



10-1-1975

AMCAP Journal Volume 1 Issue 1 1975

Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/irp>

Recommended Citation

Psychotherapy, Issues in Religion and (1975) "AMCAP Journal Volume 1 Issue 1 1975," *Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy*. Vol. 1 : No. 1 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/irp/vol1/iss1/10>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.



JOURNAL

ASSOCIATION OF MORMON COUNSELORS AND PSYCHOTHERAPISTS

CONVENTION REPORT OCTOBER 1975

Contents

- 2 EDITORIAL COMMENTS
- 4 A.M.C.A.P EXECUTIVE NOTES
- 5 COUNSELING THE HOMOSEXUAL
- 30 CARLFRED BRODERICK
- 26 G. HUGH ALLRED
- 36 VAUGHN J. FEATHERSTONE
- 42 VICTOR L. BROWN, JR.
- 22 VICTOR B. CLINE
- 14 ADDIE FURIMAN

A.M.C.A.P JOURNAL

Volume I

Editorial Board

Editor: Don Lankford

Board Members

Flodie Lucretia Brown

Lynn Eric Johnson

I. Reed Payne

Lynn Tyler

The association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists adheres to the principles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. This professional group however, is an independent association with the gospel of Jesus Christ as a common bond. It is not sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

Editorial Board

Please send all correspondence to AMCAP Editorial Board, 110 South, 600 East, Payson, Utah 84651

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Dear Associates:

The AMCAP Executive Committee has been very concerned about realistic publication to you - the members. Out of this concern has been developed an editorial board listed previously. This will facilitate and economize our first efforts at publications.

The executive committee felt that the original editorial group needed to be in close proximity to each other, therefore all of these people are located near the Provo, Utah area. Other members of the editorial board will be added during the coming year from various disciplines and geographic areas of the U.S.

The newsletter you previously received was the editorial board's first effort. After a year of struggling the executive committee approved the following: Publishing two newsletters each year, February 1 and August 1; and two journals each year, November 1 (annual convention report) and May 1.

The purpose of AMCAP publications is to become a realistic and mature voice to the members of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, to our respective professions, and to the world at large. We are going to show by example that AMCAP's members are also trusted and respected members of the L.D.S. Church. We also want all AMCAP members to be active and vocal in their respective associations (example: see Gary Carson's Response to the American Personnel and Guidance Assoc. Journal in our first newsletter).

Brothers and Sisters, the day is past that we as AMCAP members need lower our eyes, dig our toes in the sand and apologize for our respective professions. The day is also past when we as professionals need to apologize for our religious values. You're AMCAP Editorial Board is convinced that our professions, the gospel of Jesus Christ and our individual ethics are congruent. The charge to the editorial committee is to solidify purposes and goals through:

1. Sharing professional articles that strengthen our values and the values of the gospel of Jesus Christ.
2. Strengthen our association by listing employment opportunities in AMCAP's 4 publications.

3. Research development and exchange. We will publish research ideas or data you would like to share with our readers for general exchange of information and/or possible collaborative research across our several disciplines and geographical areas.

4. Publish questions and answers regarding professional practices that are of concern to our readers. This is to be done on a regular basis and will include answers from various disciplines and church leaders.

The editorial board urgently requests articles that will be considered for our May 1977 newsletter and for the journal in August 1977.

We look forward to receiving materials from you that will strengthen our members.

Sincerely,

Don Lankford, Editor

Please accept the editorial committee's heartfelt thanks for your response to our first newsletter. The following letter along with others helped compensate for all hours spent in preparing the publications this year.

Membership Directory

The Association has received requests for copies of the directory of members. Please advise us of any address changes and/or complete a form listing:

1. name
2. address
3. type of membership; professional, student or associate
4. professional field of training
5. degrees
6. present position (employer)

Then send to: Gary Carson
3750 Harrison Blvd.
Dept. of Psychology
Weber State College
Ogden, Utah 84403

Dr. E. Wayne Wright
AMCAP President
Professor of Psychology
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84321

Dear Dr. Wright:

Congratulations on an excellent AMCAP Newsletter. I am excited about the impact that our association can have on our profession. I especially appreciated the statement Gary Carson made to the editors of the APGA Journal. You may be interested to know that APGA likewise heard from some of us in the Snow College Counseling Center as we took a stand. I have been hoping since I first attended a meeting of the LDS Personal Guidance Assoc. at the APGA Convention at Atlantic City 1971 that we could organize to the point that we could have an impact on our profession. I have been involved to varying degrees since. Your newsletter is a milestone.

Sincerely,

Roger G. Baker

A.M.C.A.P. EXECUTIVE NOTES

Challenge to A.M.C.A.P. Members

As professionals and members of AMCAP, there is a lesson for us in the still-popular Broadway musical hit, "Fiddler on the Roof." You will recall that Tevye sings a song, "If I were a Rich Man," in which he makes the point that if he were a rich man, people would come to him for answers to questions and it wouldn't really matter whether the answers he gave were right or wrong because says he, "When you're rich they think you really know". The equivalent for us might be "When you're famous they think you really know".

This is obviously, an oversimplification. However, my experience leads me to believe that when you are well enough known to be elected to an office in your professional association, your word and opinions seem to carry more weight than they did before. I am convinced that as Latter-Day Saints and as professionally competent people in our various fields, we do have something to say to our colleagues and that becoming "famous" in our respective professional organizations would help us say it more effectively. My message, therefore, is simply this: "Let's get involved."

There are a number of relatively easy ways to get involved in a professional organization. One of them is to submit convention program proposals. Another is to attend and participate in conventions at local, state and national levels. By doing so, we will have

opportunities to meet and perhaps get personally acquainted with the leaders in our fields.

For Example, I recall that when I was a young member of my profession I met Dugald Arbuckle at a national convention and invited him to participate in a summer program at BYU. He accepted and in turn invited me to participate in such a program at Boston University. He was president-elect of APGA at that time and it wasn't long until we were doing a number of things together and I was involved in the organization as an active participant.

Another way, of course, is to write and submit articles for publication. If you haven't had the experience of having an article accepted by one of the professional journals, it's one that you should actively seek. It brings a certain amount of reward even if you acquire a pile of rejection slips for every article that is accepted.

Yes, we do have something to say to our colleagues and I think we should get ourselves into the most favorable positions we can so we will be able to say it with some assurance that what we say will have an impact on our professions. "Let's get involved."

H.L. Isaksen
President-elect

A.M.C.A.P. Membership

The membership section of the proposed by-laws in the August 1976 newsletter was not complete. The following is the corrected section.

ARTICLE II - MEMBERSHIP

Section I - General. Any member of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints whose primary professional responsibilities and/or interests are in the area of counseling and psychotherapy shall be eligible for membership in the Association.

Section II - Types of Membership. The Association shall include three types of membership: professional, student and associate.

Section III - Requirements for Membership

(a) Professional - the member must have reached a professional level of training in one of the branches of counseling or psychotherapy, be a member of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and be willing to declare his willingness and intentions to adhere to the principles and standards of the Church, both in his or her personal life and professional practice.

(b) Student - The member must be engaged in a program of professional training in counseling or psychotherapy and be otherwise eligible as in (a) above.

(c) Associate - An associate member need not be a member of the Church or of the counseling-psychotherapy profession, but must subscribe to the purpose of the Association. He or she may not vote or hold office.

PRESENTERS - AMCAP CONVENTION

October 1-2, 1975

G. HUGH ALLRED, currently an Associate Professor of CDFR at BYU, received his Ed.D. Degree from the University of Oregon in Counseling Psychology. He has full clinical and approved supervision of counselors from the American Association of Marriage and Family Counseling, is on the examining board for Utah's marriage & family counselor's licensing board, and holds international recognition for connecting marriage & family counseling in a wilderness setting. His books include "Mission for Mothers" and "On the Level". He has a wife, Carolyn, & 5 children.

ROBERT L. BLATTNER is Special Assistant to the L.D.S. Commissioner of Personal Welfare in Salt Lake City. He will assist with the presentation on "Counseling the Homosexual in a Church Setting". He and his wife, Beverly, have 3 children: Paula, Robert Charles and Aaron. He also holds a Masters of Science degree.

CARLFRED B. BRODERICK graduated Magna Cum Laude with a Bachelors degree from Harvard University and obtained his Ph.D. in Child Development and Family Relations from Cornell. He also completed post-doctoral work in marriage counseling at the University of Minnesota. He is presently Professor of Sociology and Executive Director of the Marriage and Family Counseling Program at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles. Dr. Broderick is editor of the Journal of Marriage and the Family and President-Elect (1974-75) of the National Council on Family Relations. He has been a member of the executive committee of the National Council on Family Relations since 1965, a Fellow of the American Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, American Sociological Association and the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex and formerly on the Board of Directors of the Groves Conference. Currently, he is President of the Southern California Association of

Marriage and Family Counselors. Dr. Broderick is married to Kathleen Broderick and the father of eight children.

VICTOR L. BROWN, JR. is the Commissioner of L.D.S. Social Services in Salt Lake City. He received an Honors B.S. in 1965, a Master of Social Work in 1967, and his Doctorate of Social Work in 1973. He is a native of Salt Lake City and is married to Maureen Holdaway Brown. They have 6 children.

ROBERT D. CARD has a private clinical psychology practice in Salt Lake City and holds a Ph.D. degree in Ed. Psych. from the University of Utah. He is a member of Phi Kappa Phi and the father of 3 sons. His wife's name is Helen. He will be conducting the "Counseling the Homosexual" presentation along with Dr. Robert L. Blattner and Dr. Gary Manwell of Utah State.

VICTOR B. CLINE is Professor of Psychology at the University of Utah. He received his Ph.D. degree from the University of California at Berkeley. His wife is Lois and they have 9 children.

VAUGHN J. FEATHERSTONE, 2nd Counselor in the Presiding Bishopric, was Father of the Year for Utah in 1974. He and his wife, Merlene, have 7 children.

ADDIE J. FUHRMAN received her Ph.D. degree from the University of Minnesota in Counseling Psychology and is currently an Associate Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Utah. She is also a counseling psychologist in the University Counseling Center. She will be presenting "Counseling the Single Adult".

TERRENCE D. OLSON, Ph.D., who will be assisting Dr. Allred in the Family Counseling presentation, is an Associate Professor of CDFR at BYU and received his Ph.D. degree from Florida State. He is a Clinical Member of the Association of Marriage and Family Counseling and along with his wife, Karen, has 4 children.

D & C 78:11 — Wherefore, a commandment I give unto you, to prepare and organize yourselves by a bond or everlasting covenant that cannot be broken.

Counseling the Homosexual In A Church Setting

Robert L. Blattner

I will proceed to present on the topic of counseling the homosexual. I must admit, I don't know if it is a pleasure to be here, or not today. I guess I will only be able to determine that once I finish speaking and have heard some of the questions that come back in response.

I'd like to do as Dr. Kline suggested today. Dr. Kline has suggested that I talk with you for a few minutes about the church's efforts to counsel the homosexual who comes to us for therapy. As many of you are probably aware, the Church has had some interest in providing assistance in this area for some time. President David O. McKay in 1961 assigned Brother Kimball and Brother Peterson to this assignment to try and see what they could do to assist those individuals who wished to overcome the problem and put it behind them. This assignment remained with these two brethren until 1972 at which time it was turned over to Personal Welfare Service or LDS Social Services. The attempt at that time was to have an office with volunteers who act as counselors. These men were not professionals but were men who had served in the Church and who did the work. President Kimball himself has done the work continuously until about the time he became the President of the Church and was not able to continue that assignment as such. As the responsibility comes to Personal Welfare Services, the assignment is twofold: one, to develop help for priesthood leaders who are attempting to counsel members of their wards and stakes who are experiencing problems with homosexuality. This is an important effort; we have seen some priesthood leaders who have done excellent work in being able to help the homosexual in dealing with the problem. We find, of course, some who are very much afraid and don't know what to do with the problem when they encounter it. The second aspect of the assignment was to develop a counseling approach or therapy approach which could be used within the agency of LDS Social Services to handle referrals which came from priesthood leaders and provide a professional base for doing therapy with homosexuality. Along with this has been an effort to do research to find out as much as we could about the problem of homosexuality among the members of the church--not necessarily the number so much as what kind of problem does exist within the church and what would be the best way to go about helping them. We are continuing this research and will hopefully be gathering some more material in the near future which will help us understand the problem a little better.

There were four things that came out of our research that may be of interest to you here today. There is nothing unusual about the findings except maybe to confirm again things which you are already aware of as to the causes of the problem or some of the related background factors in its development.

One of the factors that has stood out prominently, of course, is the disturbed family background from which most individuals experiencing homosexuality come from. The factor which was the most clear cut was that of either the emotionally absent father or the physically absent father. In all the cases which we examined this was the factor which stood out in prominence. The father, either through death, divorce, or just through emotional withdrawal or a very hard emotional surface did not relate with the individual. Of course, the factor of the mother that seemed to come out repeatedly was the mother could be either a warm and understanding or dominant and over-protective. She was usually controlling.

The second factor which showed up often among those that were counseled was the lack of relationship with peers. The individual either sensed rejection or was actually rejected by those around him in his own age group. Too, it seemed that homosexuality was used by these individuals as a vehicle for gaining love, affection and association with others, in attempting to be able to establish themselves in a relationship.

The third factor was the unhealthy sexual attitudes which had been developed by these individuals. Sex was often viewed in the home as something less than desirable, and often "dirty". Sometimes it was found that the males interest in girls had been discouraged in the home. The father's mistreatment of the wife or mother in the home had often created a negative attitude. And then, and maybe most typically, the individual seemed to misinterpret the church's standards on premarital chastity and views heterosexual relationships negatively. The statement that is so characteristic that we hear is that if they are asked the question, "Had they had any heterosexual contacts in physical union?", the statement usually came back, "What! with a girl? That would be a sin." There was no correlation between that and homosexuality being a sin. To some extent previous homosexual experiences seem to have been a factor. Although most of these in the cases which we have seen usually occurred around the age of 12 or 13 years, some were as early as 4 or 5 years of age. As a church related agency, I think one of the things we have to deal with directly is the fact that

the individual comes to us knowing that what he has done is wrong and that he is carrying a great sense of guilt when he comes in to talk with us. The church's attitude, as many of you are aware is one of placing homosexuality in the same category of sin as fornication and adultery. So, as we try to provide therapy it is on the basis within the standard framework that the individual understands he is receiving help from the church and that it will be given in accordance with church standards. The guilt is usually the thing which seems to motivate the individual to come for help in seeing us. We do have some referrals from priesthood leaders who are not motivated by themselves. They are motivated often because of fear of losing their membership in the church. But those individuals who come in to see us (and that's probably about three out of four) come in because of experiencing a sense of guilt and wanting to overcome a problem. But it is not just a problem of homosexuality that is troubling them as they come in. They also feel themselves being unable to handle their lives as adequately as they would like to. They feel that their lives are not moving in the directions that they would like to be going. Now, speaking specifically as to some of the things that we are doing in therapy within the agency, I would like to make a distinction between counseling with the homosexual, with just his homosexuality, or counseling with him as an individual in total. Homosexuality is not just an isolated problem, as you are no doubt aware. It is a symptom of a more basic difficulty within the individual that he has grown up with as an outgrowth of a basic problem of being unable to deal with problems within his life. And so, in order to successfully counsel him in helping him to eliminate the problem, both aspects must be dealt with. Homosexuality being eliminated does not cure or solve the other problems that he has to face. Eliminating the neurotic behavior probably will not solve his homosexuality. In a counseling approach an effort is made to deal with the individual in total, not with homosexuality as an isolated problem in his life. No doubt homosexuals are individuals troubled with homosexuality. They are the most sensitive people that I have ever dealt with in a counseling relationship. They fear greatly, of course, the rejection of any type and are sensitive to that occurring. They are also very sensitive to people becoming aware publicly of the problem that they have. The first aspect of therapy is the development of the relationship where the individual does feel that he can relate in a manner that will be one of trust and one of warmth and acceptance with the therapist. In conjunction with this, he also especially if he is desiring to overcome the problem, must feel that the counselor feels that he is capable of

overcoming the problem. This item of positive set which we sometimes discuss seems to be of basic importance, the positive set being that the individual receiving counsel and the therapist who is working with him, both feel that help is available to them and that the method that they are going to use will be successful in dealing with the problem. If that step can be once reached the objective of therapy is more easily obtained. In conjunction with this, I try to assess the motivation of the individual and its source. It has been my experience that those individuals who come for help even though they may have been involved in it for a number of years, and have a sincere desire to overcome the problem and feel the motivation from within to deal with it can be successful. Of course, the more years that they seem to be involved with the practice and the older they are, sometimes the more difficult the problem becomes. But the motivation of the individual is achieved.

I have been surprised as I have counseled with the homosexual how similar their problems seem to be in comparison with alcoholics that I have worked with in the past. From what I have read of drug addicts dealing with their problems, there seems to be a real similarity in the way their problems developed and how they go about trying to solve their life problems. In assessing motivation, I might just mention that one of the real tests seems to be, at least for our agency, why they came to us in the first place. Did they just come because the priesthood leader had said you go or it is going to be excommunication for you, or did they come because family and friends were pushing them to do something about it; or did they have a deep sense within themselves that what they are involved with is an unhealthy thing for them personally, that is a sin that they want to eliminate. If it is the latter their chances of doing something about the problem are much greater than if it is the former motivation. As mentioned a little bit earlier it is necessary to assess the extent the problem has occurred in the person's life, i.e. how young. It seems like the younger it has occurred like at age 4 or 5: the more difficult it becomes to offer treatment. If it seems to begin to occur during the adolescent years the opportunity to help is much greater in reaching them. All of this, even though it may be specific items that seem related to beginning of counseling - establishing relationship and trust assessing motivation, determining the extent of the problem, determining why the individual practices homosexual behavior - it all ties in with the basic part of therapy and all has an influence on the individual overcoming his problem. I believe that

without these things bring done, even for the counselors benefit of gaining knowledge, the individual would not be helped nearly so much. As an aspect along with it and which takes a significant part of the time later on in therapy is the system of trying to set goals with the individual. To help him mark out which way he wishes to go, not only with his life but with handling the behavior. Some of the areas where specific goals are set are in handling the masturbation and fantasy. Masturbation and fantasy seem to be a key in the maintenance of the problem of homosexuality. The individual through the process of masturbation fantasizing about homosexual activities is able to in a sense condition himself to maintain the behavior and I would doubt very much if an individual will ever be able to overcome his problem if he continues to masturbate and to have homosexual fantasies, because it is part of the system of maintaining the behavior. The same holds true with use of pornographic literature which could be a source of his fantasies. Were he to obtain some of the things that he fantasized about these things are calculated to lead the problem on. In fact, one client I have been working with recently had a whole room full, practically of pornographic materials which he got rid of. But he is still troubled by the fact that when he drives past an adult bookstore (he is from Idaho) has has an overwhelming feeling inside to stop, especially when he is under a lot of stress or anxiety. It brings personal satisfaction to him and seems to alleviate some of the feelings that he has. Another area of working on specific goals in the elimination of homosexual behavior is the stopping of association with individuals who are involved in the behavior as well. If we are in a situation where we can work with someone who can help replace his contacts with situations that are a little more healthy, it is very beneficial. It is very hard for the homosexual to find himself without friends, because often when he breaks his contacts with homosexuality he loses one of his sources of satisfaction, and that is the friendships that he has built up in the homosexual community. I am going through this right now with a homosexual who lives in my ward. He is trying to make the move and I am finding that I see why homosexuals have a difficult time doing it. As I try to move members of my ward without telling them what the problem is, into being his friend and trying to work out new relationships for him, I have found that people don't want to associate as closely. They don't want to make the effort to step over the bounds and offer association.

Another area of goals is in self-improvement, where the individual strives to work on goals that he has sometimes put aside and which he feels some sense of failure in dealing with them. This also seems to help build his self-confidence that he can deal with the problem. All of the goals have the idea behind them that this is going to help you deal with it and make you feel better about yourself because self-image is such a problem.

I won't go into some of the other things that are being done presently. The time is going but the church is very interested in providing help to the homosexual who wishes to eliminate the behavior from his life and we are finding through what research we have done and from some of those who have been counseled by Priesthood leaders and those who have been counseled within the agency that we are experiencing success. Homosexuals can be counseled with success if he so desires to accomplish this. Thank you. Do you have any questions that I could answer at this time?

Q: Does your research only deal with males?

A: We have some with females but it's very limited. We don't have much information on the female.

Q: One of the fears that seems to accompany this is that there can be a normal affection between men or between women that would not be defined as homosexual. There is for some who are healed a difficulty in shifting gears and determining what is a legitimate affection for another man or another woman that would not be related as homosexual. Do you have anything along those lines?

A: No, quite frankly, I haven't dealt with that, but maybe as a part of discussing that problem it seems as you counsel with the homosexual, you see that he has a hard time differentiating, at least when he was younger, between normal affection for another member of the same sex and sexual attraction. That seems to be one of the reasons why he has gotten into the behavior, because in seeking for the close warm relationship, before he knows it he steps over the barrier into the homosexual kind of activity. As we try to deal with that problem, I think that the individuals have a real fear as to what they are going to do when they are faced with it. I talked with one of my clients just recently in fact, and he described the situation like this that just developed. He said that the fellow didn't really make any kind of an approach to him, but because they were talking and friendly, he just fell into it. He said, "The only way I can deal with it is just not allow myself to get emotionally involved with the man any more. I can still talk with him but I just cannot get too emotionally involved with him." There is an emotional component there.

Q: You said that you don't trust your present statistics. What is your distrust of the present data; and secondly, in some broad generalization, does the church acquaint masturbation with homosexuality?

