

# Freud as Friend of the Gospel

OWEN CLARK

WHEN THE CHURCH ORATOR POSES his rhetorical question, "Who's on the Lord's side, who?", no one thinks to suggest Sigmund Freud. Most Mormons associate Freud with lustful sexuality, primitive drives and (somehow) biological evolution. Psychoanalysis, the diagnostic and therapeutic tool he developed, is considered ungodly at worst, and irrelevant to the moral church-going Mormon at best. This essay makes the modest suggestion that Freud's life work need not be summarily dismissed by the believing Mormon and that it just may contain elements that are of good report or praiseworthy.

*The Man and the Image.* The image of Freud looms larger in public consciousness than the man himself. The many legends built around him more accurately reflect the needs of their creators than they do the historical facts. Freud implied comparison of himself to Copernicus and Darwin and did not discourage a view of his work as the singular creation of an oppressed genius.<sup>1</sup> He has been enthusiastically adopted by a twentieth-century society based on mass consumption and a hedonistic utilitarian philosophy which has misread his arguments for the existence of inner impulses and wishes as advocacy of direct satisfaction of animal desires.<sup>2</sup> His writings have been vulgarized through the popular press and used to argue causes antithetical to his own personality. It is to this distorted, popularized view that most

---

OWEN CLARK is a psychiatrist in Seattle, Washington.

Mormons respond when "Freud" is mentioned. At the pulpit and in the Church press, he is criticized in conjunction with those forces that would grant illicit sexual license and belittle and deride the godly.

A smaller but often equally clamorous group of Mormons revere Freud as a proponent of freedom and light as opposed to the illusion and bondage of oppressive religion. This essay will not pursue the historical development and function of these varied symbols, but will only note that failure to look beyond them almost inevitably predisposes to a serious misunderstanding of the man and the content of his work.

The man Freud had his own personality, prejudices and professional jealousies. He was extremely ambitious, with a boundless capacity for hard work. Moved by a strong sense of duty, he was honest in his financial and professional affairs and scrupulously punctilious, a model of respectability in his professional, social and moral life. He was the devoted father of six children and a faithful husband. His unwavering puritanical behavior prompted one biographer to excuse him with the conjecture that by the time he had acquired his knowledge of sexuality he was too old to change.<sup>3</sup> In sum, he was an asthetic-idealistic person whom most Mormons would respect and admire were they able to overlook his ever-present cigar. (This cigar probably caused the cancerous growth on his palate and jaw. Because of this he suffered stoically through 30 operations in the 16 years before his death in 1939.<sup>4</sup>)

Freud's achievements are monumental. He pioneered the technique and application of psychoanalysis. This is not only a form of treatment of mental disorders but also a specific method for obtaining information about the psychodynamic determinants of behavior, a theory of personality and a metapsychology.<sup>5</sup>

Everyone has seen the standard cartoon portraying the patient on the couch and the analyst sitting where he sees but is not seen, probably without fully appreciating that this arrangement characterizes the neutral observing attitude of the analyst. Also popularized has been the specific method of free association: having the patient say whatever comes into his head however irrelevant, silly, offensive, or absurd it might appear. Less familiar are the techniques for dealing with the unconscious that are incontestably Freud's innovation: the analysis of the patient's resistance to saying everything that comes into his head, and of the irrational feelings of love and hostility toward the therapist.<sup>6</sup>

Freud elaborated a series of hypotheses into a theory of human personality. His hypotheses were based upon clinical observations described in terms of conceptual schema.<sup>7</sup> He also formulated a metapsychology: pronouncements on the nature of society, civilization, war, religion, and art which are essentially philosophical conclusions based upon his thoughts and life experience. They have been viewed both as jottings of free association and as a legitimate extension of his basic psychological premises.<sup>8</sup>

*Freud's Psychological Premises.* Foremost in Freud's thought and professional work was his appreciation of the importance of the unconscious. The concept of the unconscious might be most simply viewed as the assumption that many important determinants of behavior occur outside an individual's subjective awareness that are not normally recognized by him.<sup>9</sup> The existence of mental activity below the threshold of momentary awareness was apparent

long before Freud and was recognized by many of his contemporaries.<sup>10</sup> Freud's contribution was the use of psychoanalytic technique to intensively study unconscious mental processes and to demonstrate their influence in almost every area of human behavior: neurotic symptoms, dreams, jokes, mistakes of everyday life, artistic creations and character structure.

