

closer to the present, the fall 2007 issue had articles on same-sex marriage with diametrically opposing points of view. Undoubtedly, some readers who found Randolph G. Muhlestein's article on this subject convincing found Wayne Schow's "unfriendly" or even disturbing, and vice versa. Any article may, in fact, be a Rorschach test of each reader's faith and reason.

Reviewing forty years of *Dialogue*, I find it hard to see how the journal (or any scholarly journal for that matter) could make editorial decisions based on the principle of friendliness, knowing that many of the issues facing any religious community are complex, ambiguous, and even divisive. That is why *dialogue* itself is so essential. It is in the give and take, the sifting and winnowing, the speaking and listening, the pondering and praying that we both seek and, hopefully, find the truth, even if our finding is at times temporary and tenuous.

Ward wants articles that are "enlightening," but it is the very process, even more than the end product, that some find most enlightening. It is what, I believe, God intends when he invites us, "Come, let us reason together." I have found some of the articles that I disagreed with to be among the most enlightening and some of those that challenged my faith to be among the ones that most strengthened my faith—not because I accepted their arguments but precisely because they caused me to be more introspective and more thoughtful about my own beliefs. As C. S. Lewis states, "If you look for truth, you may find comfort in the end; if you look for comfort, you will get neither comfort nor truth."

I appreciate the open, honest, and

thoughtful spirit of Ward's letter and welcome him back into the fold. I hope he, as well as other previously disaffected readers, keep an open mind and heart about *Dialogue* and support the vital role it is playing in our religion and culture.

Robert A. Rees
Brookdale, California

Patrick Mason *Regretfully Resigns*

Editor's note: This former board member has stated the purposes of Dialogue so eloquently in his letter of resignation that we have asked his permission to publish it.

With great regret I am announcing my resignation from the board of directors of Dialogue Foundation. When I accepted my current job at the American University in Cairo, I knew that my travel back to the United States would be limited, which would thus hamper my ability to attend most *Dialogue* board meetings. I was hoping that I could continue to function in my position, but it has become increasingly apparent to me that some things are very difficult to do transcontinentally, despite the wonders of modern technology. Being an active member on a working board for an organization that deserves genuine commitment is one of them. It is precisely because I value *Dialogue* and the work of the board so much that I feel I should pass the torch to someone who can be more active in the role.

I was honored to be asked to serve on the board and very much enjoyed the collegiality of our correspondence and gatherings. I often left our board