A: In regards to the first questions, I think that because of the length of time we have been keeping the statistics and the amount of contact we have had back with the individuals whom we feel we have been able to help is still not substantial enough. We have a very select sample because there are individuals who have come in for the most part seeking help, and are not people who are forced to come in or anything of this nature. In regards to the second question, I personally, as a professional, don't think there is necessarily a relationship between masturbation and homosexuality unless masturbation is part of the homosexual's fantasy; then very definitely it has ties. I have never heard any statement from the church that would indicate that the church thought homosexuality was caused by masturbation.

Q: I have heard it suggested that the incidence of homosexuality inside our church population is larger than its incidence in the general population.

A: It is kind of assumed that when you have a

society that has a strict code of chastity before marriage that there would be a greater tendency for homosexuality to develop. But as far as I know we have not statistics such that verify that.

Q: What is the church's feeling about electric shock and other forms of behavior modification?

A: As far as I know the church has never made a statement on it. I think the only statement that has been made is that it should be in propriety with the standards of the church, whatever kind of method is used in the assisting of a person receiving help. At least that is the approach that we try to take through the agency. I think that from the information that I have in regard to it that there are times when behavior modification through aversion therapy, relaxation or desensitization depends on the need that particular individual has for it. I don't know that it is necessary in all cases. Our experience so far has been that most people coming to us can be helped with it.

Counseling the Homosexual In A Private Practice Setting

By Robert D. Card

It is easy in my estimation to work with the bisexual; they already have heterosexual arousal and some dating skills, or they wouldn't be bisexual. It is really a matter of eliminating the homosexual cues, and most people that I have worked with have been extremely happy to see the homosexual urges diminish. So this really hasn't been much of a problem.

When we started out working with homosexuals, the criteria for successful treatment as reported in the literature was a reduction in homosexual activity. I suppose if you can stop the homosexual activity, this is some measure of success, and I think it has been the measure that has been used in many cases. I'm afraid that the measure of success that I'm looking for is marriage. And on that basis, let's talk about success rate in terms of stopping the homosexual urges as I said earlier, if they'll stay with me through twenty sessions, I think I could get success in stopping the homosexual urges in 80% of the clients. Now, if you ask how long does this conditioning last--what's the duration of it--then I have to say that it's successful if the individual develops some new heterosexual skills and does not begin to relate his activities back to the homosexual. In other words, if they don't develop some good heterosexual relationships and they don't come back for periodic reconditioning, I'll expect them to drift back toward the homosexual again because there are countless more cues in the environment to restimulate the homosexual than to maintain the heterosexual for these individuals.

One of the things at which I am aiming at the present time is to develop a "shy guy" group to accompany the treatment process. We will hire female models to help the homosexuals in treatment to become aware of and develop dating skills.

We start out with the conditioning about three times a week so the individual can begin to notice some change quickly. Nobody is going to put up with the shock for very long if he can't see some positive results. I have a strong conviction that the shock serves a secondary purpose in that it seems to resolve a lot of guilt. Patients seem to feel a sense of relief when they feel they are being concretely punished and the same is true when they feel something concrete and directly related to their problem is being done to or for them. It is much like going to the M.D. and getting a "shot" for something.

Question: Are you a medical doctor?

Answer: No.

Question: Do you do this therapy under the auspices of medical treatment or anything like that?

Answer: No. I don't feel a need to.....

About the female homosexual--up until the present time, one of the most important pieces of equipment that I have in working with these people is the penile penismograph (which directly monitors male arousal) because in order to transfer the sexual arousal I have to do so very precisely in terms of timing. Up until very recently, there hasn't been any equipment to work with females, and in doing some kind of research on this, using various measurements of physiological arousal, I had come to the conclusion that their arousal is much slower and much different than males. If some of you read Psychology Today a couple of months ago, there was an article about a piece of equipment that would measure female sexual arousal. Apparently, they are aroused in much the same way as males, but they don't know that they are because they don't have the external genitalia that tells them when they are aroused, so they don't know. As a matter of fact, they may report that they are not aroused when they in actual fact are. That's been one of the problems in working with female homosexuals. But I would see the bigger problem, especially in reference to working with females, as being the tremendous devotion that they have to one another. That's ten times harder to break up than any sexual arousal, at least from my experience in working with females.

Before I ever start, I always spend a full hour with the individuals, talking about what I am going to do and why, and encouraging them to ask any questions they want about why we are doing it. I tell them that we are going to spend probably 6, 8 or 10 sessions spaced very closely together because I want them to be able to detect any changes that occur, if they do. After that first session, there are a number of sessions where we do mostly conditioning, and then as we go along the first part of each session is spent talking about their feelings about the conditioning, about their relationships with their peers and so on. It is more of a talking kind of therapy. Now, just one comment on that: I have a suspicion that many of us in our talking therapy never get to the homosexual's basic problems personality-wise, because they are so involved in the guilt, the denial, the obsession, the hiding, etc., that homosexuality as seen in these dimensions becomes a major

portion of their life. It just occupies almost their entire time and energy. However, once they begin to feel that they have some control over the homosexual urges, then almost immediately the personality problems surface and you can deal with them.

Question: Do you make any use of the hypnotic suggestions, especially in the dream state, in your treatment with homosexuals?

Answer: A technique that I think is appropriate and can be used where you have the conditions that I have been talking about and if you wish to work directly on the problems, would be in the use of Covert Sensitization. I believe that this would work very well, where you take the individual, relax them and present the homosexual stimulus concurrently with a noxious stimulus and then have them avoid it by escaping to a positive stimulus. I think you could parallel what I have been doing rather well. I prefer to work with what I am doing because I have specific measures that I can use to determine the amount of shock and when to give it. At the present time, I haven't discovered a way to transfer homosexual arousal to heterosexual arousal using Covert Sensitization so I just don't feel as comfortable with the other method.

Question: I was thinking in terms of our understanding the problems where, when you present a homosexual stimulus or what we think is a homosexual stimulus to a homosexual and it isn't really turning them on at all; whereas in a hypnotic state suggesting that he imagine an encounter with a female he will then bring up in his own mind something that he finds arousing to him.

Answer: I don't think you can keep him in a hypnotic state very long. I have thought along those lines at times and I just don't think they would stay in a hypnotic state, especially using shock. This is not the situation, however, with Covert Sensitization where I would like a good relaxed state to hypnosis.

Question: You said that part of the problem is the inability to get at some of the basic personality problems. Would you comment on what affects you think it may have now that the APA has taken homosexuality off the deviate behavior list. Is it going to alleviate the problem or help them get a more healthy personality?

Answer: As you know, reaction to societal pressures is so much an individual reaction with these people. I think, particularly, when we are talking about the LDS Community, I don't think it has done a thing. LDS people are just filled with guilt if they are involved in this area. I had two individuals come from the local homosexual church and talk to me one day and they said to me, "Boy, you know that Catholic Church is now accepting homosexuals. They even have homosexual pastors and so on (and gave several other instances) and it won't be long before the Mormons will be accepting us too." I said kind of mildly, "Gee, I don't know. I can't believe that could happen--just on a basis

of the Mormon theology alone." Boy, were they made at me. They spread the bad word about my intolerance all over for a long time. I guess some of them out there have the hope that this thing will gradually mushroom until social pressures will force the Church to accept homosexuals in full fellowship.

Question: What kind of advice would you give to the wife when, 1) she finds out that her husband is a homosexual, or 2) the woman who is either emotionally or physically attracted to a homosexual of any stage--let's say even from the very worst part of homosexuality to eventually trying to get out of it.

Answer: If I could have a wife that is involved with a husband who has a homosexual problem and I am seeing him in treatment, I want the wife in there, too, including the wife right in the treatment. While the negative stimulus is being presented, she is there, not touching him, and when the heterosexual stimulus approaches, I have them holding hands. Any arousal to the heterosexual stimulus I want transferred to her. Now I don't know how you could do this kind of thing with Covert Sensitization. I suppose that one of the things you would really want to look at would be whether or not the wife is a castrating individual to him. And if she is, it is going to be a long time if not impossible to get this individual to relate to her in a healthy fashion. To the woman who is attracted to the homosexual male--good luck. I see all around handsome, good-looking, young males who just look like the perfect match or perfect mate. The girls are attracted to them because they are such perfect gentlemen, and never push their controls. They think it is so neat and they can't figure out why the guy doesn't want to marry them. These kind of individuals will date them and date them and if they push too hard for marriage, they will drop them. Generally, then marriage with such males does not often occur. However, when such marriages are projected, the fiancée should be counseled along with the male so she can see what they are getting into. In one instance, a male who was planning marriage verbalized that although the thought of sex relations with a female repelled him, he thought he could go through the ordeal often enough to have children because he loves children.

Question: How "church-approved" is your therapy?

Answer: It is probably not approved because of my treatment media--but such disapproval is usually sensed and communicated by innuendos rather than being directly given.

Question: Do you use pictures or movies in your therapy?

Answer: We have a very difficult time finding appropriate movies. Most of the stuff that is out in the pornographic market is just so blatantly crude that we couldn't use it and wouldn't try. We have movies with a variety of degrees of stimulation value which we use with some discrimination.

Question: As a member of the Church, would you feel comfortable in asking Bishop Latmer to send down a group of his girls to work with you in your group therapy, when you get to that point?

Answer: Yes, in the group that we are trying to put together, we are going to be talking about just being able to recognize flirting cues, being able to hold hands, being able to look one another in the eyes, being able to talk to someone and being able to say endearing kinds of things to a girl. This is the kind of thing that I expect to be doing. We have done it in the past. It is most difficult from my standpoint to get enough people together at one time to be able to make this kind of thing feasible in a private practice setting.

One last word; Bob and I spent about an hour before this meeting talking together about the various kinds of individuals that he and I work with, and I am convinced that we are seeing two very different populations. I think his population are individuals who have and are and wish to remain within the confines of the Church. The ones that I see have gone way out in left field, clear off the normal curve, and a vast number of those individuals are either not active, antagonistic to the Church, or their behavior is so far out that they are picked up by the law. I get many, many court referrals. It involves being able to work with them, being able to deal with the hostility and the anxiety of having been apprehended, working through that, and then moving on to the more positive kinds of things.

Question: You said your definition of homosexuality was a conditioned avoidance of an adult female in a domestic setting. Is that your definition of how a boy reaches the homosexual position? What is the difference then for a girl?

Answer: The female is largely a reversal of that definition. I have had females where the husband or the father has been covertly seductive, buying the girl slinky dresses and all sorts of things and at the same time the girl cannot relate to the mother. I think it is pretty well reversed. I am sure there are some basic differences, but generally I would see it as being reversed in females.

Question: One of the things that has been a question in my mind has been the pure-like almost celestial kind of love they can have for their partner. Do you have any idea of the dynamics that underly that kind of relationship?

Answer: I describe this as pedestalizing the female or making her too pure or remote to be approached physically. It is one basic homosexual defense. On the other hand, when I talked about this at one place a person probably not a homosexual came up and very strongly accosted me after the meeting saying, "Boy, what you are doing is going to ruin the caring kind of relationship that one man ought to be able to have to another man, even if he is not homosexual." This is one

of the interesting things that I have noted as conditioning progresses, the opposite of what the above individual feared often occurs. I have had individuals come and say, "Hey, you know for the first time there is this guy and he and I are real buddies, and there is nothing sexual to it. It is like finding a wholesome new relationship for the first time." I really believe that homosexuals are in a no-man's-land. They generally can't relate to males nor to females. They can't relate to males because the other person might discover their homosexuality or homosexual urges and reject or hurt them. They can't relate to females because of the conditioned avoidance kind of thing so I think they are really in a no-man's-land and really very vulnerable in their need to find this warmth and closeness.

Question: Are you saying then that the emotional attachment of men is more of a lustful kind of thing that most of the people feel. For males, I am sure they might be both. I think that the males tend to be fairly promiscuous generally, but certainly not always.

Answer: In most situations I have observed, males generally have more short-term sexually oriented relationships while females are much more interested in caring relationships first; sex comes later.

Question: Could you give us some ideas of your personal views as to the legality of homosexuality?

Answer: I think that I take the standpoint that the homosexual is entirely free to carry out his own life style provided that he doesn't infringe on the rights of others.

Question: Do you find conflict with the Church with that statement?

Answer: No, not personally.

Question: Do you have estimates on the portion of the population either in the Church or nationwide over the past 15 years involved in homosexuality, and does there seem to be an increase in this activity or is it just more openness?

Answer: Probably both. I get the impression that there is a greater incidence of homosexuality, but it could be that there is more openness; I suspect both.

Question: You mentioned that you deal with a different population. You deal mainly with people that have gone inactive. Have you done this with people who are active in the Church and how successful have you been?

Answer: That would be my first choice of people to work with because I think they tend to be more motivated to change than some of the others. I believe my success rate with active LDS people has been excellent.

Question: How much responsibility do you feel that a homosexual should accept towards his problem?

Answer: My standpoint on that is that you can't divide responsibility. I don't care whether it is in marriage or individual counseling. So individuals come in claiming the responsibility for the problem is 50% yours and 50% mine, or 30% yours and 70% his. As soon as you do that you can't do anything with the problem. I think you have to be totally responsible for whatever problem you have. I don't care whether it is a homosexual problem or whatever--you just have to accept the total responsibility for it no matter where or how you got the problem. Then the individual has all elements for change under his control. Divide up the responsibility for the problem and you lose elements of control and cannot change. I feel that for the individuals I work with, it is really a trade off--they are trading some physical pain for some control of the obsessions that have been dominating their life. I really feel that the individuals I work with do take responsibility for their problems. I place more emphasis on responsibility for how they keep

getting into the problem rather than focusing on the actual behavior itself. I personally would like to draw as much attention as I can away from "You have to quit this masturbating--you've got to quit thinking about men," etc. I would like to draw as much attention away from that, let the conditioning do that, and let them be responsible for how they get into the problem.

Question: Does your definition of homosexuality mean that you have eliminated the physiological aspect of the problem and that sexuality is learned? You said that it is conditioned avoidance.

Answer: I said that I gave a very narrow definition of homosexuality and we have been looking at just the sexual component. There is a vast homosexual superstructure in addition to the sexual which has to be worked with too, but without dealing with the sexual part first you will probably never get to the essential parts of the superstructure.

Jacob 2:7 — And also it grieveth me that I must use so much boldness of speech concerning you, before your wives and your children, many of whose feelings are exceedingly tender and chaste and delicate before God, which thing is pleasing unto God;

Counseling The Single Adult

ADDIE FURIMAN

Margaret Hoopes: I don't know of anyone that is better qualified to introduce Addie Jean Furiman than I am. I've known Addie Jean for about 14 years and we went through our masters program together and then a number of years later went through our doctorate program together. For those of you who know what the blood, sweat and tears of a masters and doctorate program means, then you know that we have some very strong ties. Addie is from Logan, Utah and did her undergraduate studies at Utah State. Her masters degree was at B.Y.U. and a degree in counseling psychology at the University of Minnesota.

That's her formal education. For those of you who know her, you realize, of course, that her informal education has contributed a great deal to her life and to other people also. She has a great curiosity about people, about how they interact, and has the ability to give a great deal. I think that I will now let her expose that to you.

Addie: Margaret is the only person that came to ask me to get information about what to do. She is the only person that asked me, "What don't you want me to tell them," instead of "What do you want me to tell them." I appreciate her sensitivity.

It is a pleasure to be here today, and particularly around the topic that we've been asked to present. It has been a very good method on my part, they asked me if I would conduct the panel, and then, just like every thing else that happens that's good, some unknown person arranged for the panel, and arranged to have them here. And I appreciate that kind of effort, and I hope that it is useful to the people that are here.

One of the reasons why I think it is an interesting topic is because most of us spend our lives either married or single and that for most of us in the room today, we will at one time be either married or a single parent. And so it does add some other common experience. Maybe it is one, because of the usefulness of the people on the panel today, that may help our own experience at some other time. I hope that would happen.

I just finished conducting, last year, two individual studies for the church, and one was on single parents. The other was on single females in the church. Today we were going to talk about, and still are for awhile, the issue or the topic that you have been given--and that is counseling the single adult in the church. Another interesting fact is that we had to solicit Jan Tyler ten minutes ago to represent the "never married". I think that gives you some idea of the difficulties in assembling a panel such as this, and why I think it's kind of interesting.

They tell me that they asked thirty people to participate on the panel, and of the thirty, they had seven, I believe, who were either never married, who refused to come or couldn't make it at the last moment. The three who are here, representing three of the thirty, are single parents. Because of this I appreciate their attendance, and I think that they can share some of their experiences that can also be useful to you in your own careers.

One of the difficulties of this age group of never married, widowed or divorced in the church, is that they probably represent the widest variation of interests of any other group in the church. They also represent the widest variation in age of any group in the church. You're talking about people from 18 to 100, from all walks of life, with different priesthood callings and different church callings. So in a sense, it is a different experience.

By way of how we are going to structure the next little while, I have a series of questions that I am going to raise, and then ask the panel to respond to them, both out of their own experience, and of the other people they know who are single parents, either divorced, widowed or never married. Then we will probably have a little time at the end for a few questions and answers from the audience, so that if you want to go into an area that for you would be useful, we will have some time for that, although I would guess it would be somewhat limited because of the number here.

Now to move right ahead, and not use any more of the time that we need, let me introduce the panel to you briefly, and then I am going to ask them to say a little bit to us about themselves in addition to what I introduce them as, in order that you might have a little better understanding of their background.

I have Larue Petty on my far right. Currently she is working as a secretary in a bank in Utah, and in the church she serves as a stake Young Special Interest Representative; so she is not only on the church council, but she also as a career, and in addition to that she raises four children.

Irv Lindsay, sitting next to Larue, is currently working at Utah Trade Technical College in Provo, and also works with academic standards at B.Y.U. He is the multi-regional president of Young Special Interest in that area. When he is not working he has time to raise two children on the side.

Ellen Bates is next. She is currently enrolled at B.Y.U. She is the mother of three children and a recent convert to the church of about one year. She teaches a Sunday School class of 15 and 17 year olds.

Jan Tyler, who has just been recruited and who has to leave in order to attend a class, is currently director of the Family Consultation Clinic at B.Y.U. I think that it is under the office of the Marriage and Family Department. I appreciate her coming at such a short notice.

I'd like to begin, then, with kind of a general question, and I will tell you what my purposes are with the questions I ask. I have told the people on the panel that today their purpose is to help you and me. One purpose is to try and increase our awareness of what it is like to be a single parent. The second is to try to help us as professionals to see what we can do to increase our skills and our attitudes, and maybe you will have to change them such that we can be more useful when we are counseling with single parents, particularly in the church. So to begin with I have asked them to be spontaneous as possible with the traveling microphone. I'd like them to address themselves, to look at just what it is like to be a single parent in the world today, and then we will just move from that point. I would like to include Jan Tyler until the time that she leaves, so we'll discuss what it is like to be a single adult in the world today. So, do you want to start from there? Who wants to start first? Do you want to?

Iry Lindsay: You get to hear this story. Keep in mind this story is part true and part made-up. You've got to know that from the beginning. I'd like to take you on a short, one-day journey through the life of a person, so if you will imagine with me, you just got off work at about 5:30 or 5:45. You should have been off at 5:00, but you were held up at work and traffic and such, so you didn't get to the babysitter's until close to six. So you are rushing madly to get to the babysitter's. You arrive, the babysitter is a little upset because you are late. She is trying to get dinner for her family, her husband is expected home at any time, and your being late has caused a problem.

The children feel it, so they are a little bit upset. You manage to get them out to the car and as you arrive at the house you think, "What are we going to have for dinner tonight? Well let's see, we can have--no, we had roast beef last night--no, that was a week ago we had roast beef. Let's see, last night we had peanut butter, so we can't have peanut butter sandwiches tonight. What am I going to fix for dinner?" So, you run in the house and you open the refrigerator and look around and finally you come up with some choice morsel. After a good deal of preparation you eat dinner about seven thirty or eight o'clock and you haven't had time to really be with the children. You haven't had the time to sit down and give them their baths and spend some quiet time with them.

Your first comment is, "Hurry and come sit at the dinner table. We've got to eat quickly and get it done." So they sit down and you eat very quickly. About eight thirty you are finished. You rush them into the bathtub and

you tell them again to hurry quickly and get it done, so they can go to bed. "Come on now, hustle your bustle, get going." They hurry, and at a quarter after nine, you run in and pull them out of the tub. You, since then, cleared the dinner table and are trying to get dishes washed. You notice the time and it is getting late. So you pull the kids out of the tub and dry them off, and rush them in to get their jammies, excuse me, pajamas on, that's home talk. Then you kneel down and have a real quick prayer. Well, the hour is late and you're in no emotional state nor spiritual state to have the kind of prayer and do the meditation necessary, so you have a quick prayer and you pray to the Lord . . . silently, "Help tomorrow to be better so you can do a better job in raising the kids in terms of giving a prayer." You give them a good-night kiss and tuck them into bed and say, "Go to sleep." You're on the way out the door and you hear a little voice from underneath the covers say, "Daddy, can I have a drink of water?" So, you run and get a drink of water and then you spend five or ten additional minutes. You come back and it is five minutes to ten.

You look at the house. You have forgotten that you had to have you scaling boots to get through the house, initially. So, you begin to pick things up. Finally, the house is straightened, the dishes are yet to be finished, so you need to go and finish those up. You come back and it is a quarter to eleven. I was supposed to be in bed by ten thirty tonight--that was my goal tonight, so you rush about, sit on the couch for a minute to breathe a sigh of relief, and you think what do I have to do now? I've got to finish that Sunday School lesson, or I've got to get things ready for school tomorrow, or whatever is necessary. Finally after some dejected minutes you go in and kneel down and have your own prayer. You try to read the scriptures and you fall asleep. You get up the next morning and rush about to get things going in the same process that it was in the night, and you finally tell the kids, "Hurry, we've got to get breakfast over with so I can get to school and so I can get you to the babysitter's on time." You get them to the babysitter's, you drop them off and give them a quick kiss and say, "Bye, bye. Hope you have a good day," and you're off to work, and that's your day.