Psychic determinism is a second basic premise. This hypothesis holds that all psychological symptoms are meaningful as part of the continuous production of mental activity, both conscious and unconscious. Psychic determinism accepts no behavior as "accidental," that is, as capricious or fortuitous, and assumes meaning in "slips of the tongue," "meaningless" dreams and the "irrational" utterance of a psychotic man. Psychic determination does recognize that an individual is subject to external forces such as the impact of falling ladders or meteorites. But application of the concept suggests that it is no accident when a woman marries three men who all "turn out" to be excessively attached to alcoholic beverages, or when a dutiful husband uncharacteristically "mislays" his wife's grocery list after the breakfast argument during which he has been unable to express his grievance.

The concept of psychic determination, however, does not hypothesize that all behavior is predetermined and hence theoretically subject to prediction. Freud's interest was to understand and to explain behavior, not to predict or control it. The very nature of the unconscious mental apparatus—with its multiple determinants of behavior, its own rules of causality and incomplete revelation of its workings—implies that man will never have the full conscious knowledge upon which to construct a thorough-going positivistic philosophy.<sup>11</sup>

A third basic hypothesis is instinct as a primary motivating force. Freud postulated a process of excitation generated within an organism with the aim of removal of the organic stimulus, e.g., hunger pains relieved by taking in food. His concept of an instinct "contrasted with 'stimulus,' which is set up by *single* excitations coming from *without*."<sup>12</sup> His attention to innate drives sets his theory apart from the mechanistic theories of human behavior which emphasize the organism's response to external stimulation, such as those of Pavlov and Skinner.

Freud acknowledged the incomplete development of his assumption of instincts, but he recognized its crucial position in his hypothesis. He pursued a genetic-experiential approach to the study of human behavior and mental dysfunction in the face of contemporary theories centered on constitution, degeneration and inferiority.<sup>13</sup>

Freud constructed other hypotheses to form his psychology: the role of libido (a term for the instinctual sexual drive) in the etiology of neuroses; constitutional bisexuality of man; innate aggressiveness and death forces opposing life forces. These latter concepts figure prominently in the formulation of his metaphysics, but are less essential to the practice of psychodynamic psychiatry, where they are still being disputed, especially in the United States.<sup>14</sup>

Further analogies between Freudian premises and Mormon doctrine could be drawn. Obvious topics are sex as a fundamental aspect of man's nature and the validation of man's efforts to expand his self-awareness and to assume personal responsibility for his behavior. But although argument by

analogy appears clear, it is logically precarious. Such argument extracts elements of common appearance and neglects the complexities which abound in the study of subjective experience, sexuality and human responsibility.

Finally, there are significant differences of both intent and perspective between Freudian thought and Mormon doctrine. Freud was a personally ambitious man, impressed by the illogical and illegitimate use of religious dogma, who saw himself formulating a new science of the unconscious. Mormons assert an eternal perspective which Freud would not recognize in his scientific pursuits and which is not the subject matter of the science of psychology. Dynamic psychiatry investigates an individual's psychic reality: his subjective view of the world with its distortions, fantasies, wishes and fears. A believing Mormon can acknowledge the reality of a person's psychic life, and yet insist that such psychic facts cannot be equated with spiritual realities. The subjective God-image of a given man (or any group of men) is not to be confused with God as he is, and as he may reveal himself. The projection of human concerns to the cosmic level is not the same as revelation of the Divine to man. Prophetic pronouncements make claim to an authority and a validation of a different nature than those of modern science. A prophet leaves it for the apologist, systematist and philosopher to justify his proclamations, to form a rational system of thought from his utterances, and to fit them into an existing philosophical schema. Such revelation is a meaningful reality to those who experience it and a nonentity to those who do not. A religion based upon such revelation warrants acceptance and devotion for reasons outside the realm of science.

