

continued from page 3

4? I still do not understand the public outcry. It has something to do with our cows. Wisconsin cows seem to handle the trauma, but apparently our cows are more delicate or less intelligent. Anyway, for the sake of our sensitive cows, we shall continue to stay on Eastern Standard Time during the entire year.

For most of you, it takes about two minutes to set your clocks and watches ahead or back one hour and then life goes on as usual. Some of you may need a few days to regulate your biological clocks and sleeping schedules. For those of us in Indiana, however, your minor change has momentous consequences. While officially we stay on Eastern Standard Time, for all practical purposes we switch to Central Daylight Savings Time and thus alter our temporal relationship to everyone else in the country.

Instead of being two hours ahead of Utah, we are only one. We are no longer the same time as Connecticut but are now the same time as Kansas. In the fall, it all goes the other way. Such calculations can become critical. They dictate our telephone habits, for example. To get the cheapest rates, half of the year we call my brother early in the morning—the other half, late at night.

Transportation schedules are also affected. Every six months, the airlines have to modify the arrival and departure times for all interstate travel beginning or ending in Indiana. If we buy our tickets early, we have to make sure that seasonal flipflops have been figured in. Driving to Chicago or Cincinnati, we have to ask "What time zone are we in this month?" to know how much time to allow.

Probably the most pervasive change is in the television schedules. Almost every program comes on at a different time. If we want to see the network news, we have to move the dinner hour. If we want to catch the late local news and weather, we have to stay up an extra hour in the winter. It is particularly crazy with our children's bedtime routine. In the summer when we would prefer having the shows later, they are on early; in the winter when it would be nice to have them on earlier because of school, they are on late. We end up not watching television very much.

Well, I have complained enough. The point of the lament is the paradox that it is sometimes more difficult to adjust if we do not change than if we do. This is also true in relationships between husband and wife, parents

and children, and church and society. One of the primary causes of conflict in marriage is that one of the partners changes and the other one does not. This is often a side effect of education. When people marry young and the woman stays home to raise children while the man continues his education, a gulf can grow between them. Or if a woman continues to grow and develop but her husband remains stagnant, he often cannot accept the differences which result.

And this is the shock which comes if such marriages end in divorce. People who find themselves suddenly single often experience trauma as they try to deal with adult relationships in the 1980s using teenage rules from the 50s or 60s. For someone who is 35 years old, single, and sexually experienced to approach intimacy with the behavior of a naive 18-year-old is not healthy. Psychologically, trying to live out a script that does not fit can cause severe stress and self-alienation.

Parent-child conflict—especially in the teen years—is often a result of the same failure to respond to change. The style of parenting that works very well with young children is totally inappropriate for teenagers. The challenge of parenthood is to be able to adapt to the changing needs of our children, particularly their increased need for independence and a separate identity.

The Church faces a similar dilemma because to a certain extent it plays a parental role. Through childhood and into adolescence, it is useful to have the Church provide directions for us, but when the Church continues to treat us as adolescents after we have matured and need a higher level of independence, it creates tension.

In addition to responding to the various chronological and emotional needs of its members, the Church needs to address the new technological, environmental, and social conditions which are part of the milieu for everyone. Any business (and increasingly, any person) that refuses to adapt to the computer age will soon not be competitive in the marketplace. It is ironic that the Church has been very astute in taking advantage of computers and other technological innovations but has been slow in acknowledging other shifts in our society. As the world changes and we do not, the discrepancy becomes greater as does the potential for conflict.

A trivial example of this failure to recognize societal changes is the Church's reaction to facial hair. Fifteen years ago, many men grew beards to make a political or social

statement which the Church found distasteful. For at least the past ten years, however, beards have not made a consistent statement about anything, and it is no longer possible to determine our political proclivities from our appearance. The Church ignores the new meanings—or lack of meaning—and expects us to conform to an anachronistic grooming standard. This not only causes conflict within the community of the Saints but makes it difficult for some of us to convince people that we really are Mormons.

More important examples of the failure to recognize social realities are the injunctions to women—particularly about having babies and not careers. With the opportunities to combine productivity with reproductivity (to create as well as procreate) so obvious in our society, it is discordant to continue promoting what is a minority choice even among Mormons.

I do not mean to imply that the Church does not change. After all, I teach Primary on Sunday morning in my two-piece garments (and a three-piece suit). The Church has also recognized that the meaning of the movie rating system had evolved and therefore adopted a more rational guide to movie selection than simply condemning "R-rated" films. The changes simply come slowly. When I was at BYU I concluded that the Mormon approach to the injunction to be "in the world but not of the world" is to be three years behind the world.