Now brothers and sisters, that is not too uncommon a day for a special interest person. Thank you.

Ellen: Instead of going through the whole story, I just want to give you some little ideas. There are difficulties in having a car break down, and not knowing who is a good person to ask to have it fixed, because many people can be taken advantage of (if you don't know anything about a car except how to put gas in and how to tell if you have a flat tire). It's difficult not having the support of somebody, anybody, to give you a little bit of help in decision-making when you've got a sick baby or a sick child. You really know what to do, but you just need somebody to confirm it, and to give you a little bit of moral support.

My own son,--I look at him and he smiles, and I see dollar signs because he is going to need orthodontic work. This is a major decision because he is almost twelve years old now, and I know deep down inside, one of these days I'm going to have to get started on this. But it means an awful lot more money than I am prepared right at this point to put out, but I should do something. And who do I ask? He has a father, and I get support the way it's defined legally, in terms of dollars and cents, but it comes in a way that he can pull out his wallet. This is support--and I have bad feelings about it--or those bad feelings, is it bitterness? Is it resentment? What kind of feeling?

When I look at things like a baby who has been sick all night and I've been up all night and I have to go to school the next day, and even if I get to school I didn't study because last night I was taking care of a sick baby.

What are the feelings I am feeling? I don't know! Is it bitterness? Is it resentment? What is support?

If I call on people in the area, especially priesthood or people in the Relief Society who offer their help and say, "Anytime, just anytime," but never specify, --"let me come over today," and "Is there anything specific today I can do?" I often wonder if I can call on these people, and I feel uncomfortable calling on these people when it doesn't come spontaneously. I'm not trying to complain. I get along okay. There are just little feelings that I don't live with continuously all the time, they pop up every now and then; and these are things that I wonder about and I question. These are some of the feelings on the mind of the single parent and they are bothersome.

Jan: I'm not a single parent but I am a single person and maybe it is because I was not raised in Utah. Some of the people had already talked about the culture shock of coming to Utah. I have found it easier to be a single person in the world than to be a single parent in the church. I am grateful to say that I do see that changing. I do see a few heads nodding and agreeing with me, but I guess this convention has been exciting to me because I find that there are some things worse than being a single person in the church--such as, being a fornicator or an adulterer or a homosexual. Seriously, I don't think it is quite that desperate.

Life for me I find is quite an adventure--and not that I don't want ever to be married or that I haven't always wanted to be married, because that is part of my orientation; I come from a large family and have parents who are not only happily married, but are beautiful individuals--but I think I don't feel a sense of desperation about it, partially because of some very comforting things and instructions that I am given in my Patriarchal Blessing, which indicates to me that each one of us has our own time schedules for certain events to

take place in our lives and through the eternities. Also, being single has become an adventure because I have not had someone to rely on, and so I have had an opportunity, maybe earlier and for me longer, to draw upon the concepts of self-reliance that are beginning to be talked about by some of the General Authorities. It would have been easier for me to avoid those kinds of self-responsibilities if I had someone to rely upon.

Also I think by being a single person I have the opportunity, to discover talents and resources within myself that I might have had to defer, because my energies are not being drawn towards making a household and directing my energies towards children, and so that is part of the adventure for me.

I have also learned that there are certain ways in society, not only in the society generally, but in the Mormon subculture, that really do not help women to be self-reliant. In fact, we encourage them not to be self-reliant or to learn how to do things such as change a tire, or change the oil, or how to figure our income tax and things like that; and so this is part of my system of self-reliance that I have had to learn. Another part that has been hard for me has been living in Utah. I can't say it has changed that much, but it has been an adjustment. That is, while living in the world or in the mission field, I have found that relationships with men have been easier. Coming to Utah I find that a lot of times men will relate to me as a sister, or in the qualities that I have thought could be labeled as mothering. They relate to me in those kinds of ways. They relate to me as they relate to close members in their family, but have a hard time relating to me as an individual; and so that has been a hard thing for me to adjust to. I think in the process I have had the opportunity to educate a few men in very pleasant ways.

I also feel that human resources, the human resources of single people, are going untouched to a great extent within the church. I can remember one instance when I had been to a ward in Utah--my first Utah ward, not in the city of Provo--I was the only single person in the ward and they did not know what to do with me. The other night I had the opportunity to speak in a regional meeting and I said that one of the great needs I have is not to be treated as a paraplegic, and that is the kind of feeling I had in the new ward I had entered. Suddenly I was a cripple of some sort and I couldn't be dealt with; I couldn't be fitted in, and nobody knew quite what to do with me and the priesthood person came up to me and said, "We'd really like to place you somewhere. We wanted to put you with the widows but you wouldn't fit there, and we wanted to put you with some of the people living in your area, but they are married and there might be concerns on the part of some of the wives that you might be after their husbands." By the time the man got through, I was quite distressed and I thought, "What's the point of that type of arrangement, when a common bond should exist between us in terms of gospel concerns; and whether I'm married or single I

do still have some of those gospel concerns," -- so, it has been a tremendous learning process for me.

I think as I work with students--particularly young women who are in their late twenties, who have returned from missions and still aren't married, and who are feeling kind of desperate--it's been because of my experience that I've been able to be more helpful in helping them become more productive in their single years. Sometimes some people indicate to me that maybe I should be feeling guilty because I am having such a good time being single. I feel guilty about other things that I don't wish to confess to you here, but it is not because I am single. I would hope that as we get more sensitivity to the broad spectrum of human experience that we can learn to relate to each other whether we are married, single or divorced. Thank you.

Addie: Jan presents a good opportunity to slide the conversation from what it is like to be a single parent in the world to what it is like to be a single parent in the church.

Maybe this can be useful to us because of our common bond as members of the Church and also as professional helpers, so if you could, at this point, say what it is like to be a single parent or a single person in the Church.

Laure Petty: May I also point this towards family, and may I relate on incident that I think may perhaps illustrate--and that is, that you are living your church standards and you are trying your very best, and you portray to your children that all of you are--and at the time of divorce my daughter cried, "God's a liar. God's a liar. Look at us for living our religion, for doing everything you're supposed to do. This church isn't true. There isn't a God." When she watches her grandfather dying and she knows that he is a very devoted righteous man, she wonders if God is just, why this.

Being a single person in the L.D.S. Church means going to church and watching the children learning lessons of devotion in families. Hearing promises that if you live worthy and if you do this and you do that, you will be blessed and your family will be united in all these things. It's having your children come and say, "Mama, please don't get married. I don't want my name to be different from yours." It's watching a son go through his priesthood years without a father for a companion or a guideline. It's watching him, because of his teachings in the church, continually trying to build a relationship with his father, and his father not responding--just slightly--enough to torment but not enough to fill his needs. It's having your daughters very loving and very close and very devoted with you, until they reach the age of 15 or 16 and suddenly turning on you because you can't show them how to build a relationship with men. How can they trust you when you couldn't even keep their father. It's knowing that there is a God, that there is eternal life

and eternal marriage and you don't have it. It's watching your children who desperately need a father and wondering if it is your fault that you don't get one for them, but not having the courage to do anything about it. I would agree with Jan that it would be easier outside of the church than in. But you love the Lord and you know that the gospel is true and you just can't deny that. From there where do you go?

Irv: I'd like to make a comment about that. When my wife died I walked into a Sunday School meeting, and I have been in the Bishopric (not with this individual), but we had gone to stake Bishopric meetings together and had spent many hours listening to Stake Presidents and associating together on many stake activities. I knew the wife of this man very well, as well as the husband, of course--I have to make everything clear, see how defensive I have become. As I entered this Sunday School meeting I was about as close as the gentlemen on the front row here. I started to reach out and shake their hands, and the two other women standing with her were prominent leaders in the ward. All three of them looked directly in my eyes and turned on their heels and walked off, and I thought at that point, "Gee, What have I got?" I had even taken a shower that morning, changed my brand of soap, too! This is not an uncommon story, and this is the reason I'm relating it to you. It happens quite often. If you'd allow me enough time, I could sit down and come up with sixty or seventy names for similar incidents that have happened, both here and in California.

There are a lot of things that happen in the Church, not by design but by accident, but they hurt nonetheless. They effect your spiritual growth. They impede your emotional stability, and they certainly question your physical ability. So, this is one of the problems that I think we have to deal with as counselors, particularly church counselors.

Ellen: My older son is going to be twelve years old in January and he is looking forward to receiving the Aaronic Priesthood. We've only been members of the church a year last month. This is all new to the boy, to us--the church and the teachings of the church. We were already separated from their father before I joined the Church. They (the children) have an entirely different outlook. Their outlook is--it is going to be a different story. I hope that it will be. The children push. They are looking. Every man that comes around they say, "Is he going to be our daddy now?" But it is difficult to be a single parent in the Church because everything is geared to the family. It's very conspicuous like on Christmas Day, because all the programs, all the songs, and when it comes to the part where it talks about in the song "I Am A Child Of God", "Parents kind and dear", she knows her mommy kind and dear. All she knows about her daddy however, is that he holds her on his lap sometimes, but not at other times. That's really sad, and it is hard for her to relate to the concept of family life as the church presents it from what she knows.

I think that there is some discrepancy somewhere, where children know that they are different; that they need to have some help in an environment geared to the perfect family and family life; how it should be. And if they are in a single-parent home, whether it is just a single father or mother, it can't be the way that the songs sing, the songs that they sing in Sunday School. It just can't be that way for them.

Addie: In addition to some of the comments by the panel, you might be interested in some of the data obtained in the survey that was conducted on single parents in the church. Most of the things they have found have been mentioned by numerous men and women, and they talked about what it is like to sit in Sunday School on the first Sunday of the month, and the children ask why they aren't asked to participate as a family, and it is because they don't have a father and or a mother. Another discussion was what it is like to be a single parent and to have 3 or 4 children, and yourself being about thirty, and you have two home teachers, one that is about twelve and the other about twenty, and they have no apparent needs or desires to respond to the youngsters in any way. Or what it is like to have little girls grow up without a mother to have some sort of identity. Or what it is like to have a boy who never had the protection of a father or a man around the house.

At church they talked about what it is like to have a lot of attention of different ward members, i.e. what they can do for you, or maybe a home teacher that comes twice or three times every year--not the regular kind of follow through--he takes your boy to priesthood outings if there is not a father in the home.

There is also another concern--how do you feel about a relationship with the opposite sex in the church when you are a single parent and, thus, be under suspect even to have a conversation with another adult. Although the children are adolescent, with an adolescent vocabulary, this affects their having a relationship with people the same age, or even the opposite sex.

Another concern with single parents is the kind of help they get as a single parent in the Church. I don't want us to have a cloud hanging over us, so we are going to move to some kind of help--situations that we all operate in our own individual styles, and we reason them in our own ways in which to help. But, some of the suggestions that were given by single parents, one of the concerns, was how they are counseled both in the church, and in the ecclesiastical council, and professional council--those employed by the church, and those who are not in the church. One of the common concerns was that there seemed to be a real need for people to tell them what to do. Somehow, single parents were more in the need of advice than anyone else. I'd like to shift the conversation a little bit, because I have heard from a number of people that say they have been burned by a counselor. Now, I've used that phrase a couple of times, and it never made contact. Now, I'd like to ask the

question from the parents point of view. What do people mean, the single parent, when they say that they have been burned? Could you help me on that because I don't know? Could you respond to that?

Ellen: I am assuming that this is not an L.D.S. counselor, so I can't say that it is an L.D.S.--in fact, I was talking to a counselor who was a Baptist minister. His solution was that he was going to show me how much he loved and cared for me, and he wanted me and my family to join him and his family in a relationship.

Irv: I think I can be quick. I don't know about a counselor crusade, but I think I can report on some stories I have heard about bishops, and please, before I get accused of heresy, I'm not knocking bishops, but there are some problems that bishops have in counseling with single people. The first thing, the most common thing from people I've heard that are single parents, is that they go into the bishop to seek help and the bishop preached to them for 45 minutes, and they walk out of the office saying, "Bishop, you didn't help me out with my problem." I don't know if this happens. I have not heard the comment about counselors, but I have heard the comment several times that we are not getting the counseling in the church.

Question: What do you mean by preaching?

Preaching about how to make your life better. You have to pray. You have to fast. You have to get on your knees and pray. These people have been doing this. Their problem is that they are not getting the kind of help, the guidance to show the way to go, the way to meditate. I guess the male direction is what I'm trying to indicate. They are getting the prayer, and they are getting the fasting going, but they are not getting the male direction to help them to come to some kind of decision. I don't know if that communicates the feeling that I got from these people, and what they communicated to me.

Ellen: I think that the way I would relate to this kind of question is that perhaps, there has been too much time and energy and thought dwelling on what happens and trying to analyze and comprehend and understand it, and at the time that seems very important, but through the years I have found that it doesn't help. I think that the counseling should be more supportive, and should be instrumental in getting you started again, or how to get going again; how to cross this bridge, and how to react in a particular situation. I had the experience of being held back in counseling. They spend too much time on the situation, and trying to understand it and to analyze it, and this just got me deeper into despair.

Question: From what I've seen, single parents get married again within a year. Do you have any information on why they get married. Do

they just say, "Well, I want to get married again," and then they just do, or what?

Answer: One of the things that you've got to consider, I think is that the majority of people that remarry have children that are already grown. I think it would be difficult to go out and find a woman to fill the shoes of that wife. If you have young children, it isn't easy to go out and search around.

Broderick: One of the things that I've thought of that I don't know if anyone else has thought of is a little preparatory work. One of my good friends about my age with a lot of children died and left his children fatherless. It really brought my own mortality to me very vividly. We had a family home evening around the subject of what would happen in our family if our daddy died. Two very good things happened on that evening--that if I ever died I would be glad of having done. One thing, my oldest son, who was very concerned over that matter, said to me we have life insurance, social security, lease on the house, and one thing and another; and he said, "You know, if it happened we could do it." I thought, "You, know, that really is something." He knows that it is not impossible, that if something happened he could do it. That shows really a lot of strength of character.

Another thing I said was, "Well, our mother has a lot on the ball. I would hope that if something happened she would not stay unmarried." It seemed to me that with her talent it would be a waste for her to live alone. She got a little bit upset, but I said that if something came up there would be someone else in the world. She could find a relationship with someone else in the world. I would even give my children permission to accept a stepfather if that event should occur. I think that was one of the best things I ever did was to tell them to accept my wife's remarriage without spoiling their relationship.

Statement: I was also raised in a single parent home from my teenage years, since my mother died when I was twelve. And a couple of particular things that happened in our family as a result of my mother's death was this. I knew that my mother had already told my dad that if anything should ever happen to her she wanted him to find someone that had been married in the temple, who had her own children; and the two of them marry and raise their children together, and be each other's helpmate. Another thing, just a few months before my mother died, I think she knew she was going to die, she had a talk with me about what would you do if you didn't have a mother, and how would you feel. Also, when my mother died, one of the very first thoughts that came to me was something that she had told me when I was about eight years old when my great-grandmother had died, and she said, "If I ever died I would want you to grow up and be happy and make the best of life--to remember me with love and to do the things that your father in Heaven

has told you to do." That was the first thought that came to me after her death. I tried to do that. She told me, and she talked to me quite a bit and she said, "Love your dad, and accept the kind of religion that he does and be as good as you possibly can." I'll tell you how far I carried this. A customer of my father's came in and said that something must be wrong with me because my mother just died, and I still was so happy. But there wasn't anything wrong. It was the chance my mother had given me for reconstruction.

Addie: We do need to move along, and I'd like to do that knowing that we will have a little time in just a few minutes, if I could. I'm going to jump over the other 86 questions that we have, that are just around how we as professionals can increase our awareness, and move into some of their ideas of how we can be more facilitating. Let me just read through two or three of the questions that I was going to ask, and maybe you could think about them, and give your own conscience a chance to build in your own home.

Another thing that I was going to ask was, what are the attitudes in the Church towards single parents that compound counseling? What makes it difficult for the single adult to be in the mainstream of the church? Where are the areas--physical, mental, spiritual, emotional and intellectual--of a single parent that are most often ignored? For example, I participated a little bit ago in a critique of a premarital seminar that they held in my stake for a couple that was going to be married the next night. They spent a few hours with the couple, and they dealt with four topics: communications, financial planning, sex, and spirituality in marriage.

So, you just focus only on the physical, which we aren't focusing on today, and you talk about the statistics that he reported, that it wasn't uncommon for a husband and wife to participate in sex two or four times a week. I went home and thought about that in relationship with this topic today and thought of what that must mean to someone who is used to knowing that at least someone was sharing the same bed, that you could at least reach out and touch them as you wanted to. To not have that anymore. Where does a 35 year old male go when he wants to be held and know that someone, somewhere thinks he is all right, that he is number one. Or where does a 30 year old mother with four children go when she wants to be held and told that it doesn't matter what she did that day, she is number one still to him. Maybe you might look at these areas, intellectual, emotional, spiritual and physical, and understand what it is like to be a single parent as opposed to yourself. It might be somewhat different.

Another one that I find is, what do you think is their contribution as a single parent both in the Church and outside. You might want to look at those questions; and maybe if you wanted an experience that was as rich as mine, you may want to interview about 15 or 20 single

parents and let them know your reasons for wanting to know is because you don't understand. I didn't understand and I fall in the category of a single adult in the Church and I was amazed. I was amazed that with my broad education and high intellect and all those different qualities, how much I had assumed about single parents--like they had never been married. And there are a lot of things that are different. It was a very useful experience for me. I'd like to turn the last couple of minutes and have the panel respond to what they think counselors do not understand about single parents, that if they understood it might help them to be better counselors, and maybe some do's and don't's that they might have in their minds about what they would do if they were counselors' trainers and what they would do about how they would work with single parents. So, if we can respond to that for about two or three minutes and then we will open it up for questions.

Panelist: Before I decided to come out to B.Y.U. to go to school, which was fourteen years between my high school years and the time I started college, I was in a special class--I got accepted into college in the summertime without one of those tests, what are they called--college entrance exams. The university took a chance on me. One of the bits of advice that I had gotten before I came here which I can't imagine anyone giving to anybody, but it came from a professional counselor, was why don't I investigate the possibility of becoming a housekeeper in a home of an L.D.S. man who has lost his wife. His children would greatly respect a woman to come in to help, and I could probably end up getting married to that person. I was offended, greatly offended, because even though I didn't have any formal education I felt, "If that is what I have to resort to, I might as well go with my hands tied into the mountains and put out a sign somewhere and say someone come and take care of me."

I want to be counseled as an intelligent individual who has capabilities. I ran a business. I was an operator of a business before I joined the Church. Now, I think I have something to contribute to our society. I don't know exactly what, but I think I have something. I want to be counseled as an adult, not as a potential wife to someone else. That may be a possibility, but I have heard so many times that it would be the prime thing in my life. If that is the prime thing in my life, what happens to my children and my studies? When you counsel a woman who has children, this is something to consider. I don't know what she particularly wants to hear all the time, but I don't think she always wants to hear she should be looking for a husband. I don't!

Irv: Today, one of the things that is important to keep in mind when you're counseling a single adult is to have no assumptions when you listen to them. So often there are several assumptions made. You've heard some of the assumptions already. I think the most important thing is not to have assumptions but to listen to their story and help them set goals, and to help them

understand what their place is in life. Help them to understand where they fit into the society that they exist in, the environment they find themselves in, and also how they fit in with their family, their children; and help them identify themselves as a human being. My experience, and it's not uncommon again, was that about a year after my wife died, I had a hard time identifying who and what I was. I've been very active in the church ever since I've joined. I've had several church responsibilities, but all those things meant nothing at that point. New identity had to be assumed, and it was at that time that I finally got out of the rut. Let me add, also, there was no mourning or wearing of dark clothes and ashes, because we expected it. It happened just as we were told it would happen, so there was no deep mourning and sadness for eight months and no sad tears. But there came a time when that had to be faced as to who I was, and what I was, and why.

That is probably the most difficult time that I went through; and if the counselor had been there to offer to listen to my story and to offer to give me some objective directions and some objective advice, rather than subjective advice, I think that it would have made the situation much easier for me.

Panelist: I have tuned into everything that has been said, and I had no idea that anyone had lost their mate through death and had to know up to the last minute that they were loved. Because after going through the feelings of worthlessness when the divorce is going through, I know that these feelings are very strong, too.

I think that the best thing for the counselor to do is to accept the human being as an important person, an intelligent, worthwhile human being--one who has the strength in their dignity and their ability and at that point in one's life, when going through a divorce, you wonder if you really have any dignity or ability. I was thinking about the divorce on the way over and I think that everyone who goes through a divorce must face it alone. They must realize that they have worth. I had some good friends while I went through this situation, and although they tried to help me, they didn't quite know what to do. So, I think that everyone has to go through it alone and not put themselves down.

One thing that really helped me get through the divorce is in going to church and knowing that Our Heavenly Father really loved me. Anyone who is going through a divorce, or has lost a mate and is in doubt about what they want to do, if they have this assurance that they are truly loved and that they are important people, it really helps them. I wish that when I was going through the divorce that someone could have helped me and told me that I was really important. I am so glad that I had the Gospel to turn to.

Question: I just want to comment on the subject of people thinking that they were burned by their counselor. Well, I am a counselor and I feel that sometimes I have been burned while

trying to help, I know that there has and still is some type of church program under the title "Special Interest Group". This often has a negative connotation to it. For people who are divorced, widowed, or unmarried--whether they want to get married, whether they are lonely, are seeking someone, whether it is suggested by me or by someone who is their friend, it sometimes gets negative reactions. And when that happens, how can we solve that problem when these people react negatively at the mention of Special Interest Groups.

Answer: Well, this type of thing comes up often. I think one of the problems here is that the people feel left out when they are put in a "special interest" group. They feel they are being excluded. They feel that by being put into these groups they are quite different. And I think that one of the reasons they don't want to include themselves in this type of group is because you are not responding to their individ-

ual needs and maybe it should be more for everybody.

