It is perhaps only fair that I give my own opinion regarding the controversy surrounding Elder Holland's talk, which I mentioned at the outset. As I said before, it is very complicated, and my own view is evolving as I study and learn more, but here it is:

- He shouldn't have singled out the valedictorian whose speech mentioned their sexuality. It's clear they had university approval for the content of the speech, so retroactively condemning it seems in poor taste, to say the least.

-Holland was justified in his use of metaphor (i.e. muskets and trowels), given the literal historical event it was based on; however, I can also understand the argument that he should have used a different weapon, given the recent gun violence that has plagued the nation in general. To those who think any metaphor involving weaponry is inappropriate in any context: weapons as metaphors is a pervasive rhetorical device in all walks of life, and has many examples even in common speech ("Call to arms," "bite the bullet," "shoot from the hip," "Take a stab at it," "stare down the barrel of a gun," "locked and loaded," "arrow in the quiver," "friendly fire," etc.). Not to mention violent metaphors that don't include weapons, like "come out swinging" or "roll with the punches." Clearly the use of violent metaphor isn't the problem with this speech, since we use violent metaphor all the time.

- As part of this, nowhere in his speech does Holland ever say we should shoot LGBTQ+ people. Nor does he suggest literal violence against anyone. If anyone interprets his metaphorical use of muskets as an actual call for violence, then they must also interpret his metaphorical use of trowels as an actual call for more gardening.

- Calling Holland's own tears crocodile tears and invalidating his experiences does exactly the thing he and others have been accused of. It is unfair to attribute hypocrisy if one hasn't personally seen those experiences and been with him.

- I believe the core message of the talk has been distorted by misunderstanding. Never does Holland say that LGBTQ+ people don't belong in the church, or that they are sinners consigned to hell. His stance is that all members should be loved, but that this love should not be misinterpreted as condoning or accepting sinful behavior.

- I believe both sides need a bit more empathy and understanding. Without doubt, this talk has hurt many people, and they should be helped and comforted as much as possible. Without doubt, members of the church generally aren't homophobic monsters. I personally don't view Holland's speech as a personal attack on all LGBTQ people; as a pair of LGBTQ+LDS podcasters said, "None of this is new."