I am also not saying that we need to always give in. But we should analyze the costs and benefits of all alternatives. Then if we decide not to change, we need to find the best ways to adapt to the revolutions around us. Our time zone complications, for instance, are not serious because we are aware of the problem. If we ignored the fact that we are out of step, we would have problems making contact with the rest of the country because our timing would be off. The worst response is to pretend that things are not changing. Taken into account, our time change is merely a nuisance. We could, however, avoid even that if we would reset our clocks with everyone else—and at little cost other than a few discontented cows.

I do not like the hassles imposed by Indiana time. When I grew up I discarded those childhood clothes that were too small. Likewise, I sort through my childhood ideas and discard those which no longer fit while keeping those which do. I even retain some ideas—and clothes—

which are not fashionable but appeal to me. I can make these choices to fit my needs. But I cannot decide to go on Daylight Savings Time with the rest of you. That decision has been co-opted by some legislators. They have decreed that I should not reset my watch (unless I want to be at odds with my neighbors). Likewise, when the Church resists societal change and tells me that I must also resist if I

want to remain in good standing, I am forced into a dilemma. I can obey, stand with the Church, and be in conflict with society; or I can change and be in conflict with the Church. Either way, this pattern of having part of my life change while another part tries to hold firm creates tension—a tension which is even more bothersome than Indiana's scrambled time zones.

group to pray when they want to, but at secular events to which non-church members are invited, such public conversation with the Almighty seems out of place.

I can't help wondering where the line is drawn. Are BYU basketball games opened with prayer before the first whistle? How about car washes at the warehouse? Does the board of the Bonneville Corporation petition guidance from on high before voting a stock split? Maybe they do.

Public prayers have always seemed to me designed more to meet the needs of people rather than to develop a relationship with God. Public prayers can't help but be very aware of their mortal audience, and principles of oratory often become the guides in such a situation.

There is a long-standing tradition of public prayer in the Christian world, probably never inhibited by the biblical admonition to do one's praying in the closet. Public prayers are justified on the basis that they are reminders of our Christian heritage and beliefs. Such reminders may reassure the faithful, but I doubt that they convince the unbeliever. They are more likely to offend the different-believer.

The communion a group of like-believers feels at a public prayer by one of their members may well be important. But unless it is a religious occasion intended for their own members, such prayers would be better gotten out of the schools, theaters, and other public events. Let's get prayer back in the closet where it belongs.

Outside Looking In

PUTTING PRAYER IN ITS PLACE

Ray Ownbey

Growing up in the fifties, I got to know Gilbert and Sullivan operettas as a student in high school productions. I can still sing (with more nostalgia than skill) "A Wandering Minstrel I" or "I Am the Very Model of a Modern Major General."

Imagine my delight upon returning to Utah to live some four years ago when I read that Promised Valley Playhouse was mounting a production of *HMS Pinafore*. I would have a chance to relive my role of Ralph Rackstraw of some 25 years before.

The night of the performance I arrived at the theater and took my seat with great anticipation. But before the houselights dimmed and the familiar overture started, the curtain parted and a dark-suited figure appeared on stage. Had one of the principals been taken ill? Was a patron whose generosity made the production possible going to have his ego massaged and his corporate identity laid bare? Were we going to be asked to deposit popcorn cartons in the receptacles?

None of the above. We were going to pray. And the chorus of "amens" which followed indicated that the majority of the attendees were Mormons.

Now as I understand it, Promised Valley Playhouse is run by the Mormon church, and I guess they can pray before a production of *HMS Pinafore* if they want to. Certainly the high school production I was in years before could have used some outside

help.

But, smart remarks aside, praying before such events is standard practice in Mormon-sponsored events. I went to a recital at a warehouse some months later, one where both Non-Mormon and Mormon musicians performed music that was probably more profane than sacred, and the event was both opened and closed with prayer.

I've since been told that all events in the church buildings are opened and closed in such a manner, and I guess that includes such secular events as boy scout meetings.

No one can argue the privilege of any

The Noumenonist

PUTTING PRAYER IN ITS PLACE

Paul M. Edwards

Recently I heard Richard Poll's excellent John Whitmer presentation where he up-dated his provocative 1968 article, "What the Church Means to People Like Me." In that article he described two categories of critical approach within the Church: "The Rod of Iron Saint" and the "Liahona Saint." The first "does not look for

questions but for answers, and in the gospel . . . finds or is confident that he can find the answers to every important question." The second is "preoccupied with questions . . . but finds in the gospel . . . answers to enough important questions so he can function purposefully without answers to the rest."