Question: I've noticed that where the Church and the programs are allowed to grow by themselves without much interference, we have a lot of involvement, whereas when the bishop or the stake president run the program there is a lot of complaining and a lot of dissatisfaction.

Answer: There are a lot of factors that we will have to go into after we close the meeting because of the lack of time we have right now. So, if you would like to stay about fifteen minutes afterwards we will go into that. I certainly appreciate the attendance we have had today. I appreciate the openness and the willingness each of the panel members has displayed today and I hope as professionals we can look at our own individual needs and help others with theirs. Thank you very much.

D & C 25:12 — For my soul delighteth in the song of the heart; yea, the song of the righteous is a prayer unto me, and it shall be answered with a blessing upon their heads.

How the Mass Media Effects Our Values and Behavior

By Victor B. Cline, Ph.D.

President John Kennedy once stated, "We have the power to make this the best generation in the history of mankind of the last." Others have noted that our civilization is just one generation or twenty years away from savagery and whether this occurs or not depends on how we socialize our children and the general quality of our family life.

At the present time we are witnessing a virtual explosion of interpersonal violence in our society. As mentioned a moment ago, crimes of violence in U.S. are currently increasing at nine times the rate of population growth and this may be an underestimate because as recent government financed studies have shown, in some areas of the U.S. the majority of crimes go unreported. And while in Utah one may feel reasonably secure and safe walking about unescorted at night, there are many areas of the country constituting major pockets of violence where this could be regarded as a very high risk behavior and the height of foolishness.

However, even though Utah lags behind the rest of the nation in various types of social pathology, eventually even we are touched and affected.

The U.S. is now the most violent of all the major advanced literate societies in the world today. Our rate of homicide is four times greater than that of Scotland or Australia, and 10 times greater than the Scandinavian countries. Lest I be misunderstood, let me state that this is not a 10% difference of a 100% difference that I am speaking of, but rather this is a 1000% increment.

There are more murders per year on the island of Manhattan, or the city of Philadelphia, than in the entire United Kingdom including troubled Ireland with nearly 60,000,000 people. But not only are we violent, but many of us are also indifferent about the violence and the pain and distress wrought upon the lives of others. This condition has been termed "bystander apathy", by behavioral scientists. It might best be illustrated by the experience of Kitty Genovese, the Brooklyn girl who, returning home one evening to her Kew Garden apartment several years ago, was brutally attacked, raped, and slain. This attack took some 35 minutes to accomplish. The young girl screamed, struggled, and cried for help during almost the entire time of her assault. Police later found that 40 people in the apartment complex were aware of her distress, yet not a single person made any effort to help or attempt to rescue her or even anonymously call the police.

If we search for the causes of violence in our society, we know that any single act has multiple determinants and most studies suggest that these determinants are usually found in the family experience as well as peer culture of the perpetrator.

However, the intriguing question which still remains is why is U.S. society so much more violent than our neighbors to the north and south, or say England? Or the other Western European countries?

One hypothesis which keeps re-emerging focuses on the nature of our television programming. If one analyzes the content of TV programs in England we find their rate of televised violence is only 1/3 that of ours. The Scandinavian countries have a much lower rate even than that. Thus, one of the major social-cultural differences between the U.S. with its high rate of homicides and violence and those other countries with low violence rates is the amount of violence screened on public television. Television is probably the second most powerful socializing agent in our society, exceeded only by the family and where the family is immobilized or disorganized, TV may be the most potent force.

Consider the following: Much of the research which has led to the conclusion that TV and movie violence could cause aggressive behavior in some children has stemmed from the work in the area of imitative learning or modeling which reduced to its simplest expression might be termed "monkey see, monkey do".

There have been numerous documented instances by children and adults of direct imitation of behavior and activities witnessed on the TV or movie screen. Many children have been injured and at least one killed trying to fly like Superman. A 14-year-old Canadian boy after watching rock star Alice Cooper engaged in a mock hanging on TV attempted to reproduce the stunt and killed himself in the process. Several months ago NBC-TV presented in early evening prime time a made-for-TV film, *Born Innocent*, which showed in explicit fashion the sexual violation of a young girl with a broom handle wielded by other inmates of a juvenile detention home. Later a California mother sued NBC and San Francisco TV station KRON for \$11,000,000 charging that this show had inspired two girls and a boy to commit an almost identical attack on her nine-year-old daughter and an eight-year-old girl friend three days after those other children had witnessed this program on TV.

In a Salt Lake Junior High recently, two boys were found drunk in the classroom. An

investigation showed that one of the boys had recently watched a 30-minute TV documentary on the making of whiskey and distilled spirits. On the basis of this single exposure he built himself a still and made his own private alcoholic stock which he brought to school and shared with his companion.

The key slayer in the Ogden Hi-Fi murder case had seen the film "Magnum Force" three times the week before he forced his victims to drink lye (as a method of killing them) in direct imitation of what he had witnessed in this film.

The general notion behind modeling or imitative learning is that if you want someone to adopt a new behavior you show him a life or filmed model under attractive or glamorous conditions. For example, a young man may be afraid of snakes. You wish to cure him of this malady. You show him a cute little girl playing with a harmless snake, first at a distance, then close up. She models for him the handling of a snake, demonstrating how harmless it can be. After a few exposures to this he touches the snake (in imitation of her) and soon overcomes his fear and aversion to it. One can effectively teach golf, the operation of a complex machine, smoking cigarettes, good table manners, deviant sexual activity, use of harmful drugs, or loving your neighbor, or any other kind of behavior--through this modeling or imitative learning technique. And it works. There is little doubt that imitative or observational learning plays a highly influential role in accelerating social change. This can be in a healthy or pathological direction. . . which strongly suggests that people's basic values as well as behavior can to some degree be shaped, manipulated and engineered with these techniques.

Research by Stanford psychologist Albert Bandura has shown that even brief exposure on TV to novel aggressive behavior on a one time basis can be repeated in free play by as high as 88% of the young children seeing it. Dr. Bandura also demonstrated that even a single viewing of a novel aggressive act could be recalled and produced by children six months later without any intervening exposure.

Other studies have estimated that the average child between the ages of 5 and 15 will witness during this 10 year period, the violent destruction of more than 13,400 fellow humans. This means that through several hours of TV watching a child may see more violence than the average adult experiences in a lifetime. Killing is as common as taking a walk. A gun more natural than an umbrella. Children are thus taught to take pride in force and violence and to feel ashamed of ordinary sympathy.

According to the Nielsen Television Index, preschoolers living at home are exposed to television an average of 54 hours per week. This means that by the time they are ready to enter kindergarten they have spent more time in front of a television set than the average college student will spend in the classroom during four

years of college. Or with children of school age, during one year they will spend more time watching TV than they will spend in front of a teacher. In fact, they will spend more time watching TV than any other type of waking activity in their lives. It might also be noted that 98% of American homes have one or more TV sets.

So we might legitimately ask, "What are the major lessons, values, and attitudes that television teaches our children?" Content analyses of large numbers of program broadcast during prime viewing hours suggest that the major message taught in TV entertainment is that violence is the way to get what you want. Another major theme that many TV studies have shown to occur repeatedly is that violence is acceptable if the victim "deserved" it. This, of course, is a very dangerous and insidious philosophy. It suggests that aggression, while reprehensible in criminals, is acceptable for the good guys who have right on their side. But, of course, nearly every person feels that he or she is in the right. "Every man" as William Saroyan once wrote, "is a good man in a bad world. . . as he himself knows." Often the good guys are criminals whom the film happens to depict sympathetically as in a film such as "The Godfather." Who is good or who is bad merely depends on whose side you are on. Thus, much movie and TV programming for both children and adults presents an antisocial system of values. The lesson which is taught is that violence succeeds and violent methods are the ones most usually used in goal attainment.

Studies by McLeod and associates of boys and girls of junior and senior high school age found that the more the youngster watched violence on television, the more aggressive he or she was likely to be. Other studies revealed the amount of television violence watched by children, especially boys, at age 9, influenced the degree to which they were aggressive ten years later at age 19. The problem becomes increasingly serious here. Even if your child is not exposed to a lot of media violence, your youngster could still become the victim or target of aggression by a child whose parents were not so concerned and who is stimulated and influenced by the violence which he or she witnesses on TV.

Criminals are too frequently shown in movies and TV as daring heroes. In the eyes of many young viewers these criminals possess all that is worth having in life--fast cars, beautiful admiring women, super-potent guns, modish clothes, etc. In the end they die like heroes, almost as martyrs. But then only to appease the old folks who insist on a crime-does-not-pay ending.

The hard scientific evidence clearly demonstrates that watching television or movie violence sometimes for only a few hours and in some studies even for a few minutes, can and does instigate aggressive behavior that would not otherwise occur. If only 1% of the possible 40 million people who saw "The Godfather" on

TV recently were stimulated to commit an aggressive act, this would involve some 400,000 people. Or if it were only 1 in 10,000 it would involve 4,000 people plus their victims.

Some parents believe that if their children are suitably loved, properly brought up and emotionally well-balanced, they will not be affected by media violence. However, psychiatrist Frederick Wertham responds to this by noting that all children are impressionable and therefore susceptible. We flatter ourselves if we think that our social conditions and family life and education and entertainment are so far above reproach that only emotionally sick children can get into trouble. As Dr. Wertham points out, if we believe that harm can come only to the predisposed child, this leads to a contradictory and irresponsible attitude on the part of adults. Constructive TV programs are praised for giving children constructive ideas, but we deny that destructive scenes give children destructive ideas.

It should be noted that the "catharsis theory" in vogue a few years ago which suggested that seeing violence was good for children because it allowed them to vicariously discharge their hostile feelings, has been convincingly discarded. Just the opposite has been found to be true. Seeing violence stimulates children aggressively. Much of it also shows, and in a sense teaches them explicitly, how to commit aggressive acts.

The speaker has conducted research of his own studying the desensitization of children to TV violence and its potential effects. In our University laboratories we set up two six-channel psychographs which had the capacity to measure emotional responsiveness in children while they watched violent TV shows. When most of our subjects saw violent films, those instruments measuring heart action, respiration, perspiration, etc., all hooked up to the autonomic nervous system, did indeed record strong emotional arousal. Next we studied 120 boys between the ages of 5 and 14. Half had seen little or no TV in the previous two years and hence had seen very little media violence. The other half had seen an average of 42 hours a week of TV for the past two years and a great deal of violence. As our violent film we chose an 8-minute sequence from the Kirk Douglas prizefighting film, "The Champion", which had been shown some years before on TV reruns but which none of the boys tested remembered ever having seen. We considered other more violent TV films but they were too brutal, we felt, to be shown to children and raised numerous ethical concerns. The boxing match seemed like a good compromise. Nobody was killed or seriously injured, nothing illegal occurred, yet the fight did depict very graphically and explicitly, human aggression which was emotionally arousing. These two groups of boys watched our film while we recorded their emotional response on the psychograph. The results showed that the boys with a history of heavy violence watching were significantly less aroused emotionally by what they saw. They had become to some extent habituated or desensitized to

viewing violence, suggesting the possibility of an emotional blunting or loss of conscience and concern in the presence of witnessed aggression. This means that they had developed a tolerance for it and possibly some indifference toward human life and suffering. They were no longer shocked or horrified by it, which suggested to us the many instances of bystander apathy which has frequently been noted to occur especially in large urban areas where citizens have witnessed others being assaulted and have not come to their rescue or even tried to secure aid or help. Or incidents such as the My Lai massacre where American soldiers killed innocent Vietnamese civilians and even small children. This suggests an unfeeling, indifferent, non-caring, dehumanized response to human suffering and distress. In any event our research has presented the first empirical evidence that young people who are exposed to a lot of TV violence, do, to some extent, become blunted emotionally or desensitized to it. Since our children are an important national resource, these findings suggest that we should teach them wisely. The kind of fantasies we expose them to may make a great deal of difference as to what kind of adults they become and whether we survive as a society.

Let me now summarize and review the implications of some of my remarks. There is now a great deal of scientific evidence that suggests that for children from relatively average home environments, continued exposure to violence is related to the acceptance of aggression as a mode of behavior. The results now also show clearly demonstrated link between the viewing television violence and aggressive behavior. During the last decade two national violence commissions and an overwhelming number of scientific studies have continually come to one conclusion: televised and filmed violence can powerfully teach, suggest—even legitimize—extreme antisocial behavior, and can in some viewers trigger aggressive or violent behavior. The research of many behavioral scientists has shown that a definite cause-effect relationship exists between violence on TV and violent behavior in real life. As Robert Liebert, a psychologist at Stony Brook, has put it: "Any steady diet of television will have a powerful influence on children. Its affect is, the inevitable, natural consequence of observing the behavior of others. Modeling, in which a child learns from witnessing the actions of other persons is a cornerstone of social development. (Monkey see, monkey do.) Television by its very nature brainwashes children in that it shapes the way they view the world and the kind of people they will be." Of course, there is much additional evidence now that suggests that adults are also affected by the kind of television and motion pictures they are exposed to.

Another example of the power of modeling or imitative learning comes from studies on the origins of some sexual deviations as well as changing them in therapy. Witnessing pornography can introduce long lasting fantasies into the mind or brain which in some cases can be converted

into deviant sexual inclinations and ultimate deviant behavior. Time precludes an extensive discussion of these mechanisms but they are discussed at length in my recent book, "Where do you Draw the Line", published by your Brigham Young University Press.

Having been engaged in behavior science research for some twenty years, the inescapable conclusion I have reached is that the media--television, commercial motion pictures, printed matter and even advertisements in magazines, on TV, etc., can fill our minds with fantasies and images that can powerfully affect our beliefs, feelings, values and then our behavior, and it can be for good or evil.

I have chosen the area of violence to illustrate my thesis of how moral, ordinary people can be induced through "persuasive communications" to engage in behaviors which are highly inimical to their self-interest as well as being irrational and ultimately self-destructive. In fairness we need to indicate the other side of the coin. That the same techniques and tools or persuasive communications which can manipulate behavior, values and choice detrimentally can also be used for beneficial purposes. In fact, many behavioral scientists are now studying how TV and motion pictures can be used to teach children prosocial behavior and we are just beginning to see a whole wave of research findings powerfully demonstrating that children can be taught via movies or TV: self-control, number concepts, increased vocabulary, sharing, willingness to help others, or even not to smoke because it may harm your health.

While the values modeled in many commercial motion pictures and television entertainments are nihilistic and antisocial--which in fact often reflects the lifestyles and pathological value system of their creators, it doesn't necessarily have to be this way. It seems entirely possible for the artist, the playwright, the lyricist, the novelist, the creator of cinema--to produce models of man in many instances which emphasize coping behavior not coping out, life not death, health not pathology, competence not ineffectuality and inadequacy. I see the arts and artists as now having an almost incredible potential and power to shape our future and, almost even the very nature of man himself.

We are moving into an age of the reduced work week and earlier retirement with much increased leisure time, which means that the theatre, our entertainments, sports, recreations and the arts will all occupy an increasing portion of our time and psychic involvements. This is associated with an even greater penetration of the electronic age involving instant audio-visual communication available to us all. These facts taken together have profound implications for the artist and the entertainer to influence us. It is these people, for most Americans, who are now becoming the new high priests of our society, influencing our fashions, our styles of sexual expression and even effecting our most basic values and behavior.

In an attempt to analyze in depth the content, values and themes modeled in our present

day cinema, the speaker conducted a survey of every motion picture playing in Salt Lake City area several years ago. We analyzed altogether 37 films. We found that 62% of the films reviewed presented an essentially fatalistic viewpoint of life and human destiny, in which man was caught by forces that he could not really control or cope with and in which he had to endure his fate without much hope of resolving his difficulties or conflicts. This approached in some ways the existential view of man, though here it also suggested an additional impotency and ineffectuality.

Fifty-seven percent of the films presented dishonesty in a heroic light or as being justified by the hero because of the circumstances. Thirty-eight percent of the films presented criminal activity as something that pays off or as being a successful and an exciting past-time with no negative consequences. In 59% of the films the heroes killed one or more individuals. Seventy-two percent of the heroines were presented as being to some degree sexually promiscuous. In fact, only one film suggested normal sexual relations between a man and a woman legally married to each other. In other words the model of sex presented in most American cinema is almost entirely illicit. In only 22% of the films were any of the principal figures seen engaged in what might be termed healthy and reasonably satisfying marriages. Thus in sum, we found that the majority of our modern cinema heroes are anti-heroes who, for the most part, are unprincipled, unrestrained, lacking in impulse control and unconcerned with the rights or sensitivities of others--they could be best described as character disorders or psychopathic personalities--for the most part.

I am personally convinced by a vast amount of research, that the images, fantasies and models which we are repeatedly exposed to in our advertisement, our entertainments, our novels, our motion pictures and other works of art can and do powerfully effect the self-image and later the behavior of nearly all men. We, in a sense, are at your mercy. The novelist, poet, creator of cinema, the lyricist, the playwright, I would plead with you to give us--at least in part--a new vision of man, a new set of heroes. Let us see at least some heroes who can cope, who can solve problems in responsible ways. And these productions and creations need not be devoid of tension, conflict, and great diversity--which are the very essence of nearly all drama and great art. But we need to see people sacrificing for a greater good, overcoming temptation, disciplining their emotional and psychological resources in climbing new Everests.

What I am suggesting, no less, is that if our civilization is to survive, our arts will have to contain some positive values and which at least some of the time present an image of man

and his infinite capacity to love and have concern for the welfare of his brother and his neighbor.

How To Make A Good Marriage Better

By G. Hugh Allred and Nathan M. Smith

How often do those of us who are married members of the Church ask ourselves: "How can we bring a greater degree of harmony, peace, and spirituality into our marriage? What is wrong?" The Lord has told us that if we are not one we are not his (D&C 38:27). This oneness, then, is an ideal we must strive for if we are to find joy with our partners and the full acceptance of Our Heavenly Father. From what we know about marriages in the Church it appears that many of us are not able to achieve a high degree of oneness and that others of us, when we do achieve this unity, are not able to maintain it. A great many of us are conscientiously searching for ways to improve our marriages and have concluded that it is usually a lack of knowledge and skill that prevent us from obtaining our righteous desires. This article is dedicated to helping you, as you earnestly seek to strengthen your marriage, obtain that degree of joy, happiness, and spirituality for which you long.

Striving for oneness in marriage is essentially the same as striving for effectiveness in any other endeavor, such as excelling in physics, medicine, government, and child rearing. God has left most of the how-to up to us. He has given us gospel principles to guide us as we search for answers to our questions. Many of us want--and ask--our Father in Heaven to tell us exactly what to do, even to the utmost detail, but out of respect for our free agency and our individuality he has left a good deal to us. Part of our growth results from our working on the how-to of our own salvation as we seek to acquire all knowledge (D&C 88:78, 79, 118) with the help of the Holy Ghost (John 14:26).² Our challenge, if we are to grow in our marriage relationship and become more Christ-like, is to become truly one and, thereby, obtain Eternal life--creating our own family in the hereafter and living in God's presence.

As we search for answers to the how-to, then, we must be aware that one of the first essential steps is for us to have a clear understanding of what oneness and its opposites are like. We will suggest ways of graphically looking at the marriage relationship that can help you acquire a clear image of oneness and its opposites.

All marital interaction is, in reality, communicative interaction. In other words, communication in marriage can be defined as all behavior that occurs between husband and wife. Apparently, then, there is no such thing as a husband and wife's not communicating, not interacting with each other. A husband and wife are continually influencing each other through

their communication: in fact, there is no way for them not to influence each other.¹ One of the best means we can use to bring about a oneness in marriage is to remember that all of our interaction is communicative interaction.

In what follows, we provide you with information you can use as a mental map to help you identify where you are at any given time in your marriage relationship, what you want, and where you need to go in your communication with your spouse to bring about a greater degree of oneness. We also provide suggested phrases to help achieve this goal. (These guidelines can also be applied to your relationships with your children to help you achieve oneness with them.)

The Vertical Model

The vertical model is one way of viewing destructive relationships in marriage that are the opposite of those that indicate oneness. This model concerns itself with those relationships that are of Babylon, that are identified in the scriptures as unrighteous (see Revelations 17:5, Alma 4:6-13, 3 Nephi 6:10-15, D&C 121:37-39).⁴ Such relationships are the opposite of those described in Moroni 7:45 and are characterized by action against or away from the spouse, and includes striving to appear superior or inferior; competing for favored positions; avoiding being open and congruent; and exhibiting dishonest, greedy, critical and one-up-manship behaviors. A sampling of vertical personality traits indicates tendencies to be dogmatic, preachy, cold, abrupt, quick-tempered, judging, patronizing, and coercive. The communication of a spouse with this type of personality may be characterized by hinting, sarcasm, ridicule, humiliation, and dishonesty.¹ To visualize the vertical relationship, imagine a society in which all people are on pedestals. The pedestal symbolizes the worth of the individual. In the vertical relationship each person has a hammer and chisel and is busily chipping away at the pedestal of each of his fellows, attempting to increase the relative height of his own stature.³ So, it is in many of our marriages.

The consequences of vertical movement may include, on the part of both partners low self-esteem, fear, suspicion of others, stunted spiritual growth, cliques and divisions, complex and subtle social transactions, alienation, loneliness, misery, apathy, chronic fatigue, headaches, neck aches, stomach problems, heart problems, other psychosomatic complaints, and emotional illness.⁴ If we are to avoid such consequences, we must become sensitive to vertical communication so that we can know immediately

when we or our spouse are acting vertically; then we can take effective action to diminish such destructive behavior and work on increasing the constructive.

Vertical Communication in Marriage

To help couples recognize vertical communication, we follow a model developed by G. Hugh Allred. This model is divided into four categories. (1) Solicits attention, (2) bosses/punishes, (3) creates/maintains distance, and (4) surrenders.¹ For each category we describe the behavior and the feelings felt by the spouse subjected to the behavior.

