



1-1-1978

In Behalf of a Revealed Approach to Counseling

Allen E. Bergin

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

Recommended Citation

Bergin, Allen E. (1978) "In Behalf of a Revealed Approach to Counseling," *Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy*. Vol. 4 : No. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/irp/vol4/iss1/2>

This Article or Essay 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.

In Behalf of a Revealed Approach to Counseling

Allen E. Bergin, Ph.D.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REFERENCES

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