*Potential Usefulness of Freudian Thought.* What then does Freudian psychology have to offer the Mormon who both studies psychological processes and cultivates his own spiritual life. He may choose Freud's insights and techniques without embracing Freud's metaphysics. This approach requires a critical reading of Freud's work for assumptions and implications and a selective acceptance and application. It also involves the flexibility to select out personally meaningful material and the tolerance to allow others the same privilege, recognizing that differences in personal experience may make a given hypothesis or concept productive for one person but confusing and frustrating for another. This pluralistic and voluntaristic approach would probably not be acceptable to persons who demand complete and absolute reconciliation of all factual data and who are uncomfortable with the ambiguities of working hypotheses.

*Philosophy of Science.* I see three areas of potential usefulness of Freudian thought for the serious Mormon student who elects the above approach. One lies in its implications for the philosophy of science. Freud stands as an obstacle to those who would invoke an empirically oriented scientific tradition to reduce their understanding of man to physical and chemical forces alone. The contemporary philosophy of science grows out of an early nineteenth-century tradition that recognized only physical-chemical forces or physical-mathematical explanations of existence. These nineteenth-century empiricists were zealous to avoid the murkiness of German Romantic speculation. They avoided unnecessary postulates not subject to laboratory verification.<sup>24</sup> Following this tradition, behaviorism, a science based upon observable behavior, became a predominant trend in psychology after the

turn of the century. This approach excluded man's consciousness as acceptable subject matter, rejected introspection as an acceptable scientific method and turned to observable behavior as most appropriate for psychological science.<sup>25</sup> John B. Watson, an early leading behaviorist who had a strong commitment to the program of exact science, supported psychoanalysis, but nearly all subsequent behaviorists have criticized Freud's approach as "bad" science which fails to follow "the standard rules of science."<sup>26</sup>

It is true that Freud's method of inquiry does not easily lend itself to quantification and reproducibility—an objection applicable to the scientific study of all singular historical events, including Christ's resurrection and Joseph Smith's visions. It is also true that man's consciousness cannot be dissected like a laboratory animal. Nevertheless, Freudian thought affirms the importance of internal psychological processes. It lends them a dignity equal to that given not only to the physical and chemical forces of the "exact sciences" but also to the computer-oriented technology of today.

*Freud on Religion.* Of all "Freudian" concepts, Mormons are most likely to object to his metaphysical views of religion and God. Freud's pronouncements on religion in his "Future of An Illusion," written in 1927, is one of the sharpest criticisms of religious institutions ever penned. He characterized religion as "the universal obsessional neurosis of humanity,"<sup>15</sup> bringing the same restrictions upon mankind as an individual neurosis brings upon a person. He also termed religion "a system of wishful illusions together with a disavowal of reality, such as we find in an isolated form nowhere else but in . . . a state of blissful hallucinatory confusion."<sup>16</sup> And the author of this may be called a friend of the Gospel?

These stinging epithets are fully appreciated only in context of the topic of the essay. Freud allowed that in this essay he "was concerned much less with the deepest sources of the religious feeling than with what the common man understands by his religion—with the system of doctrines and promises which, on the one hand, explains to him the riddles of this world with enviable completeness, and, on the other, assures him that a careful Providence will watch over his life and will compensate him in a future existence for any frustrations he suffers here."<sup>17</sup> He wrote this essay with the perspective of a man impressed by the ruling minority's use of otherworldly religious dogma as a means to contain the impulses of the uneducated and oppressed masses. He did not view such an "illusion" as a legitimate basis for the authority to maintain existing social control and cultural form.