The spouse who solicits attention does so through demands for undue attention. He seeks attention at the expense of the other, monopolizes any conversation, and seldom, if ever, seeks feedback. Other characteristics include bragging and monopolizing the other by keeping him engaged in giving service to him. His verbal and nonverbal communication are characterized by:

- "See what I've done."
- "Only I could have done it so well."
- Dressing in clothes that set him/her apart.
- Wearing makeup that sets her apart.
- Parading his/her accomplishments.
- Entering meetings late.
- Telling shocking stories.
- Keeping his/her spouse waiting.
- Talking continually.

You can, by taking a reading of your emotions, usually recognize the vertical attention-seeking in another by being aware of and identifying your feelings of irritation and annoyance. (Note: The vertical person may have similar feelings when others do not give in to his manipulations.)

The spouse who bosses or punishes characteristically communicates by lecturing, preaching, giving orders, talking down to the other, faultfinding, being sarcastic, ridiculing, talking angrily, whining and crying. His goal is to find his place by being superior through control of the other. His verbal and nonverbal communications are characterized by:

- "You always overspend our budget."
- "You couldn't be on time if you tried."
- "Why is this house such a mess?"
- "I've told you at least..."
- Pointing a finger.
- Shaking a fist.
- Pounding a table.
- Making unreasonable demands.
- Lying.
- Holding his head high in the air and then marching away.
- Being stubborn.

Your own emotional response to this kind of vertical behavior could include anger, feeling hurt, thinking "You can't get away with that. I'll get even. I'll show you who is boss," or "I'm no good," and "I can't do anything right."

The spouse who creates/maintains distance finds it very difficult to develop and maintain a close interpersonal relationship. He exhibits vertical behavior through talking in an aloof or disinterested manner, talking incongruently, intellectualizing, talking like a robot, talking evasively. This behavior is often a response to the boss/punish interaction discussed earlier. In the following short dialogue both husband and wife are interacting vertically.

- H: this is the second roast this week that you have overcooked. When are you ever going to learn how to cook a roast? (Punishes wife.)
- W: I cooked it like the cookbook said to. (Creates distance by talking like a robot.) The bishop called today. He wants you to call him after dinner. (Creates distance by deflecting.)

The spouse who surrenders is often responding to a spouse who sets a pattern of bossing and punishing. (Surrendering is not to be confused with turning the other cheek (Matthew 5:39). Surrendering as used here is the strategy a frightened individual chooses in order to avoid responsibility in the relationship.) The spouse who "surrenders" gives up his own wants, desires, and wishes. He gives in with the attitude of you're right and I'm wrong, or I'll do whatever you say. This is exemplified in the following conversation between a wife who has set a pattern of giving in to a husband who continually uses family money for his own personal wants.

- W: Can I have the money we set aside for the children's new shoes?
- H: No. I have to use it for some fishing equipment that is on sale. (Bosses.)
- W: But, we've planned....
- H: I don't care what we planned. Don't be such a pest. (Bosses and punishes.)
- W: Well, alright. (Surrenders.)

The Level Model

The level model, which reminds one of what he would expect in a Zion society from those who are righteous (see Moses 7:18,19; Galatians 5:16, 22-26; 2 Ne. 26:33; 4 Ne. 2:3,16; D&C 121:41-46),² is a way of viewing constructive interpersonal behavior in the marriage relationship. The level marriage is characterized by openness and congruence, honesty, mutual respect, and consideration. In such a relationship, there is room for each individual because each has a place of respect. Each spouse has limitless opportunity to progress as rapidly as he chooses and as rapidly as he receives support and encouragement from his spouse. There is no need for one spouse to tear the other down. In addition, each person assumes responsibility for his own behavior and its possible influences on his loved one. The levelly oriented individual

measures his progress against his own previous performance or basic standards of excellence, not against the performance of his spouse. He is cooperative, not competitive.]

Level behavior is exemplified by a husband and wife who are standing on a level plain, reaching out to each other and encouraging each other on to greater growth and happiness. Level behavior, because it is not competitive, is not threatening. Such movement with one's spouse fosters feelings of trust and increased love, simplified communication, rapid growth and development, zest for living, genuine concern for the other in the marriage, and an atmosphere of harmony and peace and, therefore, greater spirituality in the home.]

Level Communication in Marriage

Level communication is defined as movement with and toward one's spouse. The personality traits of the individual who is moving levelly with his spouse include sincerity, warmth, friendliness, flexibility, and approachableness. He is also open and spontaneous, confident, consistent, and well-organized. His communication is characterized by nonpossessive warmth and respect, genuineness, and accurate empathy. It is free from demeaning critical comments. He negotiates for change in a respectful atmosphere. His words, eyes, tone of voice, and body posture are congruent. In this style of communicating, couples experience feelings of acceptance, belonging, positive self-worth, and peace.

In his book, *HOW TO STRENGTHEN YOUR MARRIAGE AND FAMILY*, Allred presents a model of level communication that includes five categories that will aid a husband and wife in determining the behavior they want to increase: (1) voices observations, (2) seeks meanings or understandings, (3) discusses alternatives and commits, (4) gives support, and (5) expresses emotions. We recommend that these five categories be committed to memory along with several facilitating phrases that accompany each category.

A spouse may voice his observations about relationships, events, places, and facts, and give feedback. This must be done, as with all level responses, in a context of respect, warmth, sincerity, and empathy; otherwise the communication is classified in one of the vertical categories. Facilitating level phrases include:

- "As I recall, it was..."
- "I could be wrong, but to me it..."
- "It seems to me that..."
- "I could be wrong, but it appears to me as though you are treating me as an inferior when..."
- "It appears to me that I am better able to understand your need when..."

A spouse who seeks meanings or understanding asks questions, tries to clarify or understand, and guesses about meanings. Facilitating phrases include:

- "Let me see if I understand what you want..."
- "You are asking for..."
- "Please, tell me why you get so upset with me?"
- "How did you feel when that happened?"
- "Do I understand? This is what I think you want..."
- "Let me see if I understand. You believe that..."

A spouse who discusses alternatives and commits himself to action is willing to be actively responsible in improving the marriage relationship. Discussion can include advantages and disadvantages as husband and wife negotiate and commit to an alternative. Facilitating phrases include:

- "How might I respond to help you feel better about..."
- "Which of these ways do you feel is best?"
- "What do you see as possibilities available to us?"
- "Which alternative do you prefer?"
- "I prefer to..."
- "Do you think we should also consider..."

A spouse gives support through empathic statements, acceptance of others' feelings, paraphrasing others' feelings (reflecting), and making encouraging statements. The following phrases tend to facilitate level communication by giving support:

- "Please tell me more."
- "And it made you angry and upset."
- "That was courteous of you."
- "I find I can discuss almost anything with you."
- "That's great."

In the last category, number five, a spouse expresses his emotions, including his negative feelings (this, of course, is done in a respectful, friendly manner.), about the relationship, places and things. Phrases that facilitate this type of level communication include:

- "When you say that, I feel..."
- "I feel very hurt when..."
- "I feel good when I think you appreciate the..."
- "I am afraid to express my feelings to you when I think you might reject me."
- "I feel my help is really appreciated when..."

Each of the above five level categories-- (1) voices observations, (2) seeks meanings, (3) seeks alternatives/commits, (4) gives support, (5) and expresses emotions--contributes to peace and harmony in interpersonal relationships. The categories are most effective when they are used as interactive, intertwining parts of the interpersonal relationship.

In the dialogue that follows, the husband and wife demonstrate the use of level communication techniques to work themselves out of vertical interaction.

H: Listen, I know a roast that's tough when I see it. Especially when the knife just about jumps out of my hand as I try to cut it. (Bosses.)

- W: I prepared this especially for you, and I think you're totally ungrateful, just ungrateful. (Punishes.)
- H: What do you mean, ungrateful? All we're talking about is whether the meat is tough or not, and anyone can see it's tough. (Punishes.)
- W: Listen, it's just that you don't know how to cut, and probably you've got a knife that isn't sharp. You know that you should use a sharp knife to carve a roast. (Bosses.)
- H: Hey, what are we so upset about? (Seeks meaning.)
- W: I'm upset because you're just being rude. (Punishes.) I've worked all day trying to please you, and there's just no pleasing you. (Punishes.)
- H: I'm upset because I thought I'd have a tender roast. I came home starved as could be, and I guess the roast just isn't what I expected. (Discloses emotions.) I'm sorry if I flew off the handle. (Gives support.)
- W: Well, I'm sorry I got upset too. (Gives support.) But you don't know how I feel. I've worked on this all day, and I did it especially for you. (Gives support.) If it hadn't been special, just for you, it probably wouldn't have upset me so much. (Discloses emotions.)
- H: You mean special for me, and I didn't even appreciate it? (Seeks meaning.)
- W: Yes, and I just felt really bad about it. (Discloses emotions.) I don't know if it's tough or not. (Voices observations.) I suppose that's not important, and maybe our tastes are different. (Gives support.)

Memorizing the few definitions and phrases we have given in the five level categories and recognizing the vertical and level ways of

communicating by analyzing the accompanying dialogue can help you learn and apply level communication patterns. If you have vertical tendencies, you will have moments of frustration as you attempt to change to level behavior. But your earnest and courageous efforts to change will be well rewarded with greater peace and spirituality in your home. If you want to behave levelly but find that in actual practice you fight against it, you may have faulty convictions regarding the need to behave vertically in order to be worthwhile in marriage. If you seek the assistance of your bishop and a competent marriage counselor who is close to our Heavenly Father, you will be better able to work through this difficulty to achieve oneness with your spouse.

As you work to improve your marital communication, your children will also benefit from the progress you and your spouse make. The parent's marital relationship tends to be the model children imitate as they relate to one another and others outside of the family, including their own marital partners. The Lord has cautioned us that our sins can influence the behavior of our children to the third and fourth generations (Exodus 20:5). We have a great opportunity--and responsibility-- to diminish our sins and increase our righteous behaviors and, thereby, pass on to our children, as they imitate our righteous communication, a spiritual heritage of happiness, joy, and peace.

SOURCES

1. Allred, G. Hugh. How to Strengthen Your Marriage and Family. Provo: Brigham Young University Press (to be available in September 1976).
2. Allred, G. Hugh. The Challenge to Be One. Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1974.
3. Sicher, Lydia. "Education for Freedom." The American Journal of Individual Psychology. 11 (2):, 1955.

New Wine In New Bottles

By Dr. Carlfred Broderick

The title of my talk, "New Wine in New Bottles," I thought was provocative. It is also scriptural, and indicates a point of view that I would like to present to you today. When these valleys were settled, Brigham Young told the Saints that they should beware of medical doctors, quacks, who when you needed nourishment, would bleed you. He urged the Saints to rely on the Priesthood, mild herbs, and bedrest. If you stop to think about it, I'm sure there were many members of the medical profession, including some of the Twelve, who were offended because Brigham Young was always saying things that would offend somebody. I've always thought somebody should have been kinder than to take down every word he said and put it in 26 volumes. However, I often have been tempted to go to the library and raid a lot of the articles I've written and throw them away. It is my lot in life always to publish something just as new data comes in to prove that it's not true anymore. It is no sooner at press than new research shows that you're only passing on old myths and fancies. I'm sure Brigham Young wishes that there were a couple of volumes selected from his comments that might be dropped; but, if you look back on it, that wasn't such bad advice in those days. The main thing they knew how to do was to put a leech on you and bleed you because of a misconstrued notion of how the body operated. You're probably better off with mild herbs and bedrest. You'd save money besides.

Only 20 years ago, Joseph Fielding Smith wrote that psychotherapy was of the devil. That statement also found its way into the first edition of Mormon Doctrine by Bruce R. McConkie. I'm not so sure that 20 years ago, and even today in many instances, there is not some truth to that statement, that people get as much pain from going to psychotherapists as they get rid of by going to psychotherapists. I think those of us who are counselors in the Church need to examine whether our art is getting to the place where Brigham Young's and Joseph Fielding Smith's advice may be dated, with respect to our services. I find, in and out of the Church, a lot of counseling isn't very helpful to the people who get it; sometimes it's devastatingly destructive. Perhaps because I'm in a training center where I train counselors, I tend to get a lot of people who have been seduced by their counselors, driven insane by their counselors, led to divorce by their counselors, recommended into adultery by their counselors, in other ways "screwed up" by their counselors far beyond what would have happened to them if they had just stayed home.

I have a lively awareness that counseling can be lifesaving, soul-saving, or life destructive and soul destructive. How many

times I've had to give permission to someone to get out of a group, where it took them two days in bed to recover from being attacked by hostile people in the name of unleashed honesty. How many times I've had to restore people to sanity--I mean that both literally and figuratively--from the strange things that they have been told and the strange ways in which they have been treated. So I think, in the Church, the long-standing hostility between the ecclesiastical authorities and the counseling profession is not without cause.

Now let's discuss to what extent that profession is changing, and also the response to that change by the Church. As we become more trustworthy, I think we'll be more trusted. First of all, I think counseling, and indeed the social sciences in general, started out as a substitute for religion, and religion was often one of the things it attacked. The object was to replace religion with rational explanations for behavior which didn't involve will the superstition and metaphysics of religion. Religion was viewed as, and indeed it functioned as, a negative influence in people's lives as often as a positive influence. I'm sure in the history of the world, as recently as Masters and Johnson, it has been found that one of the chief causes of sexual disfunction was fundamental religion. The religion can be Catholic or Protestant; and although they didn't name the Mormons--I know Masters and Johnson quite well, and they've had a fair number of Mormon patients--it's very common among the Mormons for their Mormonism to have contributed to their sexual disfunction. So we know that religion can be used, Mormonism or any other religion or philosophy, to hurt people. Therapists have observed this effect, and today one of the most prominent therapies is what I'd call hard existentialism, as in hard rock, versus soft existentialism and soft rock.

Hard existentialism reduces religion. I operate downstairs from a department which is run as a very tight religious group. There are only three kinds of students in that department. There are real disciples who you can immediately recognize because they take on the narrowisms, the accent, the euphemisms, the idioms, and the philosophy and lifestyle of their mentors. You know if ever you walk up to one of them, they're going to grab you by the forearms and tell you what a beautiful person you are. Then there is the group who are closet rebels. Outside, when they go home, they spill to their spouse or whoever they are living with that they made it through another day, and just can't see how they did it, but they've got to get their degree. Then there are the active rebels, and they're just destroyed. They become the subject of the group, and they're assigned to senior students who train them in the faith. They're confined

with group sessions where they're attacked for their hangups and their holdouts. So, among counselors there are religions. There are counselors whose faith is their counseling philosophy, whether it be existentialism or whatever.

It's still true that in and out of the Church there are counselors who have philosophies of life that are fundamentally contrary to the Gospel principles--fundamentally contrary. They feel torn to pieces as they try to function as counselors and as members of the Church. They have to shift from forward to reverse every time they shift pads. Their ecclesiastical authorities would be shocked if they heard what they did in therapy, and their clients and colleagues would be shocked if they heard what they said in Sacrament Meeting. They must live in some degree of terror of cross-discovery that the one world will discover the other because they're both religious faiths and they really belong to two religions. However, I think that one reason the Church is more open to counseling today is because there is a whole new wave of counseling style and techniques that are eminently consistent with Gospel principles. I don't mean that they're derived from Gospel principles, but they do not put an individual under strain in operating in those style techniques. I would like to name some of them. Obviously I can't develop that many, but in any case, as counselors, you probably know about these.

I think that the whole short-term, action-oriented approach tends to be problem solving. It tends to try to find and diagnose a problem in terms of what you're doing that you ought to change doing to get different results--even how you ought to view yourself differently if that's a new way. So we have assertiveness training with different versions. There is no one of these that can't be used for ill or for good, but it is possible to teach persons to value themselves, to speak clearly for what they want, and to deal with people forthrightly. Learning assertiveness would make them really good Relief Society presidents, Bishops, and Stake Presidents, if we could just get them to do that.

Some behavioral therapies are very consistent with being doers of the word, not hearers only, as you get people to make systematic changes in their lives. I like the philosophies of the behaviorists who say, for example, "There is a cycle in behaviors and attitudes and reactions that go like this: A person's attitude determines his behavior. His behavior determines other people's reactions toward him. The other person's reactions determine his attitude. That is the cycle." I'm a skeptic myself. I feel that since our profession is not revealed, one can afford to keep an open mind and not quickly sign up for that particular heaven; because unlike the Gospel, heavens change. I don't want to end up in the wrong one.

The behaviorists point out that while it's possible to change an attitude, and then to change a behavior and then a reaction to that behavior so you get different reactions, it's also equally possible and much more accessible to just decide to change a behavior. It's hard to decide to change an attitude. For example, you don't think about a white elephant and you would never have thought of a white elephant if they hadn't mentioned it, but now you can't think of anything but a white elephant. The harder you try to not think of one the more you do. You've run into people who are trying to change an attitude, and the harder they try, the harder it is, and the more they doubt the change that they just tried to make. Behaviorists say, "Change the behavior and then you get different reactions from people and then your attitude will change." That approach is much more accessible. The nice thing about this method is that you can decide to change a behavior.

A couple of years ago my oldest daughter came home, sat down on the arm of the chair, and said, "Daddy, I'm not charitable to boys." I said, "Oh?" (I didn't know whether to congratulate her at this point or to commiserate with her.) She just had a talk that morning in seminary on charity, and she decided that she wasn't charitable. She was 15 at the time and a very serious-minded girl. I said, "What do you mean?" "Well, I don't say hi back to boys."

"Why is that, Honey?" "I don't want to encourage them." "I see. Well, what else?" "When they want to talk to me I only insult them." "Right to their faces?" "Yea." "Well, you've got a point there. You might improve a little on that." She was afraid that if she even encouraged them, who knows what deliciously terrible things boys would do. If you give them an inch, etc. So I said, "How would a charitable girl be toward boys--how would she behave toward boys?" "Well, if they wave to her she would wave back." "Okay, like how many times a day would you wave to a boy that waved to you first?" "Five." "What else would she do?" "Well, I would talk to boys, but I don't know how to talk to boys. I don't know what to talk to them about." So I quoted from Dick Stewart, one of my very favorite behaviorists, the author of Trick or Treatment and Slim Chance in a Fat World. He has a two-question system: Whenever you're in conversation with someone you ask them a question, and whatever their answer is, don't then take off on something that it reminds you of. You probe. You ask another question. Now all counselors know how, that's all that we do practically is follow-up on questions. That's what makes us counselors.

And so you ask two questions in a row to the same person, and I've had good luck with that. People in conversations say, "You really care about that?" And so I guaranteed my daughter that if she would do that she would have a conversation going because no one can resist explaining when you show real interest in something they're doing. So I gave her that

rule and I suggested that maybe she had better not criticize them right to their faces. She said, "I can still do it behind their backs, can't I?" I said, "Yes." So we assigned her two of those a day and five "Hi's" a day for a week. And if she made that five times out of seven days she would get dinner out with Daddy.

Now you have to believe--it may be incredible to you--but that's rewarding at my house. With eight children, to have dinner out with Daddy by yourself is a "biggie." Ordinarily you have to have a birthday to rate that or go away to college, so she said, "I can't do it, I could never do it." I said to her, "What can't you do? Is it that you have trouble raising your arm?" "Oh, Daddy!" "Is it the waving part that gets you down? You could practice waving. Is it the vocalizing? You could practice vocalizing." "No, I know how to do it." "Fine. All you have to do is to decide to do it."

That's the nice thing about behavioral therapy. You really can decide to do it. You know you can do it or not do it. You don't have to change an attitude, you don't have to revamp yourself. You can just decide to do it or not to do it. Brigham Young was a behavioral therapist along with his other qualities. He was the one who said, "If you don't feel like praying, pray until you do." He didn't say read the scriptures until you change your attitude, he didn't say get a blessing, he didn't say get down on your knees in a prayerlike behavior until you feel like praying. My daughter not only had dinner with me, but within that week she had two invitations to boys' birthday parties, and I've never been able to get anything but a busy signal from her since. That turned out to be irreversible growth that occurred on that occasion.

I'm not saying that I'm a zealous behaviorist, but I find that short term techniques such as behaviorism really work. They're consistent with the Gospel. What you do is find that law, "Irrevocably decreed before the foundations of the world," which applies to this principle. So they get blessings that are attached to that principle. That's good Mormon doctrine. Let's get out and diagnose it, find out what it is, and change. I like that. That feels good in counseling, and so do the new short forms of therapy that can be action-oriented, change-oriented, goal-oriented, limited-contract oriented, where you don't get into therapy as a way of life, but where the therapist gets in and out of the person's life, in and out of the marriage, in and out of the family. The object is to train the family to take care of themselves. That's like the Welfare Program. We don't want to have people on psychological dole. When a client says to me, "You know, I think I'm getting better and I'm ready to quit." I don't say to him, "In every way?" I'm thrilled if he's feeling like he can quit. If he comes back three weeks later that's fine. My most successful counseling cases are people that I see for maybe six or eight weeks, send them forth to practice the

things that they've developed, and then they're free to come back. Maybe three months later they give me a call and come in for a retreat for a couple of weeks and go back out. Maybe I'll see them another time in a year or two. I keep in contact. It could be like that for years, but the total time I spend with them might be 12 or 14 visits over a two-year period of time. They have the satisfaction of achieving and incorporating it, learning the true principle so they can govern themselves. I'm not very sympathetic to the kind of counseling that creates dependencies.

In college I had a roommate whose wife has been in therapy seven years, four days a week. She lives in Boston and the therapist lives in New York. My roommate finally got a divorce, but in his settlement he had to pay for her continued therapy. (Fortunately his family is financially well off.) But that's not therapy--it's something, but it's not therapy. It's a second marriage of some kind. She was spending about 17 hours a week in therapy. I'm seeing a couple now that have been in individual therapy; he for 10 years, she for 8. They came with a sexual problem. I said, "First of all, what have you learned in therapy about this problem?" He said, "We never talked about it." For eight years they never mentioned the fact that he doesn't make love to his wife as often as once a year. I said, "Well, what do you talk about?" He said, "Oh, dreams, how I grew up, my relationship with my mother." I said, "She's been dead for ten years. How about your wife?" "We never got to that." If you just hold on for a couple more months you might not have a wife, and it saves a lot of problems. So I think that there's a new line, a new form of therapy that fits the Gospel, that has a basic philosophy similar to the Gospel. It's problem solving. It's growth-oriented. But it's also dangerous because there's the question, "growth towards what?" The existentialists, the hard existentialists, are growth oriented too, but their idea of growth is not up, it's out.

