Spring, MD 20910

(301) 565-0333

**The Graduate School of Social Work,
University of Utah,**

**First Annual Summer Institute in the
Human Services**

July 7–13, 1985

For information, write to:

The Division of Continuing Education

University of Utah Campus

1185 Annex

Salt Lake City, UT 84112

**Tenth International Congress of
Hypnosis and Psychosomatic Medicine**

August 10–16, 1985

Toronto, Canada

For information, write to:

Tenth Congress Secretariat

200 St. Clair Avenue West, Suite 402

Toronto, Ontario M4V 1R1

Canada

American Psychological Association

August 23–27, 1985

Los Angeles, California

For information, write to:

Gloria B. Gottsegen

c/o Candy Won

American Psychological Association

1200 Seventeenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 20036

**The Utah Division of
the American Association for Marriage
and Family Therapy**

October 4–5, 1985

Holiday Inn

Park City, Utah

For information, call:

Dr. Marsha Stroup

(801) 278-9141 (work)

(801) 943-9704 (home)

**The American Association for
Marriage and Family Therapy**

October 17–20, 1985

New York, New York

For information, write to:

AAMFT

1717 K Street, NW

Suite 407

Washington, DC 20006

**The National Association
of Social Workers**

November 6–9, 1985

Hyatt Regency

Chicago Illinois Center

151 E. Wacker Drive

Chicago, IL 60601

For information, write to:

NASW Conference Office

7891 Eastern Avenue

Silver Spring, MD 20910

(301) 565-0333

FUTURE ISSUES

Burton Kelly

To whet your appetites, here are some of the items you will find in future issues:

- A 10-year index, 1985 being AMCAP's 10-year anniversary, of all of the articles published in past issues of the Journal.

- From the pen of David Coombs, one of the AMCAP Advisory Board members, selected quotations from the addresses of our General Authorities

given at AMCAP Conventions.

- An updated history of AMCAP under the leadership of our historian, and a past AMCAP president, Henry Isakson.

- A special article by one of AMCAP's most noted scholars (and also a past AMCAP president), Allen Bergin, entitled, "Proposed Values for Guiding and Evaluating Counseling and Psychotherapy."

149 SWKT
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602

PAID
PROVO, UTAH 84601
PERMIT NO. 21