Freud did not view subjective spiritual experience as a substitute for reason. "There is no appeal to a court above that of reason. . . . If one man has gained an unshakable conviction of the true reality of religious doctrines from a state of ecstasy which has deeply moved him, of what significance is that to others?"<sup>18</sup> Although Freud dallied with occult matters,<sup>19</sup> he always sharply distinguished such private interests from the body of his scientific theory, and his science focused upon man's psychological constructs in their social context. "Psycho-analysis has made us familiar with the intimate connection between the father complex and belief in God; it has shown us that a personal God is, *psychologically*, nothing other than an exalted father, and it brings us evidence every day of how young people lose their religious beliefs as soon as their father's authority breaks down."<sup>20</sup> (*italics added*) When Freud extended his clinical insights into historical and cultural spec-

ulations, he drew heavily upon the nineteenth-century framework of philosophic positivism and social Darwinism, and presumed a historical development of mankind in which the institution of religion serves as a defense against the perception of personal weakness and as a wish fulfillment in disregard of reality.

I submit that Freud's psychological statement of how religious dogma is used in the lives of many persons has some validity, but, of course, a believing Mormon could hardly quote Freud's "Future of An Illusion" from the pulpit.

*Freud and Mormon Thought.* Despite the above, the basic premises of Freud's psychological system are surprisingly parallel to some fundamental gospel principles. Mormon doctrine holds that the realm of man's existence is not limited to what is available to him through his usual sensory perception. It declares that each man has an eternal spirit which must be united with the body in order to "receive a fullness of joy"<sup>21</sup> With Freud, a believing Mormon would say that man is more than his observable behavior or conscious rational faculties.

Mormon doctrine does not recognize an antithesis between the material and the spiritual realms of existence, but rather proclaims that "all spirit is matter" to be "discerned by purer eyes."<sup>22</sup> Rejecting the supernatural as a separate and different order of existence, it declares that "miracles" are not due to suspension of orderly processes. Rather they conform to laws which scientists have yet to explain fully. With Freud, Mormons affirm orderly principles of causality in the universe and hold that matters vital to human life are not dependent upon caprice or miraculous interventions as commonly understood in Christian theology.

Mormon doctrine is based upon a developmental view of man. It expounds the concept of human progress, not in the late nineteenth-century sense of cultural advancement from a primitive physical and social form, but rather as a plan of eternal development. It declares that "man was also in the beginning with God,"<sup>23</sup> and has a personal, real, divine potential. As Freud explored an individual's childhood to understand his behavior in later years, Mormons postulate a pre-earth existence and speculate on its effects in this and later estates.

Freudian thought—apart from the tradition of contemporary "hard science"—lends substance to the legitimacy of yet other explanations of human behavior. I am struck by the human tendency, which also figures in "scientific" tradition, to neglect phenomena which are not amenable to the tools of inquiry used. Whatever subject matter is not studied commonly tends to be considered unworthy of study, then inconsequential and perhaps finally nonexistent. So it is that "hard" scientists slight subjective experience and religious sentiment, and spiritual mystics slight objective data and science. I insist that no one view of man may monopolize truth. It may be laudable to seek a synthesis of religious experience and current scientific thought; however, I am wary of any attempt to bind religious beliefs to any single form of contemporary science. Modern science, even in its most exact and finished form, is a slippery and changeable beast which one cannot trust to carry one's religious convictions. The history of science should teach that the hard facts of one scientific era look amazingly different when viewed from another era.<sup>27</sup> Naive indeed is the person who would presume that

present psychology will remain unaltered.

*Psychotherapy.* Many Mormons tend to contrast righteous living with medical treatment and to consider one a substitute for the other. I consider each desirable in its proper sphere. A nutritious diet with adequate bulk promotes bowel regularity, but it does not replace surgery in case of acute appendicitis. Likewise, admonitions to have a positive attitude and to avoid self-pity may promote an optimistic life-stance, but they may heighten feelings of inadequacy and despair in case of depression where the central psychological defect is loss of the very capacity to experience pleasure.<sup>28</sup> I have seen a number of Mormons suffer from disabling depression for years before accepting treatment with its subsequent lifting of the depressed mood. And I have also seen a seemingly righteous High Priest "stuck" in therapy because—to my perspective—of his refusal to clear a longstanding premarital moral transgression with his bishop.