The more things you can do and not be afraid to do, the better you are. I see tragic cases, and I know you do too. For example, people who have bought "the religion" and find it destroying them. They bought an open marriage, they're living with all different people, and they try not to find out who the other person is living with. Finally they find somebody who really needs them, they leave their spouse, and the fellow says, "Hey, what's the matter? I thought we had an agreement." "Yes, but he really needs me." They don't understand their need for stability, and they don't understand their needs for needing, as the Lord understands them.

The Church is using these kinds of techniques in training Bishops and quorum presidents, and it pleases me to see that there is some coming together of these two important streams in my life. For the most part, I would not feel uncomfortable to have somebody of the Church overhear these techniques. Increasingly, the way I use the scriptures and the things that I

do in the Church are concerned with the same growth and the same principles of human unity.

I want to talk to you, however, about some of the messy areas that I create. Maybe you've got these all worked out, or maybe you have other messy areas. Some areas still put me in distress, and I'd like to talk about two of these areas in the last fifteen minutes that I have today. First there is the Mormonist counselor. Then there is the counselor Mormon. What I'm talking about now is finding yourself in a counseling situation and saying to yourself, "Can I be the best kind of counselor I know without violating some commitments that I have?" Let me give you an example. I do sexual counseling that I have no difficulty with because I don't have people do things. There are sexual counselors, including the Mormons, who do things like use circuits, have people take off their clothes in front of the counselors, and in some cases even pleasure each other in front of the counselors. I'm not in favor with this. I value the privacy of the marital relationship, and they do all that at home. I'm quite comfortable in talking about sex with them so long as I don't have to do anything with them. I give them behavioral assignments and have them report back, and that doesn't bother me--in or out of the Church. I find that people in the Church have the same sexual problems exactly as people outside the Church because they have the same sexual apparatus and attitudes, generally speaking, as others do. The same therapies work, the success rate is the same, and I don't have any difficulty with that. But take the example of a young man who comes in with erectile difficulties. He's not married. He wants to get married, but he doesn't dare get married until he licks his problem. He doesn't know any way to lick this problem because he doesn't dare date any nice girls because he might have sex with a nice girl--or try to--and she would find out he couldn't and then he would lose a possible marital partner. So he only dares try to have sex with bad girls, but he can't get

an erection with bad girls. So he comes to a marriage counselor who he doesn't know is Mormon, and he wants help with a problem that's causing great pain, stopping his development, causing him constant anxiety, and is not helping his behavior either because he is constantly trying to find bad girls who might be able to help him solve his problem. But what do I do? Do I recommend him to go to somebody who has fewer scruples about sex in or out of marriage? I didn't do that. I thought a lot, I rationalized a lot. I thought, there are two ways of helping people with that problem, but one of them, the most effective, takes a partner. I said, "I don't know how to help you get a partner." He said, "I'll bring one." "Well, if you bring one of your own, I guess that will be all right." I'm not altogether comfortable with that, which is why I mentioned it. But it worked. With impotency, because they are under pressure, they don't have to pay unless they win. He paid, and he got married to a really nice girl. What I say to myself is, I help a person who was in pain, like a physician does. My model is a physician, and

I helped him with the skill that I had to live a fuller life. He has now settled down in a marriage that's much closer to what Mormons would have him be than he was before, and I consider that due to the help which I gave him.

On the other hand, I spent several weeks sending him and this girl he wasn't married to (she just happened to be living across the hall and was "game") to work on Masters and Johnson type exercises. Now, should I have or shouldn't I? If I took a vote, most of you wouldn't vote because you wouldn't want people to think that you were on the other side. But I had to decide. I had to decide if the real live person sitting there in front of me was in pain. So I made my decision. You might have made a different one.

I won't refer someone to an abortionist. I draw the line on that other side. I see the pain, but I tell them I realize that that's one option that is available to them, and they should be aware that the majority of places that they might seek help would make that option available to them. But I would not, I cannot, and do not refer people for abortions. Well, what's the logic of that? That's where I drew the line.

When I'm working with a client, I speak to him in the language that he uses, not the language that I use or the language I'm going to use at home. But if somebody uses an idiom that's vivid for him, perhaps an excremental idiom, and it says to them where they're at in their relationship, I don't blanch and talk about excrement. Now maybe I should. Maybe I should talk about it and use it with punch. I don't know, I could just translate it into good clean English. That would be, I'm sure, the thing I should do. And I've sometimes had a view of myself: What if somebody heard me saying back to this person what he said to me earlier, summarizing in other words? And I think about the scriptures that say, "It's not what comes into a man's mouth but what comes out of it." I never use that in my own personal conversation, but as somebody once said to me, "Who would want to kiss somebody who said that word?" Since I've heard that I've never felt it necessary to tell my wife that I do that. So I find there are places where I am uneasy because I'm working with someone whose values are different than mine. But mostly I find that is not the case. I find about 98 percent of the people that come to me want to change in ways that I can enthusiastically applaud. They want to be more loving to each other. They want to be more successful in their personal relations, they want to be a better parent. Yesterday I saw a family with a Latter-day Saint mother, a Catholic father, and a 14-year-old girl who is smoking and climbing out the window when her mother locks the front door. Her mother is so uptight about this girl she double quizzes her every minute of the day, every time she goes. She times how long the girl goes to the bathroom, because she might be smoking in there. She sniffs her breath every time she comes in the door. The woman is driving her daughter

right out of the house. Her daughter is about to run away. The father is her idol, and the father does all the things the daughter is doing. But the father supports the mother. The girl can't do these things because she is a Mormon. One of the alternatives we're considering negotiating is to enlarge the circle of the things that the girl can do. There's a line that she can't go beyond and a line that her mother won't hassle her within. But that

but it involves not going to Church sometimes. It involves going to a friend's house, where she might in fact be smoking without her mother's knowledge or doing things that she's not supposed to be doing at her age by Church standards. It would be a straight but not necessarily Mormon kid in a gentile world. That might not be the choice they take, but it's one of the three alternatives that looks like it might work. The mother looks at me sometimes like I'm a traitor to the Church. Actually, I think I'm saving her daughter from worse stuff, I really do. That girl is just full up to here, and the mother is just as unwise in the way she has the girl on an umbilical cord that is just that long. There is no way for that girl to do anything but cut free, and she's about to do that. We've thought of sending her off to another school where we can shut our eyes; a boarding school, for example, which her parents can afford. She won't be under her mother's tutelage, and she can have a kind of freedom. I don't know how we can work with that girl, but I'm not comfortable with it. Yet it seems to me as a physician--I'm not a medical doctor, but a healer of souls--that the girl needs to be given some space so she can make some good decisions, so she can come to Church. She has a testimony; it's just that she's mad at her mother. I think when her mother gives her a little space, she'll test the limits and she'll exercise her free agency and one of the choices that will be open to her will be to come back. Right now that choice is not open to her, there is no way she can come back. But, here I am in the process of saying, "Well, let her do things that a Latter-day Saint shouldn't do." That doesn't rest easy. I'm not comfortable with that, but I do it. Each one of us draws that line somewhere, so that's mine. Maybe I've overreacted to this, but I get upset at existentialist counselors who feel they have to convert people to their philosophy of life before they can help them. I really feel that is immoral and unethical, and in my profession we have a pledge that the counselor will not impose his values upon his client. So when my Bishop or my Stake President calls for us to fellowship families, business associates, clients, and students, I don't feel that I can use the power that I have in their lives, or that anybody should--even though I happen to know I'm right.

I've trained my students to respect the values of the people that they're working with and to work for their best values. Ordinarily the best values of my clients are also good values in my point of view. For example, they want goodness, love, fidelity, growth, efficiency, effectiveness--all the things that I would want on their behalf, things that are consistent with

the Gospel. But they don't want the whole Gospel. They just want the things that are in the Gospel, and with a client where that's clearly not so, I won't work with him. Somebody who wants to deceive his spouse or become illusive with him about adultery, I just won't work with. But I don't feel I can proselyte my clients.,,

Now if I know they're Christians, they're really into the faith if they're always quoting from the scriptures, I'll quote scriptures from the New Testament, the Old Testament, and some that they haven't thought of in that batch. I'll sometimes say, "Too bad you're not a Mormon, because we've got a good scripture right on that, you know." The 130th section is great, for example. "There is a law, irrevocably decreed in heaven before the foundations of this world, upon which all blessings are predicated; and when we obtain any blessing from God, it is by obedience to that law upon which it is predicated." (D & C 130: 20, 21) Now I can say that fast because I say it a lot--and I didn't just get that in MIA. It's a real and true principle. People are always protesting, "But I do all these good things." You know, these are Church members who say, "I pay my tithing and keep the Word of Wisdom. I go to Church regularly." How can I tell them their sex life is lousy? If you want a better sex life, you're going to have to do some different things. There's a different law that applies there. I sometimes say to somebody, "Too bad you're not a Mormon, because we have a great scripture on that." But I do not slip little Joe Smith tracts to them and say, "Read this, you'll like it." I don't say to them, "The problems that you have would all be solved if you were a Latter-day Saint. Let me arrange for two lovely young men to come over and talk to you." I don't do that, and I've considered that if anybody else did it for their religion to some client that I'd sent as a referral, I would never send them another referral. I don't see why they should feel differently if I did it.

The Lord does occasionally provide a ram in a thicket for me. We are committed to bring a family into the Church this year, and my kids are all out proselyting. My 13-year-old boy placed 6 Books of Mormon already. He tells them that it's the history of the Indians from 600 B.C. to 400 A.D. and they'll enjoy it, saying that if they'll read it he'll talk to them next week. I don't know what they think of it, but I'll find out. I did have two people that I've worked with a long time off and on--my pattern is working with them awhile, and not seeing them for awhile--who were quite damaged and had much pain in their relationship. They couldn't somehow rise above their background, but they've been making progress. Usually they came in surly and angry, and during the course of the hour I would cheer them up. My style was to send them out smiling and holding hands, but this day they came in smiling. It was so unusual, I said, "What's going on here?" She said, "Do you pay your tithing?" I said, "Yes." She said, "Do you pay fast offerings every first Sunday?" "Yes." "Do you have Family Home Evening on Monday

night?" "Yes." "Do you do your home teaching, do you go visit your families every month?" "Yes." She gave me a Temple Recommend interview. I said, "Why are you asking me all these questions?" She said, "We were just down to the Temple Admission Center. It hit me that I only know two men in my life who have good family lives, and they are both Mormons. Maybe you've got something." They went down to the Temple Information Center, got every pamphlet they had, read them, and came back and examined me on whether I did everything they said. I was glad I did them all, and when they started asking me questions about the Church I got really quite excited. Apparently I stood up, pacing and quoting scriptures. The husband said, "You know, I didn't know you had legs. You've been sitting in that chair for three years. I've never seen you so excited before." See, they blew my cover. I baptized them, but I just did it out of direct intervention by the Lord so that I got my family without breaking my vows.

So I think sometimes it's hard to be a Mormon in the field. I believe for me, at least, the most important thing is to be good at what you do, so that when people think of Mormons, they don't think of us as just a fringe group. They think of you first as a good therapist, and incidentally, you're a Mormon. That's my goal. My goal is to have people referred to me because I'm a good therapist. Then they know, by linkage, that you can be a good Mormon and a good therapist. People sometimes say, "How do you do it?" I'm glad to explain. But it seems to me that the greatest contribution I can make

to the field and to the Church in that connection is to be a good Mormon and a good therapist and have both known--have people aware of both. But weekly and sometimes daily I'm painfully aware that these are areas of redefinition, like your health--it's never solved. Every day you have to wake up and say, "Am I healthy today?" Every day you have to wake up and say, "Have I got it together?"

The most integrating experience I've ever had in my life was to be on the Johnny Carson Show. I'll tell you why. Ordinarily I pick my audiences. When I'm in Sacrament Meeting I have a Church audience. When I'm in school I have a secular audience. When I have a sexual meeting, I have a sexual audience. But you never know who's watching on Johnny Carson. Your mother, your children, your colleagues, your clients, your students, and members of the ward choir are watching. The sister in the next stake who believes you're a bit too interested in sex to be a good Latter-day Saint is watching. They're all out there together, every time you open your mouth, and it was and is good for me. It still scares me. That part gives me palms that sweat before I go on. I don't mind speaking before the people if I can choose the people, but when you can't choose the people, it forces you to be integrated. I'd say that we'll grow together through that process, trying to make the Gospel effective in our therapy and not inappropriate in our therapy, trying to make our therapy effective in our Church service and not inappropriately effective. I say that to myself first and for always in the Name of Jesus Christ whom I serve with you. Amen.

**Alma 37:37 — Counsel with the Lord in all thy doings
and he will direct thee for good; yea, when thou liest
down at night lie down unto the Lord, that he may
watch over you in your sleep; and when thou risest in
the morning let thy heart be full of thanks unto God;**

Transgression

By Bishop Vaughn J. Featherstone

Today I have been asked to talk to you about transgression. One of the good brothers asked me if they could ask questions and that reminded me of the fellow up in Idaho who had a wooden leg and he moved into a new ward. He had only been there a short time and two or three ladies wanted to know what happened; you know, how did he lose his leg and they talked among themselves until finally one of them said, "Well, I'm going over and ask him." So she went over to him and said, "Do you mind if I ask you a question?" And he said, "That's all right, if you promise to ask only one." And she said, "Very well then, how did you lose your leg?" And he said, "It was chewed off." So, what I'll do is, I'll let you ask questions at the end if you promise to ask only one.

How many members of stake presidencies and bishops do we have here? I see we have a great many of them. I won't be teaching you anything new, but I might for those who aren't aware of the probing which we do as priesthood leaders. Let me tell you some of the reasons for this. We had an Aaronic Priesthood worker, a man who was also a stake mission president in one of our areas and he got involved in a homosexual experience and very soon he was the carrier. (I don't know what the right term is, but I've used carrier. They say Vince Lombardi didn't have ulcers but he was a carrier.) Anyway, by the time they finally took action on him, he had had homosexual relations with many, many Aaronic Priesthood boys in that stake. And it absolutely made me sick inside to suppose that priesthood leaders would go that long without handling the transgressor appropriately. Now, your stewardship is different in that you do work with them and labor diligently and use your professional expertise in solving the problem. Ecclesiastically, we approach it from a little different standpoint. Hopefully, most of our bishops are good counselors; they know how to counsel; they have had experience; and more important, they are living a pure life so that they may counsel in the way the Lord would have them counsel, I mean by direct revelation and inspiration.

A young man came to me at one time and we discussed many things. He broke down emotionally, and told me of serious problems he had encountered. Simply stated, he said that he and his wife had met. She had come from Michigan and had wanted to marry a fine LDS returned missionary. She met him and they were married in the temple. They were active in their ward, and then moved to another ward and decided that, "We've been too active in the Church. We don't need to be that active anymore." They had decided not to get involved in church work. By the time the membership records did come and were read in the new ward and contact was made, they had fairly well

determined that this inactivity in the Church was the kind of life they wanted. He said, "I have started to smoke, and I drink coffee, and I have an occasional alcoholic beverage. We don't go to church. My wife doesn't live the commandments either, and she has fallen in love with a particular man (and he named the name). I know that it bothers her because she has drive up the canyon two or three times with the idea of driving off a cliff somewhere, and ending it all. She doesn't know how to get out of it." With as strong as any impression I have ever had I said to him, "Well, really there is no reason she ought to stay with you. You know, you are really not much of a man. She came out to Salt Lake and married a returned missionary with all the fine qualities one would expect. All that's left of the fine specimen she married is the hollow shell of a man. All those fine qualities you had have been cast aside. Why should she stay with someone like you?" Well, that shocked him a little bit and I got his attention, and then I said, (I am cutting an hour interview down to five minutes for you) "I'll tell you what you do. You decide right now that you'll never smoke again, and you give me the cigarettes, and then you promise me you'll never drink a cup of coffee, that you will never drink another alcoholic beverage. You pay your tithing this Sunday at church and I'll give you a special blessing to help you with all these problems. The Lord will bless you, if you will make a commitment." And then I said, "You go home and tell your wife this, and I would tell you the same thing if you were on the other end fooling around with some other woman." I said, "You tell your wife this, to put on her temple garments, and that if I were the bishop, and she saw this man again, I would hold a church court on her for conduct unbecoming a Latter-Day Saint and possible eventual family abandonment. This is simply what she is doing." Well, it was like taking a two-by-four and hitting him. He listened, committed, stopped smoking that instant and went home. He and his wife stayed up late through the night and I guess they had quite a talk deciding that though they were not in love, they would make some real adjustments. The next night about 6:00 the boyfriend called, and she was already to go. In fact, she went upstairs and took a shower and decided, "I've just got to go." Although she had not committed adultery, there had been some necking going on and indiscretions that a married woman never should have with anyone other than her husband, and they had fallen in love with each other. In spite of what they had talked about the night before, her commitment ebbed away, and she took a shower to get ready to go. After she climbed out of the shower and dried off, she put her garments on, and when she put her garments on she said, "Then I knew that I could not go." I think that is significant.

A couple of months ago, I attended a party on Labor Day. The wife of this man slipped up beside me, took hold of my hand and said, "I really do love my husband now, and he is worth loving. I want to tell you what you have done as far as our marriage is concerned." She told me she really had considered suicide, and now to be able to go back to church again and have family prayer, and family home evening, well. . . what I am saying then is that we must be guided by the Spirit in our interviews. If I were that bold and came on that strong with someone else, I would probably drive him right out of the church, or maybe even further into the problem. That's why I say an ecclesiastical leader must be pure in heart and must be guided by inspiration and revelation.

Another thing, as you know, you can never discuss certain things with individuals without them thinking, "I wonder if he has a hang-up, too." If you start going beyond the laws of propriety in your discussion, for example, if you would say something like, "Have you had sexual relations?" "Yes." "How many times?" "40." "What was it like? Give me an idea." You really don't need to know that. You don't need to go beyond the laws of propriety. If you find out in homosexual relations what they have done basically, you don't need to ask about the experience itself, because they will think, "Maybe he has his hang-up." Maybe you do, if you have to ask those kind of questions. I think there is a very delicate balance in probing wisely and deep enough to get the facts but not to the point where you may be accused of fantasizing.

Let me discuss a couple of other things with you. First, what do you do when someone reports to your boss that you have mishandled a problem, i.e. in counseling or in adoptions. We had a case like this. I'll try to change it enough so no one will recognize it. A lady went to a General Authority and said, "We've had our name on the baby list to receive a baby-adoptive parent list for possibly three or four years. . . but we haven't been able to get a baby. We understand that the waiting period is 24 to 26 months. Is there something wrong? Why can't we get a baby?" And the counselor, social worker said, "Well, in the first place, these babies are given by inspiration, and I'll tell you something, you'll never get a baby." The wife was shocked, and, of course, as she told her husband later, he was shocked. "Why, why wouldn't we get a baby?" "Well, you are over age, and you'll never get a baby."

Well, she went to a General Authority and said, "Is that possibly true? Will we not ever have a baby?" The General Authority checked with us and we found out who the social worker was, so they counseled that social worker. The social worker went right back and just raked this couple over the coals for going to a General Authority. Well, whose hang-up is it? Certainly, the adopting parents might have had a hang-up, and now it becomes the social worker who has to save his or her ego for some reason I don't understand. The

social worker should be mature and stable, and secure. I wouldn't think that he or she would need to defend himself/herself to someone who was having problems. I am not just talking about adopting parents. It happens in many areas, where you counsel and word gets back to your boss that you said such and such. I would tell you here that I really believe that your employers will not misjudge you. If you have had a traditional history of being competent, I don't believe they will misjudge you in any way. I think they will simply call you in and question it, and they will stand by you.

Another thing about which I feel very keenly in your work, and in anyone's work who does the type of thing you do, is please don't take everyone's problems home with you. I have a personal conviction that you can interview people with problems most of the day. You take it off of their heart, and I believe you can also lift it off of your heart. I can interview a person with a problem and they will leave, then someone else will come in with a problem--a different problem--and I can listen, and cry with them if the Spirit moves that way and I am deeply moved. When they leave, then someone else can come in, and when I leave to go home from work, I can actually leave my briefcase there, cast everything behind, and go home and just lead a normal life. I think we must do that. I don't think we can carry on our hearts all of these problems.

Occasionally, as we interview homosexuals, adulterers, fornicators, and others, we need to be very careful to remember that homosexuality, fornication and adultery are equal in seriousness; I have heard from two of the prophets of the Church that they are. If that is true, then how can we say that we handle the homosexual differently because it is not so serious, because he is not tampering with life's process. He is tampering with life's process, and in fact, he is involved in a perverted love experience, if you can use the word "love" in that context. He or she has problems, we listen to their rationalization and very soon we start thinking, "Well, you know, he is right. . . it isn't as serious," and so we start teaching it. I have heard several of our social workers really start to compromise the standards of the Church because they had interviewed enough people who had rationalized and justified, that they, our workers, started sliding over into a position of compromise. When this happens you have just lost your effectiveness.

Let me suggest the way that I think we ought to interview as ecclesiastical leaders. You, as counselors and psychotherapists, would interview much differently. We have a right to interview this way and everyone has a right to be interviewed in depth to find out what kind of life they are living. We had 1384 temple recommend holders in the stake in which I served as stake president and I interviewed 500 people personally. I would meet them at the door and say, "How are you?" "Fine." "Your family's fine?" "Yes." "Your children are well?" "Yes." "Even your boy on his mission is doing well?"

