

*When Bad Things Happen to Good People*, has written an endorsement statement that appears on the cover of Carol Lynn Pearson's new book of homosexual case studies, *No More Goodbyes* (Walnut Creek, Calif.: Pivot Point Books, 2007): "Thank you, Carol Lynn Pearson, for reminding us that the task of any religion is to teach us whom we're required to love, not whom we're entitled to hate."

Christine Burton  
Holladay, Utah

### *The Only Reason to Marry?*

In the discussion about same-sex marriage in the Fall 2007 issue of *Dialogue* (Randolph Muhlestein, "The Case against Same-Sex Marriage," 40, no. 3 [Fall 2007]: 1-39), I felt that one really obvious argument was lacking. Muhlestein begins his case by quoting the First Presidency position against same-sex marriage and their insistence that it is acceptable for a gay person to experience "great loneliness" and remain isolated and celibate his whole life because the alternative of same-sex marriage would preclude heterosexual marriage and the procreation of children. The abundantly clear point to be made is that celibacy also precludes heterosexual marriage and the procreation of children, so how is it any more "essential to the Creator's plan"? Obviously, someone who is celibate is not pursuing a heterosexual marriage and is certainly not procreating.

The supposed lack of procreation seems like a red herring in any case. Wouldn't adoption be as viable an option for same-sex couples as it is currently for infertile couples? Don't we believe that sealing in the temple makes

these children as legitimately ours as if we had borne them personally? It seems to me that the entire argument against same-sex marriage is based on a priori assumptions and double standards. Those involved in honest discussions of the subject need to be bigger than that.

Johnny Townsend  
Seattle, Washington

### *Left Me Baffled*

The logic used by Randolph Muhlestein in his article, "The Case against Same-Sex Marriage" (40, no. 3 [Fall 2007]: 1-39), left me baffled. Heterosexuals, based on his statistics, avoid marriage at an alarming rate, opting for the single life that society offers homosexuals. And homosexuals, he points out, are reaching for the married life reserved for heterosexuals. Then Muhlestein insisted that untold thousands of heterosexuals would become homosexuals if society mistakenly allowed homosexuals the opportunity to marry. But Muhlestein convinced me through all those studies and statistics that it's *heterosexuals* who clearly want less and less to do with marriage. So why would they go to the trouble of becoming homosexuals to get what they don't want?

The only explanation is that men want less and less to be married because their only option for partners is females. And why do women avoid marriage? Well, again, it's because they have such a narrow option for a partner. It must be a guy. Based on that logic, we can reach Muhlestein's goal of increasing interest in marriage by let-