Many Mormons, especially those reared in the Intermountain West, assume that psychotherapy will lead to a "loss of testimony." In fact, psychotherapy as a technique is morally neutral; a competent therapist will offer no guarantee for the eventual religious beliefs and practices of his patient. The therapist promises only to make an honest attempt to enhance a person's understanding of his subjective life, believing recognition of previously unconscious wishes and fears will allow conscious control and adaptive behavior. Religious beliefs or activity are endangered by psychotherapy only when they have a neurotic basis. For example, a man may dominate and belittle his wife under pretense of exercising "priesthood authority". In such a case, examination of his marriage may challenge his concept of priesthood authority and his related religious beliefs. Healthy religious sentiment is not adversely affected. It may even be enhanced when freed from constricting psychopathology which has acquired a religious form in the course of emotional development. Successful therapy usually promotes maturity in all spheres, including religion.<sup>29</sup>

Among forms of psychotherapy, psychoanalysis holds a special place. It addresses concerns of the inner man: the complexities of motivation, fears and fantasies, rather than just observable behavior. It places the therapist—as it were—in the head of the patient, and allows him in effect to say, 'I perceive such-and-such conflicting motivating forces in your behavior.' In other types of therapy, such as transactional analysis, the therapist takes a position outside the patient and in effect says, 'I perceive your acting toward others in such-and-such a fashion.' The therapist labels behavior, and often goes on to counsel and even to urge change in behavior, but the inner motivating force is not addressed directly. Herein lies the difference between analytic psychotherapy and counseling.

Psychoanalysis retains a developmental perspective, recognizing the influence of past experience rather than focusing exclusively on the here-and-now. In practice it is more intensive than most other therapies. Sessions are several times a week for years. The arduous training of its practitioners requires analysis of self and a careful supervision of controlled cases in addition to casework.

The demands and discipline of psychoanalysis do not attract hordes of followers in the contemporary instant-mental-health-and-self-actualization scene. Besides time and money, a prospective patient needs to have a higher

intelligence and a psychological openness. These requirements serve to limit analysis to about five percent of the population—thereby countering the egalitarian values of our democratic society. Because Freud's concepts grow out of clinical observations, they are not immediately self-evident. The introspective qualities of psychoanalysis cause resistance in people reluctant to acknowledge personal inadequacies. Its acceptance is further hampered by its cumbersome vocabulary. It is much easier to understand the simpler vocabulary of the "parent-adult-child" therapy popularized by Eric Berne's *Games People Play*.

Psychoanalysis has lost status in the last quarter-century, crowded by a host of simpler therapies that promise faster relief (without documentation of delivery!). Close scrutiny of many of the "modern" psychotherapies, however, shows heavy reliance on Freud's clinical insights and conceptions even when his specific concepts have been derided or superseded. Even behavioral therapies are increasingly recognizing the limitations of a strict stimulus-response model and are incorporating internal mediating processes.

*Human Understanding.* A third use of Freudian thought is the understanding it can provide of human personality and character formation.

Mormons have historically shown proclivity for the natural sciences and the arts in preference to psychology, often viewing psychology as somehow incompatible with their world view. (How often has the first question following my identification as a psychiatrist been, "Can you do that and keep your testimony?") A Mormon may initially react to psychological scrutiny of his religion with discomfort and even a feeling of intimidation. But this new perspective may be viewed as complementary rather than competitive for the Mormon who is sure of his religious convictions and who holds that all statements of truth have value in their own sphere. Some analytical insights may even agree with church assumptions and policies. For example, the Church and the secular world seem to be taking ever hardening lines on the subject of abortion. Over the years most psychologists have tended to accept that "therapeutic abortion is accompanied by relatively mild trauma, including some degree of anxiety and depression; that the preponderant reaction is relief; and that feelings of relief appear to be sustained over an extensive period." These conclusions come from questionnaire data—the realm of sociological surveys. But deeper feelings about abortion elicited in the course of analytic therapy "were invariably of intense pain involving bereavement and a sense of identification with the fetus. These feelings appeared even when the patient rationally considered that abortion had been inevitable and the only possible course of action . . . whatever may be the case at the conscious level, at a much deeper, initially unconscious level, abortion is regarded by many women as infanticide . . . Very few of these women would willingly place themselves in the position of having another abortion."<sup>30</sup>