"Yes." Anyway, I would come across the floor and be very warm to them and then sit, not behind the desk but across the corner of the desk or out in front. Then I would say something like this, "Now, before this interview begins, if there has been a major transgression in your life, that has not been confessed and adjusted (and President Kimball said that it is critical to say "and adjusted"), then I'd like to know about it before this interview ends--not that I need to know but that I want to take it off of your heart. If I can close it, I will close it, and you need not open it again and if not, we can take the appropriate action and help you to repent. Now, with that introduction almost immediately I could tell whether the person I was interviewing had a problem. It comes back to their mind and they think, "Finally now, am I going to be able to tell? Does he really want to know? Will I have enough courage? Is he going to ask the questions so that it will come out?" So I ask the next question, "Is there any problem with the Word of Wisdom? tea? coffee? liquor? tobacco? and so forth, and I am not going to attend to those particular questions, but we need to go slow enough to get a response to each one. If they have been to the temple, I talk about wearing their temple garments properly, and keeping the Sabbath day holy. I talk about whether they are affiliated with an apostate church, or whether they are full tithe payers, and sustaining the bishop and so forth. Now, I hurry so that I can get to this part and say, "Are you morally clean?" You know in all the interviews I have ever conducted, I have never had anyone say no. I can ask everyone in this room and I know what you would say. Every single person in this room would say yes, I am morally clean. Why do we say yes to that question? Because most people justify and rationalize their conduct. Elder Stapley, when I traveled with him once, said, "When you ask about masturbation, don't ask 'do you?', but ask how long has it been?" Do you see the difference? If a fellow did it a week ago, or had a problem or a young lady did, they say, "Heavenly Father, I'm going to promise that I'll never do that again." A week later you see them in the interview, you ask "Do you have a masturbation problem" and they answer no. In their minds they think, "Well, I've prayed about it and I won't do it anymore." They are answering honestly, but the next night after the interview is over, they know they will not be interviewed for another year. Satan will come tempting and there is a tendency to slip. If we ask them how long has it been, then you find out, and you can find out if it has been a week, or two weeks, or six years. If it has been six years, go on to the next question. If it has been two weeks, then let me suggest how you can help them overcome the problem. Give them a special blessing. I think ecclesiastical leaders who do not take the opportunity to give special blessings really miss a sweet experience and miss the opportunity to bless the lives of the persons they are interviewing. Also, always promise them by the power of the priesthood that they will have the power to overcome the temptations.

Then the next question is, "Have you ever had sexual relations outside of your marriage that have not been confessed and adjusted?" Anyone who has confessed can say, "No, I have not." Even if they have had the problem 100 times, if they have confessed and adjusted it, they can say, "No, I have not," and that's the way to do it. A stake president or bishop who would say, "Have you ever had sexual intercourse outside of your marriage?" really is unfair. The person who has confessed thinks, "Do I have to open it again? I've told the president about it and my bishop. Do I have to start all over again, and get somebody else's approval to be forgiven?" Sometimes people don't understand doctrine and church government like they should. So out of their honesty of heart, they will say, "Yes, I did have, but I have confessed it to the bishop or stake president." Well, that isn't fair for us to even know that much. If they have closed it, it ought to be closed. A priesthood leader exercises unrighteous dominion if he opens it again. In fact, he is teaching by example that previous priesthood leaders did not have the exceptional qualities to judge which he possesses. If a transgression has been confessed and adjusted, we ought to let it rest. There may be circumstances related to callings in the Church which will require a re-opening.

That brings me to another point: we need to be very careful in our relationships with the sisters, that we don't flirt--that we mentally don't flirt. Someone has said there are 600,000 ways of communicating, and if you just think or flirt in your heart, communication is going to take place that your standard is subject to compromise. You need to be very, very careful and hold your own marriage together. I believe you can do it. Great priesthood leaders, including the Brethren, can listen to the story, make an accurate judgment--a determination, and exercise whatever decision they would, and then move on to the next one, but they are not affected by the transgression. In other words, do not suppose that listening to the transgression will pollute your mind. In the 20th section of the Doctrine and Covenants, the 22nd verse, the Savior gives us the solution. He said, "Though he (the Savior) suffered temptation, he gave them no heed." I believe the Twelve Apostles probably face the same kinds of temptations each of you have faced, but have given them "no heed." One of the Brethren, as a young man, came back from his mission, walked down the main street of Salt Lake City and he lusted after several women that he saw on the street. So, he said he went back to his office, as a young man, and knelt down and said, "Heavenly Father, I don't want to lust anymore." He finished the fervent prayer and went out and walked down the street and he lusted a second time. So he went back to his office, knelt down again and said, "Heavenly Father, please, I need some strength." A third time he went out and still he said he lusted. Finally after the fourth time, he went out and he said he overcame the problem. Sometimes it takes fasting, prayer, and determination. He gave temptation no heed, and since that time, he said, "I have never had

a problem in my life." Well, I believe that is the solution to part of it.

I visited a stake about a year ago. A couple came to my office within the past week who said, "You were in our stake and we heard what you said, and we want to repent. We went to our stake president and we told him part of the problem. We were just fishing to see how he would react, and he just brushed it off, so we thought that, well, . . . we can't go to this stake president, he'll just brush it off. We went to our bishop and he really wasn't interested in listening." Members have the right in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints of having a transgression taken off of their heart, and they must confess a major transgression and submit to priesthood leaders for appropriate action before the transgression can be lifted from their hearts. So ask the question, watch carefully and be guided by the Spirit. I believe, as priesthood leaders again, you really have the right, whether you call it inspiration or intuition, until you feel a peace in your heart, don't move. It may be well to say something like, "There's something wrong in this interview, I can't tell you what it is, I just know that I do not feel at peace with the Spirit. Would you mind going home and fasting for 24 hours and then coming back and telling me why I cannot feel at peace. Twenty-four hours is a long time for them, if there has been something wrong. But I don't think I ever remember saying this to someone and they didn't come back and say, 'I know what it is. This is what the problem is.'" Then you can help them solve it.

The next question is, "Has there ever been a major transgression in your life that has not been confessed and adjusted?" Now, there is no room to hide. I interviewed one man, who was in a fairly high place in his stake and he said, "I really believe that you can sleep with a woman overnight, but actually not commit adultery. In fact, I have done it." He said, "I have slept with my secretary three different times, five and six hours. We've done every other thing, but we have not actually committed adultery. We have not had sexual relations." Who is he fooling? He may not have had sexual relations, but he committed adultery just as surely as anything in this life. And yet, there is something in the minds of members in the Church that says if we go to this point and we don't go beyond that point we will always be able to answer the questions just right, so we're safe. Members who come like that have deceived themselves and they are able to get by, but they have a withdrawing of the Spirit. If we can bring the problem to the surface then I believe we are on the road to resolution. We have a right to be directed by the Spirit and have the powers of our calling in the Church.

There was a man up in our area that when I asked, "Has there ever been a major transgression in your life that has not been confessed and adjusted?" He said, "Would you call premeditated murder a major transgression?" I

was shocked and said, "Of course, it is," and tears came to his eyes. I said, "Who was it?" And he said, "It was my brother-in-law. He is the meanest, dirtiest, orneryest human being that ever walked the face of the earth. I planned to shoot him and take his body up to Dry Creek and bury it by a big rock, and no one would ever find him, and no one would ever miss him." And he said, with tears streaming down his cheeks, "Can I ever be forgiven?" Trying to get a handle on it, I said, "Did you kill the man?" He said, "No, but I planned to." I said, "Why didn't you do it?" And he said, "Well, I thought about my sister and decided she deserved him." Well, I told him the issue was closed and need not be opened again. The very same man was in his fifties and he had a personal abuse problem. When we take a burden off of a man's heart and he walks out of the office, my heart is lighter and I know he feels better. Whether the priesthood leaders know about it or not, an unconfessed transgression is there, the burden is there. As the sinner or transgressor repents and takes it off of his heart, it is lifted off the heart of the priesthood leader also. I really believe that principle, and it is just one of Vaughn Featherstone's opinions. In fact, this whole talk is Vaughn Featherstone's opinion. It is not doctrine. I'm just giving you some thoughts that I felt were very effective as we use them in our stake in interviewing. I think they comply with everything I've read in The Miracle of Forgiveness and everything I've heard in our meetings with the First Presidency.

A critical time is after the confession and adjustment comes. For example, we need to teach across the Church, and as counselors you need to know, that the presiding authority, the ecclesiastical leader, the bishop or stake president, has the right to close that particular case forever on behalf of the Church and it need not be opened again during a normal worthiness interview. There are a few exceptions as previously mentioned. Many priesthood leaders do not say that, and then the member doesn't really know that the incident is closed. We need to teach our members that if they transgress again, then all of the former sins return, and then they would need to be confessed also. (D&C 82:7) There are four courses of action open to a priesthood leader to take. The first course of action—that it may be closed forever and need never be opened again under normal circumstances.

Second, put them on probation between the priesthood leader (bishop or stake president) and the individual. And I think that's a very critical action. We oftentimes don't use this enough. We should use it more with our youth. Fornication, adultery, and homosexuality are equal in seriousness. Handling the transgressor is different. With fornication, they are young, unmarried, and usually they have had very little experience. Their testimonies aren't solid and so a priesthood leader may choose to handle it a little differently, with more lenience. Bend over backward to convert and teach our youth in the repentance process. Now, the adulterer, the man who has been through the temple is different.

He knows far too much and should be handled with much greater firmness and Church discipline. The 42nd section of the Doctrine and Covenants says, "But he that has committed adultery and repents with all his heart, and forsaketh it, and doeth it no more, thou shalt forgive." (D&C 42:25) President McKay said, "No act is ever committed without having first been justified in the mind." If a person transgresses, he has justified it in his mind first. These are the consequences for sin and the sinner must be willing to accept the punishment. I think the idea of probation is for those who are inexperienced in the Church.

We had a letter just this past week from a stake president who sent in two court cases. One was a bishop and one was a high councilor. One was three months ago and one was just recently. The bishop who had committed adultery more than once was disfellowshipped. The high councilor had an extramarital affair over a period of years. He also was disfellowshipped. I'm convinced that the priesthood leader will have to take further action later. One of the cruelest things he could do is not to take appropriate action, to be too soft, and I think that was too soft. I think the bishop in his high position knew far too much to simply have his hands slapped gently. It was not suffering or punishment equal to the serious nature of the transgression. I wonder if a person can really repent unless he or she has suffered enough, hurt enough and desires to repent enough. President Kimball said it isn't how much time passes bringing about repentance, but how much actual repenting. Some people can repent more in 24 hours than others may do in 24 months. I am convinced that is true. I have seen it and you have seen it.

The third course of action that we may take as a priesthood leader is disfellowshipment. Disfellowshipment is, of course, a temporary state and it is just pending further court action. Either you refellowship them if they repent, or if they haven't, you reconvene a court and take further action. When the shock hasn't been severe enough, and a change hasn't taken place in their lives, then a further court to excommunicate them is held. The fourth action we may take is excommunication.

As President Lee came into the First Presidency, you recall that there was quite a weeding out process take place. The questioning and personal worthiness interviews took on a great dimension. This policy has not changed with President Kimball. I believe, as I mentioned in my priesthood talk last time, there is a purging. Many people who have been involved in Church court action will tell you that one of the great blessings of their lives was excommunication, which enabled them to make a change and adjustment in their lives. However, others it may have destroyed. We need to develop that sensitivity to the Spirit. Don't suppose that the priesthood leader doesn't receive revelation and inspiration. I have seen farmers who had very little or no experience in counseling who have been exceptional counselors with the Lord's help. I have seen

bishops who were truck drivers to earn a livelihood, and had hardly any human relations training and little or no college experience. And yet they interview members and change their lives.

There is yet another case of a homosexual in a distant city who came down with his wife to see President Kimball. President Kimball interviewed them and outlined a program for this man to overcome his problem. When they finished the interview, the homosexual said President Kimball did not understand. He felt the Brethren were old-fashioned about their counsel to the "homosexual." So the man and his wife went to a psychiatrist here in Salt Lake, and as they visited with him, he also made the same statement, that the Brethren aren't up-to-date on this particular problem. He suggested how to work with it, and outlined a different course of action. The man followed the psychiatrist, the professional. The homosexual went back home, lost his wife and the four daughters, was excommunicated from the Church, and lives now with his homosexual friend. I really believe and will bear my witness that if he had done what President Kimball told him to do, he would still be a high priest in the Church. I believe he would still have his wife, and children and the homosexual problem would be behind him. I am convinced that when a Prophet speaks, and let me include our stake presidents and bishops--with very, very few exceptions--they speak for the Lord.

I don't know how I am going to relate this, but I want to tell you because it is significant to you who work so hard. It hardly relates to the subject. It is this: when you go home, you need to really be home--you need to really be a father. I knew a mission president who told a group of bishops the following story:

When I was called to be the mission president, I went out and just put my heart and soul into the work. For about the first three months that we were out there, I really bent my back and the work started moving up. I set up a mission tour and my wife came to me and said, "You set up the zone conference the same time we have back-to-school night. Can't you cancel your zone conference?" He said, "I had a real process trying to determine whether I'd cancel the meeting or not." I finally decided I'd cancel my zone conference and go to "back-to-school" the next night. I went, and as I went to the first class everything was all right. I went to the second class and everything was all right. I went to the third class and as I was looking at some of the paintings and sketches the children had done on the wall, I looked over at my wife who was standing by the desk of our little boy, crying. I walked over and stood by her and asked what the problem was. She couldn't even speak, she just pointed down at the

paper on the desk. I looked down and read these words in an essay. "I am a dumb boy. I live in a dumb home. This is a dumb town. I have a dumb family, and I belong to a dumb church."

Sometimes we as social workers, bishops, stake presidents, and General Authorities are so involved with others, that we can't see a little boy whose soul is crying out for some attention. This great mission president said, "I spent many years since my mission trying to remove the word 'dumb' from the boy's vocabulary. And now he is a fine young man." What a heart rendering story. Now, that really doesn't tie in to all the rest of this except with one principle. Please make certain when you are home; you really have the same empathy, understanding, kindness, consideration, tolerance, and sensitivity that you have when you are interviewing someone professionally.

I'd like to share one more short example. I had a woman come into the office at work and she said, as she leaned across the desk, "Bishop Featherstone, I have a burden on my heart that I can't carry one more step in this life. I know how tender you are and I wouldn't add one featherweight of burden to your heart, but I just cannot live one more day." I said, "You misunderstand. When you take it off of your heart, you take it off of my heart also. So you tell me the problem." She said, "Thirty-four years ago I had an abortion before my husband and I got married. Can I ever in this life or in eternity be forgiven? Must I be cast out forever? Is there any hope?" Then she said, "I am remarried to another man. He was a Catholic and now he has joined the Church and is presently the Elders Quorum president. Can we ever go to the temple where I can be sealed to him?" This soul, for thirty-four years, every waking minute of her life, kept thinking of this dreadful transgression. I said, "I really don't know. Let me check with President Kimball (who at that time was the president of the Quorum of the Twelve)." So I wrote the letter, got a response back about two weeks later. I called her, and I said, "Can you meet me after work? I'd like to talk to you about this." So I met her after work at the stake office and when she came, she was pale and her eyes were bloodshot. She must have been down on her knees a dozen times during the day, saying, "Heavenly Father, whatever it is, I'll accept it, but please be merciful." I said, "Let me not keep this from you one second longer than I have to." And I picked up the letter and read, "Dear President Featherstone: You inquired about a woman who had committed an abortion 34 years ago. From the way you describe her (And I had told him about her, the kind of woman she was. There wasn't a more Christ-like woman in our stake. She baked bread and cookies for neighbors, and I never heard her gossip. She was the one that would get down on her hands and knees and scrub the Relief Society floors, I guess supposing she wasn't even worthy to do the dishes.), it sounds like she has long since repented. You may tell her on

behalf of the Church, she is forgiven." Well, when I said these words, it was like I had taken a 1000 pound burden off her shoulders. She just burst into tears and sobbed. And I said, "Let me read you the second paragraph. "After a thorough and searching interview, you may issue this sweet sister a temple recommend." If I had been in the presence of the Savior that day, I wouldn't have felt any closer to Him than I did after I had that experience, because I believe that's what Jesus would have done had He been there.

In the 32nd chapter of Exodus, verse 32, is a verse that I think expresses what our attitude should be as we serve in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Moses comes down out of the mountain to find the children of Israel along with Aaron, worshipping the golden calf. You recall the terrible destruction that took place. Many of the wicked children of Israel were slain as the earth opened and swallowed them. Finally, those who had been spared were called to repentance by Moses, and in this verse Moses goes back before the Lord and says, "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin--; and if not, blot me, I pray thee out of thy book which thou hast written." As I tell the brethren each Sunday morning, that is the way I pray. As I have interviewed hosts of members who have repented, when the interview ends, I sit down behind my desk and say, "Heavenly Father, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee out of thy book which thou hast written. I don't want to be where they aren't." These are some of the most Christ-like people I know. Many of us have walked that hairline. Fortunately, we have been able to somehow, miraculously, to escape a major transgression. Others haven't gotten so close, but those who do slip, maybe just one step makes the difference, or one circumstance against which they did not have the integrity to stand, must experience repentance. I believe in "the miracle of forgiveness" with all my heart and soul. I don't think we need to have what some call a "hanging bishop." I believe that when the right thing to do is to excommunicate to save the soul, we do it. When the right thing is to disfellowship, we do it. When the right thing to do is to close it so it need not be opened, we do it. In many, many cases, that is the course of action we ought to take, we do it.

Well, God bless you. I am grateful to be here with you. I have been very frank, maybe more so than I should have been. I hope that you just sift these thoughts through your mental processes. They invited me to express my opinion and so I have given it on these things, but I want you to think very carefully about them. Now again, the Lord bless you in your assignments. You have an awesome responsibility. I believe He will hover as close to you as any workers in any profession on the face of the earth, because you are doing probably what the Savior spent his whole life doing, in just a little different way. You are healing souls. God bless you. In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen

Truth, Sin, Guilt, Punishment, and Redemption

Victor L. Brown, Jr.

One half of the Welfare Services Department in the church today consists of personal welfare, or as you'll be seeing Saturday morning, the elements of family preparedness. More pertinent to this particular group here today, I think you are going to see the coming of the age of social-emotional matters as a fully developed integral part of the church effort. I am quite excited about that, and excited about personal welfare. You will be interested that yesterday we had many meetings all day long with church leaders from Europe and South America, and their major request was not exclusively for what we now call the production-distribution part of Welfare Services--that is, the traditional welfare of commodities and food and clothing and so on--but also for the personal welfare part. And so there is, as Brother Broderick said yesterday, a new day, to some extent, in the Church. I'll speak to that in a moment.

I was assigned the topic of "Sin, Guilt, and Punishment." I have taken the liberty of adding two words at each end. I would like to start off discussing truth and end up discussing redemption. I will react a little to what Brother Broderick said yesterday because I found it thought provoking, honest, and entertaining to say the least. I think that one of his themes, which is one of my themes, is that the Mormon professional--if that person feels that he or she is identified with the church--has a basic built-in dilemma or challenge, depending on your viewpoint, concerning your frame of reference as you practice your profession.

Truth. I believe in gospel terms that we are faced squarely with the issue of truth. Now, I don't know how many of you remember (and I am finding that some of the things I remember are dating me) a radio program called, "The Greatest Story Ever Told." Listening to that program, one day for some reason I was deeply impressed with a particular program where the Savior confronted Pilate or Pilate confronted the Savior--I don't remember which--but Pilate was questioning the Savior. This was before the Savior had been to the Jewish leaders and it was obvious that Pilate was seriously struggling at this point. Pilate said to Jesus, "Art thou a king then?" Jesus answered, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. . . ." Pilate then asked with a meaning that has haunted mankind ever since, "What is truth?" (John 18:37-38)

Well, that stuck with me over the years and caused a personal search for truth, and I found that to be an employee of the Church in my particular capacity, I have had to search for

truth in some ways that I never intended to. It has been a stimulating search, to say the least. I have also found, contrary to my expectations, and I have to admit this, that the Church as an institution--the administrative church that I am involved with, is an open system. I was surprised because I had grown up with some of the stereotypes that circulate particularly in this community, the Salt Lake Valley. I am not a native of the Salt Lake Valley, but coming here I think I have been struck by how fierce the debate rages at times about the church. There seems to be a constant ferment as to whether or not the church is an acceptable institution to certain people. I have found that the openness and the willingness of the Brethren to consider new ideas, new methods, and new approaches to helping people is almost frightening. Because they are so willing, there is a great weight of responsibility on the person who chooses to recommend some of those changes or some of those modifications. As we have ventured over the past several years at their invitation to develop, first, social services and now, the overall organization of personal welfare services, there has been no opposition. In fact, there has been so much support and encouragement that it has been difficult to keep up with the expectations of the Brethren. In this openness, however, we need to remember that there is a parameter, a frame of reference, and I find it unique.

When I was at a university in a nearby state, I was given a very unstructured assignment with a liberal budget to develop some programs, and we developed them successfully. But I found no guidelines, no parameters; even the budget wasn't particularly limited. Moving into the church setting, I found some definite parameters. How does this square with my statements about openness? I have found that the parameters are basic truths. That is, there are certain revealed absolutes, and when we reach the point where we are considering an issue, those absolutes must not be gone beyond. If a person finds that constraining or difficult to live by, then that person has a serious challenge as a professional within the church. I for one have not been frustrated by that. I have often been frustrated by my own inability to express what I know to be correct in language that might be more easily understood by others, especially Church officers who are not necessarily familiar with my profession.

