

the underground.

Nearly a year after this, a two-page memo from the Genealogical Society to higher authority outlined some of the problems attending the reinstatement:

Two living wives, twenty-eight living children and a host of grandchildren participating in the Priesthood Genealogical Programs will need to know their status in order to properly prepare their records.

It required eleven additional months of study before final determination of the case. The nub

of the situation was this: While John W. Taylor had been forgiven, could the modern Church officially recognize the validity of marriages taken after 1890? Rather than "opening Pandora's Box," the decision was that,

If the Lord should judge Brother Taylor in being justified in the last three marriages he then can adjust it in the realms beyond the grave . . .

This was exactly in accordance to my father's prediction in the matter.

Sounding Brass and Tinking Symbols

Wives Take Over

VICTOR B. CLINE

Since previously exposing myself in a sometimes quite personal way in this column I have had the heady and maybe trying experience of having some readers wishing to engage in a dialogue with me via the written letter and even through personal interaction. Sometimes this has involved receiving messages of stern rebuke, kindly persuasion, and even occasional support.

Some of the letters have raised questions which might have some interest for many readers beyond the original writer. This sort of interaction or stimulus-response is often quite personal but a wider readership might find it stimulating and informative to "eavesdrop." So in this issue's column I'll share a letter or two (apparently from L.D.S. women) and my response.

READER'S QUESTION: "I find myself constantly depressed and often think of taking my life. No one knows the full extent of my feelings, not even my husband. If it weren't for my religion and my children I don't think I'd be alive today. It seems that I just barely manage to get through each day. Any help you might offer would be appreciated."

Ms. M. Los Angeles

You are not alone. There are many men and women living lives of quiet desperation. I sense from your letter that you have a number of frustrations and problems that are not getting solved. You've endured them for a long time and somehow they get worse rather than better. Even Mormons, who have the advantage of a great positive religious faith, can have emotional and mental problems and stress which require, at times, professional care. I would strongly suggest that you see a

counselor. A clinical psychologist, psychiatrist, social worker, your Bishop, Stake President, L.D.S. Church Social Services — all might provide some assistance to you.

However in choosing a private practitioner (psychologist, etc.) I'd do a little home work rather than just look up a name in the phone book and make an appointment. Professional therapists vary in ability, skill, and competence just as in any other field. You could have a very bad experience if you went to a counselor who was not competent or possibly whose values were very different from yours. I'd first check through your friends' experience with therapists, professional associations' recommendations, your family physician's advice, etc.

This kind of help can be quite expensive (from \$25 to \$50 for a 50 minute session). And many problems are not resolved in three or four visits. You should check your family health insurance and see what it pays for psychotherapy. Some policies pay up to 80% and in some instances even 100% of the cost. Or rather than seeing a private therapist you might consider going to a community agency such as Family Service Society (focusing usually on marital problems) or a Community Mental Health Clinic (which treats the full spectrum of adolescent and adult problems at reduced fees). Usually their fees are adjusted to income so that anyone, no matter what his financial circumstances, can receive help. The occasional disadvantage with the community agency is that there is sometimes a wait of several weeks or months to get in and be seen and usually you do not have your choice of therapists. But for someone with limited income you can do no worse than try this.

In my experience the major concern many active faithful members of the church have about seeing a psychiatrist, psychologist or other mental health specialist is that this person may not understand their religious culture, the meaning of temple marriage, etc. In addition there are many suspicions about the morals and values of some professionals in these fields and concern that they might destroy Church members' faith, or that of their teen age children who might be brought in for treatment. These concerns are not without foundation. One should be just as cautious in choosing a psychotherapist as the surgeon one might have do open heart surgery on himself or his loved ones. Some therapists are very hostile to organized religious faiths. Some are very unorthodox in their views of sex — in, out of, and before marriage. Their values do influence their treatment strategies and the overt as well as covert messages given in therapy. But this doesn't mean that there aren't many remarkably competent therapists who also respect and don't interfere with the values of their patients. So if one has a problem, or someone in their family needs professional help and care in this area, it would be quite foolish not to seek it out, but the cautions mentioned above should be used in choosing an able practitioner.

READER'S QUESTION: "What do you think of the women's liberation movement? I think they've got some good points, yet some of the things they do confuse me. I have a quite happy marriage and have raised a fairly good family so far but maybe I'm naive and a little dumb. Maybe I ought to be marching in the streets, picketing, competing for some man's high paying job somewhere. The Church's thing about the Patriarchal Family seems to favor men, but this doesn't get me uptight particularly. But maybe I should be.

Ms. D. Washington D.C. area

Can any man give a truly unbiased response to this? But can any woman either? Even if I were unisex I don't think it would solve the problem, so all I can do is to give you my own very personal view. I'm very much in favor of women being liberated from feelings of inadequacy, self hatred, low self image and any kind of neurotic or emotional hang ups, of anything that keeps them from being full, complete people. Maslow has called this "self actualization." I think women should throw off the shackles of self doubt or those fears that interfere with their capacity to give and love. I think that whatever talents they have should be magnified. On the job their pay should reflect what they do, not what their sex is. But, if being liberated means being a "man," being hostile to their husbands, giving up their femininity, rejecting the chance to have children

and create new life, being unisex, equating liberation with dominating their husbands or being equal with them on every issue, then I think they have made a very bad choice.

The women I know who are militantly leading the "liberationists," come from very disturbed family backgrounds and are themselves conflicted, often disturbed, individuals. One feels sympathy for their personal problems, but to accept their vision of the female role would be to trade good money (though perhaps devalued in some places) for a fraudulent currency. If some of the more militant of the women's liberationists were to really succeed, they would in my judgment do no less than destroy the family unit as we know it, which would be destructive to our society. Some of their arguments and points do make sense, but it would be dangerous and foolish to accept their whole thesis.

I must confess that I believe that the notion of the patriarchal family is a sound one psychologically. This is based on very practical considerations. No organization, community, business, or family can survive and be successful unless it is organized. There has to be someone with authority, a president, boss, leader — "someone in charge." For two people to be bishops of a ward, or for there to be two prophets running the church at the same time, for there to be two or three presidents of the country simultaneously could only lead to confusion. Even the hippie communes which "make it" have a leader. Those that don't just don't survive. The idea of a true equalitarian relationship in any group (including the family) is a noble myth but doesn't make sense in reality. If the family is to be effective there has to be a family government with an apportionment of responsibilities, duties, and authority.

Thus in marriage under the patriarchal order, the husband is designated the president of the family corporation. If he presides with wisdom, with concern for all, the family will prosper. If he becomes too autocratic, abuses his authority, or becomes too oppressive his family will suffer, but it will usually survive. If there is confusion about who is the president of the family, if the wife continually undercuts her husband's authority, the husband (in my family counseling experience) either "runs away" (works all hours, finds a girl friend, etc.) or there is a power struggle which leads to continual tension and conflict with the children caught in the middle.

Under the patriarchal family it is possible to have all sorts of arrangements and flexibility of roles. The wife may have an outstanding "money sense" and she may be appointed family treasurer. The husband loses none of his authority or masculinity if this occurs — nor the wife any of her femininity or opportunity of self-actualization.

When a wife attempts to subvert her hus-