Like most persons in attendance I found myself reconsidering where, if

anywhere, I fit in. By orientation, if not by tradition, I have little inclination to be an Iron Rod of any variety. On the other hand, I am not interested in the variety of liberals who, as Earnest Hocking has suggested, "have become taxidermists to late principles." My suspicions were growing that the grass was equally brown on both sides of the fence. My brand of liberalism—if that is what it is—seems to be located in acceptance and understanding. I am seeking an inquiring temper that expresses a faith in intelligence and in the human ability to comprehend the tradition of a free market in the world of ideas. An attitude as willing to question answers as to answer questions.

I find such an attitude on the defensive everywhere. The tom-toms of convention and the bagpipes of Farwellian transcendentalism are growing more and more shrill. Men and women of good will defend the accumulation of human knowledge as if it were a social monster. No less a body than the MHA finds itself trying to justify the writing of honest Church history as if that were somehow questionable. I am not anxious to add my voice to this unfortunate situation, but it is my conviction that the human capacity for reflection is an expression of a person's self-transforming potential for change through growth. In the human situation, knowledge is not so much a matter of personal power as it is the ability to transform animals into persons: the reactor into the responder. The heart of such a transformation is woven into the fabric of every person's being. It has only to be released.

In the final analysis, I believe that the nature of this transformation is historical. I recognize that there are about as many definitions of history as there are historians, but I suspect that a good many would agree that history is the continuous state of interaction between the historian and the evidence. The value lies within the interaction. The outcome of historical involvement is not the end of something, like the final station on a long train journey, but the act of analysis. It would seem significant that if this is true, historians within the Mormon movement, for example, should not be so concerned with freeing themselves from their prejudices or their tendency to arrive at expected stations. Rather the reader should be protected from the limitations of these interpretations not by either restricted or official history, but by a multiplicity of views

being presented. If history is process, inquirers identify beauty and meaning as they pass through a continuous and ever-fresh landscape not by the character of their destination.

In my own stumbling and hesitant efforts, I am indebted to those who have heard me out when I wandered into new and poorly developed worlds. I was (as I am) unsure of myself, and the willingness of others to listen enabled me to hear myself more clearly. These persons have not necessarily bought my theories, and many have been free to be critical and paternal (or more often, maternal). But to a large extent those who have felt free to differ have felt free to let me inquire, and our dialogue has focused on the merit of our production, not the orthodoxy of our conclusions.

Some persons may prefer to stand alone, taking a perverse pleasure in being isolated. But for the most part, the peril of our truths and the significance of our doubts drives us to seek acceptance in our inquiry. Perhaps only presence is enough. But the burden of being born, and of giving birth, rests easier when shared with others who bear the mark of birth and creation. Our faith lies not only in our Creator, but in humankind and our capacity to

become fully human. Of this I feel certain—maybe even Iron Rod-ish—but my certainty is based on my own shared experience and not on submission to an authority. I could not have come to this conclusion had I not doubted with sincerity, searched with uncertainty, and remained open to understand again with each new person.

Assuming the above, I am amazed at the demands made by those who have determined a course of action, preferring the security of a traditional or newly popular position over the freedom of reconsideration. Whether they call themselves liberal or conservative, both have concluded that it is safer to teach persons to remember than it is to share an adventure. Such an appeal to authority does not require intelligence, nor common sense, nor faith, nor an understanding of the situation. It requires only a good memory.

I have a great fear of those who would lead and direct our institutions (as well as our inquiries) if they are persons who have never been in danger of doubt. I am afraid of those not aware that faith does not reside in the brain but in the structure of personality, and thus do not see that the "comfortable faith" is often

Special Pre-Publication offer!

THE BEST OF SUNSTONE \$9.95

Favorite articles compiled from the first five years

Remember...

Some Reflections on the Mormon Identity Crisis by *Richard J. Cummings*. A Mormon and Wilderness: The Saga of the Savages by *Levi S. Peterson*. The New Mormon Mysticism by *Marden J. Clark*. Knowing, Doing, and Being by *Arthur R. Bassett*. Time and Omniscience in Mormon Theology by *Kent E. Robson*. From Joseph Smith to Progressive Theology by *Thomas G. Alexander*. Mormon Women and Depression by *Louise Degen/KSL-TV*. Fires of the Mind by *Robert Elliott*. Bringing Humanity to the Gospel by *Stephen L. Richards*. Interviews with *Wallace Stegner*, *Kenneth Woodward* and *David Gardner*. Echoes and Foreshadowings: The Distinctiveness of the Mormon Community by *D. Michael Quinn*.

And many, many more...

Orders must be received by September 10, 1983.

SUNSTONE P.O. Box 2272 Salt Lake City, Utah 84110

inhuman. Faith confronts our existence at the point of our essential mystery. It does not eliminate the call for explanation; it cannot end all doubt. It is a gamble. To deny ourselves that gamble or to identify our grasping search as sin or faithlessness, forces us either to renounce ourselves or to renounce the community of doubters from which we are born.