To give you an example, I am going to refer throughout this talk to homosexuality. Homosexuality is an example of a human problem about which the church is much more open, frankly, than most homosexuals, (or that gross misnomer, "the gay community") understand. At the same

time I hope to demonstrate that there are some absolutes that we might call truth. Dr. Harry Gershman, from the Horney Institute, in a recent discussion about homosexuality, says this, (I don't know much about Dr. Gershman, but I had the feeling just from listening to him that he is a compassionate and warm man, and apparently successful) "Homosexuality, transsexuality, transvestism, and exhibitionism are deviations that are observable in people who have failed to integrate their gender identity." Dr. Gershman goes on to say, "As a therapist of human beings who are in emotional difficulties, my main goal is to help them overcome these neurotic difficulties. To change their sexual orientation is way down on the list of my objectives." (Audio-Digest, Psychiatry, Vol. 4 #16, Aug. 25, 1975) Dr. Gershman's main thesis is that homosexuality is a sexual gender confusion in the midst of basic and overall neurotic difficulties. And so he says that in his therapy, his hope is to resolve the neurotic difficulties, but if the person has no basic desire to deal with his sexual confusion then Dr. Gershman doesn't really deal with it.

I would suggest that is a very different view compared to the statement in the priesthood bulletin: "A homosexual relationship is viewed by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as sin, in the same degree as adultery and fornication. According to God's revealed word the only acceptable relationship occurs in a family between a man and wife. Homosexuality runs counter to these divine objectives and therefore is to be avoided and forsaken. Church members involved to any degree must repent." Now that is an absolute. There is no ambivalence in that statement, although many have tried to interpret it expediently, just as they have tried to interpret the First Presidency statement on abortion as ambivalent.

I would like to suggest another thing that is frankly a question in my mind. It is not a question as to the outcome; it is a question as to how to find the truth in the methods we use to help people. Some people feel there is evidence that masturbation therapy is "effective" with some homosexuals. There is no denying that if a person is already masturbating you are relieved of the moral responsibility of suggesting the behavior, and if you can suggest to him that he would fantasize about members of the opposite sex while he is engaged in that behavior, you have an interesting process that results in some change. I can't believe, though, that this is the valid process; it doesn't check out. It doesn't check out professionally and it doesn't check out doctrinally. There is some change mechanism occurring which we want to find out more about which can be utilized so that the ends are consistent with the means. Therefore, in a way that I am sure to be misunderstood by a non-LDS professional group, we are constrained voluntarily. We choose to be constrained within the bounds of acceptable means to achieve certain ends, and, therefore, at this point, with no particular evidence except our own testimonies, we reject masturbation therapy as a valid approach.

Sin. Now in regard to sin, if truth is an absolute, then violating truth brings us to the subject of sin. I would suggest that the LDS practitioner doesn't have the luxury of being subjective about sin. President Kimball is rather forthright, as you know. In taking the theme of the Lord in the first Section of the Doctrine and Covenants, wherein the Lord says, "For I, the Lord, cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance," President Kimball says in the Miracle of Forgiveness: "If adultery or fornication (and I say parenthetically, homosexuality, because it squares with the First Presidency statement) justified the death penalty in the old days, is the sin any less today because the laws of the land do not access death penalty for it? Is the act less grievous? There must be a washing, a purging, a changing of attitudes, a strengthening towards self-mastering. There must be many prayers and volumes of tears. There must be more than verbal acknowledgement. There must be an inner conviction giving to the sin its full diabolical weight, a feeling like, 'My sins are disgusting and loathsome.' One would come to think about his baser sins like the psalmist who used these words: 'My wounds stink and are corrupt because of my foolishness.'" (p. 155) That is strong language; that is rather plain; that is a statement of value. It is an emotionally laden statement. It states the issue squarely and I think rather powerfully. I am sure it would offend many. Dr. Karl Menninger, in *Whatever Became of Sin*, (I realize that it is not a secular version of Mormon Doctrine by any means) questions some of the implications of our modern amoral value system. "In all of the laments and reproaches made by our seers and prophets today, compared to the Old Testament and Biblical prophets one misses any mention of sin, a word which used to be a variable watchword for prophets. The word 'sin,' which seems to have disappeared, was a proud word." (p. 14) "I believe there is sin, which is expressed in ways which cannot be subsumed under verbal artifacts such as crime, disease, delinquency, and deviancy. There is immorality, there is an unethical behavior and there is wrong doing." (p. 46)

The President of the American Psychological Association gave a speech recently which was reported in *Time* and *Newsweek* in which he wondered if the trend of therapists and behavioral people over the past several decades of tending to totally disregard and even attack religious beliefs was warranted. He went further and even supported some of these beliefs. I'll be interested to see the talk in its completeness.

At this point, what I am suggesting for the Latter-day Saint therapist is that he or she has to grapple with the fact that there is truth; there are absolutes and that the violation of those absolutes constitutes sin—not sickness, nor error, but sin (along with which there may be sickness, error, or confusion).

Guilt. I would like now to talk about guilt. There seem to me, as I work with LDS clients, to be three types of guilt: immobilizing

guilt, extenuating or rationalizing guilt, and therapeutic guilt.

Immobilizing guilt can be represented (again following this theme of homosexual behavior) by Brother J, as we will call him, who lives in a South American country. He is a returned missionary who is married. I don't know if they have a child now, but especially considering his family background and where he lives in South America, he has made a strong effort to be an effective member of the church. However, he is plagued with homosexual fantasies. He is not so much overt as he is covertly obsessed with it, and he writes periodically and seeks help from us. He has written the Brethren often. He is nearly immobilized by his guilt. He reaches this point not because he is acting out of guilt but because he is so filled with a sense of guilt he just slowly grinds to a halt, at which point he finds himself right now, according to his last letter.

Then there is extenuating or rationalized guilt. I had a unique experience in this regard with a person who wished to have an operation to change his sex. He was a returned missionary, a father, and an extremely capable, talented individual. He went to President Kimball and spent many sessions with him. (I am just astounded at how much time President Kimball gives to individuals.) Anyway, he went to President Kimball and over a period of several months to other church leaders throughout the western United States. It was quite a saga as he went from community to community seeking answers. He indicated that he had been obsessed with these attitudes, although he had never acted out, over the majority of his lifetime. When I met him he told me this story of 25 or 30 years of struggling with this issue. I was sort of overwhelmed with what a great fellow he was. I thought it showed tremendous strength to have never given in. He finally reached the crisis point where he just couldn't continue any further. His wife had divorced him. He had lost his children and he was broke. He was a high living person which hurt him a lot. He was, at that point, where he had to do something. So President Kimball, in his special Christianity, arranged for a blessing from President Lee, and I was privileged to be part of the circle. But before President Lee gave the blessing he spent twenty minutes rebuking the man in a kind but firm way. I confess, I sat there and thought, "President Lee, you don't understand. This is a strong fellow. He had made a magnificent effort." I was bright enough, though, not to say anything. Then President Lee gave the blessing and rebuked him a little further. It was a beautiful blessing. He made specific promises. Then we went up to President Kimball's office and President Kimball gave him specific instructions. President Kimball didn't interfere with his free agency. He said, "I'll be able to help you if you will do these several things," and he listed them. While I was there, President Kimball called a stake president in another city and arranged for an appointment for the man. As we were leaving President Kimball's office, I was still a little concerned about President Lee's approach. However, I watched this man over the next 3 years and I

watched his former wife's life and the children. I came to know her very well. They were from another state, but circumstances brought us together. I found, of course, that President Lee was inspired; he was absolutely correct. This man had put up what might be called a commendable struggle, but he was so turned inward and had become so self-focused that he could not think of anyone else but himself. And then a lot of other things began to make sense. I helped him move once, and I had helped him pack his clothing. He wore clothes that I could never afford. His indulgence in himself in every way was total to the exclusion of his very attractive and loving wife and his lovely children--to the exclusion of any consideration, frankly, except his need to assume the woman's role, so that he could be taken care of. He had no real homosexual tendencies. He was just self-centered. There was no psychological or emotional justification for the change of sex, and President Lee had seen that as an inspired Priesthood leader. This brother had been able to assume guilt almost in a secondary-gain way and had been able to camouflage to himself and to me the real reason for his guilt; it was extenuating or rationalized guilt.

Now, as to therapeutic guilt, may I read to you excerpts from two letters from homosexuals. One of these folks has been "straight" for about ten years and the other for about two years.

"My late teens and early twenties consisted of a great deal of vacillation back and forth between these two beliefs: that is, homosexuality and heterosexuality. Unfortunately, my strong desire for sexual contact always won out for my good intentions. I made no progress toward overcoming the problem. I think part of the reason was that I had not been honest. I had not really come to grips enough to courageously admit that what I had was a problem. I had been trying as hard to justify it as to overcome it. The first step for someone as deeply involved as I was, was to be honest enough to admit their problem, and forget all the hogwash that one hears and reads. For no matter how cleverly said or written the issue of morality is still plainly ignored and it cannot be. Like it or not, the moral question is there, and it matters most of all. I have to say that the turning point came when I read the chapter on homosexuality in President Kimball's The Miracle of Forgiveness. When I finished, I knew that things could never be the same again."

The following letter is from a brother that some of you would know. He has since held some responsible priesthood positions,

"Five years ago, the spirit turned my scrutiny inward and what I saw sickened me. I saw a rebellious son

of a Heavenly Father, an ingrate steeped in wickedness, filthiness and self-indulgence. I saw a rebellious son of noble earthly parents, a prodigal unworthy of their esteemed name. No wonder I was sickened, but there was still more. I saw a faithless husband, and father whose acts, were they his companion's or his children's would surely have broken even his flinty heart. Summarily, I saw the face of evil on one whose heritage had been full of life. That is an ugly picture and it struck terror in my heart. Where could it lead but to destruction of self and others, and to eventual rejection of and by my precious family. Believe me, I know something about the despair of outer darkness. I have been on its fringe."

I would suggest based on their lives and the evidence, the long range evidence in one case, and good short range evidence in the other, that this was therapeutic guilt. This can lead to an effective change.

Punishment. If there is true sin and guilt, then there must be consequences. That is what we call punishment. I would suggest again that to understand punishment in our situation as Mormon professionals, we have to understand the gospel. I don't think the gospel in regard to punishment is clearly understood. Let me read what seem to be two paradoxical scriptures. One refers to the testial degree of glory, which by our doctrine we know is not the place that we really want to go. Nevertheless, it says in Doctrine and Covenants Section 76, verse 89: "and thus we (Joseph Smith and his associates) saw in heavenly vision the glory of the testial which surpasses all understanding." Then referring to what people in the testial kingdom will do, "they shall be servants of the most high." (D & C 77:112) Now, that is a rather wonderful blessing, to be in a glory that surpasses this world or any man's understanding. At the same time, in the 19th Section of the Doctrine and Covenants, this is what is said about punishment specifically:

"For behold the mystery of Godliness, how great is it. For behold I am endless, and the punishment which is given from my hand is endless punishment, for Endless is my name, wherefore Eternal Punishment is God's punishment. Endless punishment is God's punishment." (D & C 19:10-12)

The scriptures, especially as the Bible has been interpreted by certain folks, have always tended to be understood very harshly, especially in regard to punishment and the fate of the sinner. That interpretation continues today even within the church sometimes to the extent where some people who are very sensitive to the human condition imagine they must reject this incorrect Calvinist approach to God's judgment. If these people choose to study the gospel carefully enough, however, they will recognize that the

Lord's plan of punishment is actually a way to help people change. It is a means to an end, and the correct means.

I remember very vividly one of those situations where you do what you think you should do at the moment. We all have choices to make in our therapy. This was one of those situations where I really seriously wondered after the event whether I had made an error by substituting ecclesiastical for professional principles, but I learned by lesson. A bishop and I were interviewing a girl who was heavily involved with homosexual behavior. We had prayer, and then after the prayer the bishop turned to me (he is one of those wonderful bishops who is too modest and tended, unfortunately, to defer to professionals) and said, "Brother Brown, please tell Sister _____ what is expected of her." And so I turned to her, not as a social worker, but as a brother in the gospel and holder of the Priesthood, and I rebuked her. I said, "If you don't repent I am going to demand that the bishop hold a court on you. I can't influence the outcome but I will suggest that there is no alternative but excommunication." She started crying, escalated to hysteria, and ran out of the building. I had mixed emotions at that point to say the least. She went and drove off at a high rate of speed. I was admittedly shaken. I was afraid not so much of the emotion as I was afraid that I tipped her over the edge because she really did have a serious dilemma. She was about 25, from a small community. Well, eventually she came back and we worked on the problem. Today, three years later, her thoughts, feelings, emotions, and attitudes are still with her, but she is making progress that I didn't think possible. She is a full tithe payer. She is supporting herself. She has a church calling. She is not "cured" by any means but her behavior is modified by the confrontation around gospel discipline. She knows very well there is a day of reckoning. We have discussed it plainly with no ambivalence, that there is a day when she must become clean; she must pay the price for what she has done. However, the price she must pay is that "rite of passage," repentance, that leads to the peace of mind that she seeks which is, in doctrinal terms, Eternal Life.

Redemption. Now may I read a couple of statements here, one by a homosexual and one by President Kimball, as an indication of what we need to remember as we talk about the other side of punishment--redemption.

From the man who was homosexually involved:

"The change did not come about rapidly nor without some backsliding, but it did come. It is still in progress. The attraction for women grows stronger and the attraction for those of my own sex diminishes. The ultimate result of long, sometimes frustrating months came about when my wife and I were sealed together in a temple marriage. It has been a beautiful marriage. It has been fun. The sexual relationship has been extremely

enjoyable for both of us and very fulfilling. I know for sure now, that the power is there to change. My wife and I are anxiously awaiting the birth of our first child and this too gives me confidence and strength. My main regret is all the years I wasted listening to the pap and dribble that the world is so full of in regards to homosexuality, and I am grateful that I have found in the church positive, strong and effective ways."

President Kimball in *The Miracle of Forgiveness* tells some stories about folks who have come to him after many years of sin and repentance. He tells about one sister who came up to him in a conference and said, "Do you remember me?" He said, "No." She was so relieved that he didn't remember her (and I can testify that he remembers many things) and so it was significant that he didn't remember her because it meant to her that she was forgiven. At least, it validated that in her mind. She softly said as she left, "I have hoped and yearned and prayed for the assurance that the Lord had totally forgiven me and forgotten my transgressions, and now that you remember neither me nor my sins, my hope has soared. Do you think my Savior may also have forgotten my errors?" (See pages 342-3) And then President Kimball concludes his book. "What relief! What comfort! What joy! Those laden with transgressions and sorrows and sin, may be forgiven and cleansed and purified, if they will return to their Lord, learn of Him and keep His commandments. And all of us needing to repent of day-to-day follies and weaknesses can likewise share in this miracle. Can you not understand why the Lord has been pleading with man for these thousands of years to come unto Him? Surely the Lord was speaking about forgiveness through repentance, and the relief that could come from the tenseness of guilt when He followed His glorious prayer to His Father with a sublime entreaty and promise. 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'" Then President Kimball concludes, "It is my hope and prayer that men everywhere will respond to this gentle invitation and thus let the Master work in their individual lives the great miracle of forgiveness." (p. 368)

What I'm trying to say, brothers and sisters, is that clinically speaking, not to mention doctrinally speaking, or by witness of the Spirit, there is a valid process which we alone in all the world understand, and it really does involve all the elements of truth, sin, guilt, punishment, and redemption. If we leave any of those elements out, we deny a client or friend or someone with whom we might have ecclesiastical relationship, true fulfillment. If we as professionals feel somehow we have discovered something the Lord overlooked when He created us or when He revealed the truth about our behavior or at least how we ought to be, then I would suggest we are on a dangerous track.

I want to say one thing about President Kimball. He deserves the support of this particular group, not because he needs it to succeed but because the people we work with need it.

Especially in the homosexual community he has been misunderstood. They have taken advantage of him. I am sure some of you know people who abuse the President's willingness to see them, to perpetuate themselves in their behavior while having his cloak over them, protecting themselves from church action. President Kimball doesn't want a purge to occur, he wants the sinners of the church to repent. I've been with him when he has been criticized. He is willing to risk patience and mercy and work with those who deviate from gospel behavioral standards, so long as they are willing to work and make the effort to change. President Kimball has no desire to make a public issue, especially of sexual sins such as homosexuality. He has told me on several occasions that he recognized that publicizing that particular sin pretty well cuts a person off from meaningful change in the Church. It makes it almost impossible to be accepted again in the ward or the quorum, if there is too much publicity. All he wants is these folks to work it out, but coming up against that absolute truth, the Church must be protected. It is a sin. It is an excommunicable sin to disgrace the name of the Church. That is wrong. We cannot get away with some of the things we do and still call ourselves Mormons. It disgraces the name of Jesus Christ because that is the name of His Church. Therefore, some who will be deviant and remain so must make a choice between the church and their life style.

The other thing I would suggest is this. I wouldn't be overly impressed with how much acceptance the behavioral or social sciences are getting in the Church. The main reason for attention to human needs is because the Brethren are receiving revelation, not because we are doing anything all that good. I hope that doesn't come as too much of a shock. There is still a lot of suspicion and much of the suspicion is based on fact.

Most of us remember the occasion at General Conference when a statement was made over the pulpit about group therapy and so on. That was based on an actual event, or actual series of events. It was some--for lack of a better term--foolish, unethical, etc., etc., work that was done by certain individuals, members of the church. I saw some of their clients down there. They had destroyed people and families. They had gone beyond the bounds. And so the Brethren rightly reacted and were concerned about some of these "flakey people" who called themselves professionals. Now, every time we have a meeting with the Brethren, in our capacity in Personal Welfare and Social Services, and they agree to let us do something out in the church, I always wonder, "Now, how is so and so going to handle this?" I am not insulated from the professional world, and I know this therapist in Los Angeles and that practitioner up in Seattle, and I know they are good Mormons. I also know that when they get in the clinical setting, they are a little ambivalent about what comes first. I know because I hear the reports with intensity, when some priesthood leader calls upon one of these folks to be of some help and they then do something that is a little odd. If it is not immoral, or unethical, it's dumb, and maybe that is the

greatest sin. You know, you can almost admire a brilliant crook, but dumb crooks. . . ?

At least, at the very least, let's be competent in whatever we choose to do, and if it is wrong, be competent in it. At least then there is something specific to deal with and correct. I am really serious about this, because the Brethren are willing to do any righteous thing they can to help the Saints work out their salvation. As the Welfare Services of the Church expand and the social-emotional aspects of life are opened up, we are going to need mature, stable gospel professionals to do the work and to be the resource people.

I want to give you an example where Latter-day Saints who are in the profession are not thinking the way they must. A very fine therapist, one whom I respect, came to me recently. He was young in the work, yet but nonetheless, an outstanding individual. He said, "We've got to help the people with sexual problems." I said, "Fine. What do you propose to do?" He said, "I'm going to adapt Masters and Johnson." I said, "Oh, hell you are." I quoted myself here correctly. And an intense discussion ensued. He not only was going to, he had already done it. He had already gone out and taught some priesthood leaders Masters and Johnson in the name of the Church. I asked him what he had taught about Masters and Johnson, and he said, "Oh, I didn't teach them everything." I guess he meant he didn't show the films or use surrogates. He said, "We dealt with sensitization . . . and pleasure. . . ." I said, "What does that have to do with the Lord's plan?" He said, "Well, I hadn't thought about that. I was just thinking about my therapy." We went on, and I defied him to identify where the Lord has said that sexual technique, sexual stimulation or sexual experimentation is a foundation stone of a successful marriage. It may be a contributing factor to, or a symptom of a happy relationship, but the degree of sexual skill that is being taught by the world has no place in any doctrine or practice that the Church sponsors. I know that is offensive to some people, and it is probably offensive to some people in this room, but if we had long enough, I don't think I would have any trouble defending it. We have given this extensive consideration and discussed it with the Presiding Bishopric and the First Presidency extensively, in detail, candidly. If you read President Kimball's talks more carefully than some people do, you will see him instructing us this way. Look at his opening address of last June Conference. There is a paragraph in there about the married sexual relationship that's revolutionary to certain people, and he knew he was putting it

in, and he put it in with courage because there are some who would not agree. I know a lot of people who have been pleading with the Church to come out with a statement and a priesthood bulletin or some other publicity-oriented way to say something like that. Well, the prophet said it. But he didn't say that Masters and Johnson or anything like them is the answer for Latter-day Saint marriages.

Now I'm pleading--I really am pleading--that as we do our work, we take, as the Prophet Joseph Smith said, that which is good and praiseworthy from what we know, and pass it through the screen of gospel doctrine and the whisperings of the Spirit. If it isn't clear, then go to a proper priesthood authority and get the answer, and then practice that. I don't have any control over what you would do in your private work. I hope I never do and I certainly don't want to, but I will say this as a bit of a promise. Any professional helping person who tries to "do their thing" when it is not consistent with the gospel will, of necessity, be challenged by us. We want to help the people. We want to help the Church. We want the leadership of this Church--mainly the bishops and stake presidencies--to become comfortable with the whole range of human behavior, so that rather than being shocked and offended, they can be understanding and helpful. Instead of wanting to hold a court immediately, just to punish, they can take into account the whole continuum of the helping and change process, and know that they can call upon folks like you to give them essential and crucial input. That's one of our goals, and pertains to my invitation.

We really hope that on two levels you will make yourselves useful to the Church. On the local level, we hope that you will be available and be in good standing, so that the bishop or the stake president can use you. On the general level, we have what we call a Planning and Training Department. Please send them at 50 East North Temple any ideas you want them to know and tell them about things you feel are pertinent to the work. We plead for it, we welcome it. This, of course, does not mean manuscripts for publishing. Those should go directly to the editor.

I have a testimony of the overriding truth of the gospel and the openness and inspiration of the Brethren who lead this Church. I bear that witness to you, mainly because I know it is true, but also because I want you to be warned. I have been in that situation and have seen the professional and ecclesiastical worlds. There is a harmony if we are willing to allow it to be. I say this in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

Moses 6:56 — And it is given unto them to know good from evil, wherefore they are agents unto themselves . . .