

Dear John –

Your email dated September 2, 2020 raised several questions in my mind.

First, you stated, “We have a policy of not publishing unsolicited review submissions we haven’t commissioned.”

I feel that my article was “solicited” because when I asked you about it you told me to send it to you. Also, regarding your use of the word “commissioned,” I certainly am not asking for any payment for this article. I merely thought that *Living Lutheran* should be willing to publish another view of the *Queer Eye* episode.

Your reference to your policy raised four questions in my mind -

Is this policy in writing?

If so, could I have a copy?

When was this policy developed?

Is it consistently followed?

Second, the 2009 human sexuality social statement described four positions, each of which would have a place within the ELCA. All four of those positions are more “conservative and traditional” than the full LGBTQIA+ agenda, which the ELCA now embraces.

At the bottom of your article, “How Noah Hepler found ‘reawakening’ in *Queer Eye*,” there are postings for a number of other articles, each promoting the LGBTQIA+ agenda and lifestyle. I clicked on several of the links and found that each of those articles also ended with postings for a number of other articles, each promoting the LGBTQIA+ agenda and lifestyle.

Were each one of these articles solicited and commissioned?

Has the *Living Lutheran* also posted a comparable number of – or even any - articles promoting traditional views?

If not, why not, since the 2009 ELCA Churchwide Assembly stated that there would be a place for all four views which were described in the human sexuality social statement.

Third, one of the RESOLVED sections in the 2009 ministry policies states, “RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in American make provision in its policies to recognize the conviction of members who believe that this church should not call or roster people in a publicly accountable, lifelong, monogamous, same gender relationship.”

What has *Living Lutheran* done since 2009 to “recognize the conviction” and honor and support the position of those who hold to traditional views?

Has *Living Lutheran* done anything?

Fourth, *Living Lutheran* uses the following words to describe its work:

“We are a church that values and encourages diverse voices and lively dialogue in our faith and life. *Living Lutheran* is an opportunity for church members to express individual perspectives, and does not necessarily reflect official positions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.”

How can *Living Lutheran* claim to be valuing and encouraging “diverse voices and lively dialogue” and giving church members an opportunity to express individual perspectives if it will only publish material which is solicited and commissioned?

How can *Living Lutheran* claim to be valuing and encouraging “diverse voices and lively dialogue” if it only publishes articles which promote and advance the full LGBTQIA+ agenda and lifestyle and it does not give any space and time (let alone equal space and time) to any of the four positions which were described in the 2009 human sexuality social statement, including the two more traditional views?

Thank you for helping me understand how *Living Lutheran* fulfills its mission in a way which is consistent with its own stated purpose and in line with the social statement and ministry policies approved by the 2009 ELCA Churchwide Assembly.

Blessings in Christ,

Dennis D. Nelson
Executive Director of Lutheran CORE