I am impressed that formation of character and development of religious concepts are intrinsically interwoven for the person raised as a Mormon. The experiences of participating in family prayer, learning of a Father in Heaven and sitting through Sacrament Meeting are all part of the process of forming early relationships, finding a place in the family constellation and learning a role in the world outside the family. The emotional impact of such childhood experiences may remain a motivating force even when lost



to conscious memory and intellectually separated from abstract concepts of theology.

My impression is that the majority of active Mormons experience their religion as a constructive and satisfying aspect of their lives. However, many tend to limit and to pattern their understanding of their religion in order to justify their own emotional immaturity and rigidity. A Mormon may seek to avoid responsibility for his decisions under the guise of eliciting, even demanding, advice on personal matters from his bishop, church, or the general authorities. Or again, he may seek to avoid awareness of complex social problems and participation in his larger social community by constant "activity." It should be understood, however, that psychological analysis includes examination of motivation, not just of observable behavior. Social withdrawal resulting from fear of exposure of personal failings and immaturity is *motivationally* different from a withdrawal based upon a strong conviction that personal salvation and "establishing the Kingdom" command such a high priority that all other activities are frivolous diversions in the eternal perspective.

Other Mormons appear to experience their religion as a frustrating, poorly integrated and unsatisfying element of their lives—as a thorn in their side. In some instances these experiences appear to result from behavior in violation of personal moral values or living in clearly identifiable "sin". But other cases of discomfort with religion grow out of a disparity between a person's religious ideas and expectations, on the one hand, and his life experiences which shape his character structure, on the other hand. For example, a man would have difficulty praying to a Heavenly Father portrayed as loving, forgiving and helpful if he had experienced his biological father as hateful, punitive and vindictive.

I recall with sadness the bitter recollection of a "wayward" Mormon girl's memory of her father, a highcouncilman and former bishop: "I wanted some love and he gave me religion." She had received only the *form* of religious life; she had not received the warm acceptance necessary to shape a happy, productive adult life.

I often see a Mormon version of an all-or-nothing syndrome which might be labeled, "Perfection now or bust." Mormons are forbidden to drink alcohol, but when one does, he is more likely to become alcoholic and more refractory to treatment at that. A person walks into a clinic where I work, writes "Mormon" in the clinic form space for religion and lights up a cigarette—unaware of my religious preference. When I comment that I thought Mormons didn't smoke, I hear, "I'm a Mormon, but not a very good one." He has accepted his smoking as confirmation of his lack of self-worth in the Mormon subculture, with no reference to his compassion, charity, community service or other virtues and deeds.

Or an adolescent may attempt to emancipate himself from childhood dependency upon his parents by the transient use of peer group dress, appearance and jargon. If his parents cannot tolerate his growing independence and self-sufficiency—which is likely if they have never satisfactorily resolved their own dependency upon their own parents—they may invoke church standards and doctrine to justify prohibitions upon the adolescent's strivings for maturity, labeling them socially deviant and morally repugnant. In such cases the battleground frequently becomes visible in outward

characteristics of dress and grooming. Such an authoritarian parental attitude elicits either passive conformity or rebellious defiance. Although conformity often forestalls open conflict, it may well impede the youth's developing a mature, integrated character structure that includes acceptance of a conservative code of dress and its underlying values. In my observation defiance is often displaced from parents onto authority figures in the Church—an observation about which many a bishop could give anecdotal evidence.

Disparities in experience and ideals are universal. However, for many Mormons the disparities occur in the context of their religion because they are given religious concepts as rationale for regulation of much behavior that has a large potential for emotional conflict. It might be argued that invoking religious principles for such prohibitions is a misuse of the gospel; however, because a Mormon *experiences* such prohibitions as the gospel, their emotional impact actually contributes to the formation of character.