Our inquiry, by its nature, means so much to us that we wish to share it, but sharing and imposing are far different. What we seek to share is the joy of the journey, the challenge of the goal, the warmth of new discovery. The tendency is often to

impose answers and solutions to "rescue" others as they say in the trade, but all we can do is share.

I am inclined to suggest that there are no such things as official truths—nor for that matter official histories—no soft or hard core to our approach to inquiry. There certainly is no ultimate understanding upon which to make a judgment about the appraisal of others. We, of all people, must not allow ourselves to be ignorant of, or ignorant about, the contemporary revelation of the human spirit that emerges as persons dialogue with their God, their world, and their peers. Perhaps such an approach places me in the category of a limp Liahona.

Suit for a psychiatrist's failure to warn is an unnecessary burden on a profession ill-suited to the exactness the law demands. Restak, quoting a report by Dr. John Monahan, points out that psychiatrists' predictions of violent behavior are "accurate at best in one of three" cases. In an age when the law seeks for greater precision and measurability, psychiatry cannot offer the certitude of the hard sciences. Forensic psychiatry surely is not the developed science that forensic engineering or toxicology are. Restak himself pleads that "[p]sychiatry is not a science like physics or chemistry, and it cannot and should not be judged according to standards appropriate to an exact discipline. Society has little to gain by holding psychiatrists to a standard of performance beyond the limits of their capabilities."

Despite disclaimers such as this, the law has increasingly thought of psychiatry as a science; but in the law's defense, it must be pointed out that psychiatry has perhaps encouraged this. More and more, mental problems are regarded and treated as if they are diseases, like mumps or measles. Christopher Lasch has written that in the first part of this century "social pathologists" such as "[e]ducators, psychiatrists, social workers, and penologists saw themselves as doctors to a sick society, and they demanded the broadest possible delegation of medical authority in order to heal it." If the psychiatrists themselves see their craft as science and not art, the law can hardly be blamed for agreeing.

Assessing blame at this point is not the solution to the immediate problem which threatens not only psychiatrists, but all counseling professions. If Hinckley's psychiatrist "knew or should have known" that Hinckley would attempt a political assassination, then couldn't John Hinckley himself have a cause of action? And what of others—school counselors, teachers, and ministers—who came in contact with Hinckley? Couldn't they also have foreseen what John Hinckley might do? Based on this kind of reasoning, the possibilities for suit are limitless.

Both the law and psychiatry must be faulted for the current trend. Psychiatry, like other arts (including the law itself), is an imprecise discipline which, at least to date, does not rise to the level of a science. Until it does, the law would do well to recognize psychiatry as a helping profession and not hold it to standards expected of more exact sciences.

Law of the Land

FREEDOM OF RECONSIDERATION

Jay S. Bybee

Since 1976 the courts have been increasingly willing to recognize a legal duty on the part of mental health personnel and institutions to warn others of the violent propensities of their patients. Beginning with the case of *Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California*, the California courts have held that a psychiatrist has a duty to warn individuals who have been threatened with bodily harm by patients under the psychiatrist's care. At least in California this duty to warn has been limited to those who have been specifically threatened. Other jurisdictions, ostensibly following California's lead, have expanded the duty to warn to include other potential victims—even if not specifically threatened by the patient.

On 18 March 1983, Reagan's press secretary, James Brady, secret serviceman McCarthy, and D.C. police officer Delahanty filed suit against John Hinckley, Jr.'s psychiatrist for his alleged failure to warn officials that Hinckley might try an assassination; according to the suit, the psychiatrist "knew or should have known" that Hinckley would attempt a political assassination. The recognition in *Tarasoff* of a duty to warn and the attempt to extend that duty in suits

such as the one filed by Brady, McCarthy, and Delahanty will have serious ramifications for psychiatrists and other counselors and, perhaps even more serious in the long term, indicates an attitude towards the "science" of psychiatry which I believe psychiatry has not yet earned.

Successful suits against psychiatrists promise to cause serious problems for the profession. In a recent editorial, Georgetown University medical professor Richard Restak warned that the increase in suits might bring about an increase in dishonest record-keeping; by deliberately omitting threatened acts from the patient's history or record, psychiatrists can shield themselves from suit. Another possibility would be that a suit-paranoid psychiatrist would warn authorities and all others of the patient's threats—even if, in his opinion, the threats would not be carried out. This, unfortunately, might retard the patient's progress by stigmatizing him unnecessarily. It would restrict the patient's movements since the police would have a record of the psychiatrist's warning and might feel a duty to prevent the patient from harming someone else. In any case it would certainly erode the confidence with which patients would be willing to discuss their problems with a psychiatrist.

LISTEN TO THIS

94.1 FM 94

KALL FM

**THE MUSIC
STATION**