

(and others in the same situation) to be baptized but forbade them from voting and from partaking of the sacrament until such time as they could have a sufficiently powerful religious experience to constitute conversion.

While such an accommodation would not satisfy many Latter-day Saint homosexuals, who understandably want nothing less than full acceptance, including all the rights and privileges available to heterosexual members, some “halfway” status could provide a means whereby those wishing to could be considered members “in good standing” and therefore enjoy many of the privileges of membership. Such an official accommodation would also greatly diminish the intolerance and prejudice many homosexuals and their families currently experience in the Church. Further, it would allow homosexual members with children to worship together.

A Mormon halfway covenant for homosexuals living in committed relationships might allow them to be baptized, partake of the sacrament, receive patriarchal blessings, and serve in many positions. It might exclude temple attendance and certain ecclesiastical callings. While not a perfect solution to the present situation, it might provide a way whereby homosexuals and heterosexuals could work together “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come to a unity of the faith . . .” (Eph. 4:12–13).

Robert A. Rees
Brookdale, California

Appreciation for Dialogue

I grew up in a very loving, traditional LDS family. I love the Church, and the Lord has been there for me. I started reading *Dialogue* when my intellectual mom introduced it to me several years ago. I didn’t subscribe right away; I would read it at her house and she would give me old copies. I found many articles that addressed issues that weren’t addressed as much or at all in our “normal” LDS culture. I would read about divorce or single parenthood. I would read about issues and conflicts related to abortion and women’s rights. I ended up leaving an abusive marriage and found some strength in the pages of *Dialogue* as I read about diversity in the lives of many LDS Saints who are also struggling and questioning. When my mother moved away, I, of course, subscribed. I appreciate the discount for students as I am trying to make it on my own, finish raising my last two boys and go to school almost full-time. I don’t agree with all the articles but I appreciate the intellectual stimulation and can relate to many of them. I like articles on women’s issues (including priesthood and women, women’s rights, and motherhood), art as I am an artist, traditions in faith, and history.

Thank you for being there.

Melanie H.
Roseville, California

A Rigorous Examination

The best thing in your summer 2007 issue is Michael Quinn’s letter to the editor (“Filling Gaps and Responding

to ‘Silences in Mormon History,’” 40, no. 2 [Summer 2007]: ix) informing us of his latest (110 pages, 248 footnotes) exposition on Joseph Smith’s “First Vision” of 1820, not 1824, as oft-argued by Rev. Wesley Walters and wrongly conceded by some LDS historians. (To read Quinn’s paper, go to www.dialoguejournal.com and click on “E-Paper #3” in the *Dialogue Paperless* section. It is downloadable free.)

It’s pleasant to see a rigorous examination of historical evidence exhaust-

ively investigating an important topic. Quinn’s evidence shows not only an extensive Methodist (exactly as Smith stated) Palmyra “camp meeting” religious revival in 1820, but also an interdenominational (Methodists and others) Palmyra camp meeting revival in 1818 as well. We may now safely ignore historical criticism that no such religious revivals occurred in Palmyra until 1824.

Gerry L. Ensley
Los Alamitos, California