*Summary.* Freud applied his psychological insights to the religions of his day and concluded that they were illusions, much as a young Joseph Smith concluded: "All their creeds were an abomination in [God's] sight; that those professors were all corrupt."<sup>33</sup> Had Freud understood the Mormon world view, his response might still have been irreverent but it could also have been one of restrained sympathy for a revolutionary and maligned "heresy." However that may be his basic principles may be used as a working hypothesis to explore the netherside of man's psyche without adhering to his world view. Freud was no "defender of the faith," but he can be studied as an explorer of the territory in which religious sentiment takes root. His world view may be contrary to that of most Mormons, but study of his fundamental principles may stimulate development of one's own metapsychology. It is easy to read Freud as portrayed by the popular press—generally in support of a hedonistic culture—and then to attack him as a shaman of the modern permissive society. But to reject his introspective examination of man's most moving subjective experiences is to ignore significant aspects of human life.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*. James Strachey (trans.). Vol. XVI, pp. 284f; Vol. XVII, pp. 139ff. London: Hogarth Press, 1959.

<sup>2</sup> David Shakow and David Rapaport, "The Influence of Freud on American Psychology," *Psychological Issues* 4:1 (Monograph 13): p. 25. New York: International Universities Press, 1964.

<sup>3</sup> Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1970, p. 468.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 456ff.

<sup>5</sup> Roger A. MacKinnon and Robert Michels: *The Psychiatric Interview in Clinical Practice*. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1971, p. 66.

<sup>6</sup> Ellenberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 490, 549.

<sup>7</sup> J. A. C. Brown, *Freud and the Post-Freudians*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964, p. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Ellenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 525.

<sup>9</sup> MacKinnon, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>10</sup> Ellenberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 495f.

<sup>11</sup> Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>12</sup> Freud. *Standard Edition* (fn. 4). Vol. VII, p. 168.

<sup>13</sup> Shakow and Rapaport, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

<sup>14</sup> Brown, *op. cit.*, Chapters I and II

<sup>15</sup> Freud. *Standard Edition* (fn. 4). Vol. XXI, p. 43.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 43.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>19</sup> Ellenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 534.

<sup>20</sup> Freud. *Standard Edition* (fn. 4). Vol. XI, p. 123.

<sup>21</sup> *The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*. 93:33.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 131:7.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 93:29.

<sup>24</sup> P. F. Cranefield, "The Organic Physics of 1847 and the Biophysics of Today," *Journal of the History of Medicine*, 12:407-423 (1957). Read this and Shakow, *op. cit.*, pp. 34ff for a concise review of the minimally effective attempt to apply principles of the "hard" sciences of physics and chemistry to the field of psychology.

<sup>25</sup> Shakow, *op. cit.*, Chapter 3.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69. Also see Chapter 6 and pp. 172f for review of this criticism.

<sup>27</sup> Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

<sup>28</sup> Donald F. Klein and John M Davis, *Diagnosis and Drug Treatment of Psychiatric Disorders*. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1969, p. 175.

<sup>29</sup> See the 1968 report by the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (GAP): "The Psychic Function of Religion in Mental Illness and Health" for a balanced exposition on the use of religion in mental illness, the influence of religion on character, and the role of religion in normal psychic functions.

<sup>30</sup> Ian Kent, Paper at the 1978 Canadian Psychiatric Association meeting, reported in *Psychiatric News*, 13 (5), pp. 50-51, March 3, 1978.

<sup>31</sup> *The Pearl of Great Price*, Joseph Smith 2:19.

More disturbing than all of this is the fact that the chief "clientele" for Mormon history, i.e., Latter Day Saints themselves, do not as yet demand good history. Mature historical writing is most likely to result when thoughtful people raise important questions about the present which can only be answered by a resort to their past. The prevailing climate within Mormondom is as yet characterized by unconcern or timidity about such questions.

-ROBERT BRUCE FLANDERS  
Vol. I, No. 3, p. 61