



Minnesota Citizens in Defense of Marriage

1730 New Brighton Blvd PMB233
Minneapolis, MN 55413
www.mnmarriage.com

January 5, 2005

Dear Minnesota State Legislator,

As we begin this year's legislative session, I respectfully request your support for a Minnesota State Constitutional Amendment bill defining marriage exclusively as the union of one man and one woman. A small group of activists, together with renegade judges, are seeking to force our country into the greatest social experiment of our lifetime by redefining the institution of marriage. At last count, there were over 20 lawsuits challenging marriage laws in 11 states. In the state of Washington, two separate judges recently ruled that state's Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) to be unconstitutional. This creates the distinct possibility that Washington will become the second state in the union to legalize same-sex marriage when the State Supreme Court hears this case in March.

In response to these threats, other state legislatures have moved quickly to amend their state constitutions. Consider these facts:

- 44 million people in 13 states were able to vote on marriage amendments last year.
- 12 of these states already had DOMA statues on their books.
- 10 of these states' amendments also precluded same-sex civil unions.
- All measures were overwhelmingly approved by the voters, with an average win margin of 71%.
- 15 additional states are now in the process of introducing marriage amendment legislation.

Polls show that Minnesotans also want a constitutional amendment defining marriage exclusively as the union of one man and one woman. No other single issue generated more feedback from constituents in the past legislative session. We believe it's simply a matter of time before Minnesota's marriage laws are challenged in a court of law. Make no mistake: our Constitution will be amended - the only question is when and by whom. Will it be activist judges who are allowed to discover a new Constitutional right for same-sex couples to marry in Minnesota? Or will the Minnesota legislature that allows the people of Minnesota to amend our Constitution to preserve marriage?

I am enclosing two talking point sheets that help present the case for the marriage amendment. In addition, I have included a copy of the *Defense of Marriage Pledge*. If you have not already done so, please join the 80 other Minnesota State Legislators that have pledged their support for traditional marriage. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey J. Davis
President, Minnesota Citizens in Defense of Marriage
651.633.6773 phone
501.647.7108 fax
www.mnmarriage.com

Enclosures

Implications for You and Your Family Should Same-Sex Marriage be Legalized

You might ask yourself, “Why should I care if a homosexual couple wants to marry? This doesn’t affect my marriage, right?” Wrong. Legalization of same-sex unions will likely lead to tremendous irreversible changes that will directly impact you, your children and the future of our society. Here’s what’s likely to occur:

- Family structures will be permanently weakened as the definition of marriage is slowly destroyed, resulting in increase co-habitation and out-of-wedlock birthrates.
- Sex education and social studies in our public schools will include all aspects of same-sex partner lifestyles. Children, as young as kindergarteners, will be indoctrinated with a curriculum that seeks to legitimize homosexuality and same-sex relationships as a normal part of our society.
- Children raised in same-sex couple relationships will be deprived of the proven, best environment for their upbringing – a committed, monogamous marriage of a mother and a father.
- Our lawmakers will be pressured to pass additional hate-crime laws that will make it illegal to speak-out against homosexuality, including the public recitation of certain Bible verses.
- Churches could lose their IRS tax status and could be legally liable if they refuse to honor same-sex couples’ requests to be married within the church.
- States will be eventually forced to legalize polygamy and other types of polyamory unions, as marriage is transformed into a variety of relationship contracts (see Star Tribune article of January 1, 2005).
- Businesses will be forced to provide healthcare coverage to same-sex couples. Studies have shown that homosexuals have dramatically higher health care costs due to their lifestyle. Many businesses are already struggling to maintain adequate affordable health coverage for their employees. Adding mandatory coverage for same-sex couples could be enough to push these employers into insolvency or discontinuing health coverage for all employees.
- Taxpayers will be forced to pay higher taxes to finance state-sponsored social programs and benefits for same-sex couples.
- Legislators will be required to divert their attention to rewriting of hundreds of state and federal laws to accommodate same-sex unions.
- Social security will become financially insolvent more quickly as same-sex couples claim survivor benefits.
- And individuals that believe a child needs both a mother and a father for their best upbringing will be deemed intolerant and bigots.

If you think these possibilities are far-fetched, consider the fact that many of these events have already occurred in Canada, Sweden, England and Ireland where same-sex unions have been legal for some time. Whether it’s called same-sex “marriage” or “civil unions”, the social implications are the same. Is this the legacy you want to leave for our children?

Common Arguments Used by Proponents of Same-Sex Marriage

Liberal activists have carefully crafted their arguments in support of redefining marriage. Here are some of the more common arguments and the real truth as to why these arguments do not hold-up.

Argument #1: "Same-sex couples are being denied their civil rights."

Every individual is free to marry – sexual orientation is not a criterion used in issuing marriage licenses. However, no person has a legal right to marry any willing partner. Each individual, whether homosexual or heterosexual, is subject to the same legal restriction as to whom they may marry. Specifically, individuals are prohibited from marrying a child, a close blood relative, a person who is already married, or someone of the same sex. These restrictions apply equally to all individuals, therefore there is no "right" that is being denied to anyone. What homosexuals are really seeking is social validation of their lifestyle. Columnist Jeff Jacoby of the Boston Globe summed it up well. "The marriage radicals...have not been deprived of the right to marry – only of the right to insist that a single-sex union is 'marriage'. They cloak their demands in the language of civil rights because it sounds so much better than the truth. They don't want to accept or reject marriage on the same terms that is available to everyone else. They want it on entirely new terms. They want it to be given a meaning it has never before had, and they prefer that is be done undemocratically – by judicial fiat, for example, or by mayors flouting the law. Whatever else that may be, it isn't civil rights".

Argument #2: "Racists once used the law to preclude interracial marriages."

Same-sex marriages and interracial marriages have nothing in common. There is no difference between a black person and white person, other than their skin color. There is a tremendous difference between a man and a woman. Allowing a black woman and a white man to marry does not change the definition of marriage. Allowing two men or two women to marry, however, would fundamentally change that definition. Maintaining the definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman is essential to preserving the very nature and purpose of marriage.

Argument #3: "Same-sex couples are being denied access to certain legal rights and benefits".

It is true that homosexual couples do not have access to some of the legal benefits that are available to married heterosexuals. But why should they? Why should homosexuals receive preferential treatment just because they are sexually involved? Our society affords certain benefits to marriage because marriage involves the procreation and upbringing of children. Marriage begins a family. And the purpose of family is to produce the next generation. Government supports marriage to protect the future of society. It has no interest in affirming any other kinds of relationships.

Argument #4: "Why should two people who love each other be denied the right to marry?"

Because marriage is about more than just love. There are many types of loving relationships within our society – the love between an adult and a child, the love between a brother and a sister, the love between a group of friends. Yet none of these relationships constitutes a marriage. So what then is a marriage? Marriage scholar Maggie Gallagher offers a definition. "Marriage across societies is a public sexual union that creates kinship obligations and sharing of resources between men, women, and the children their sexual union may produce."

Argument #5: "Those who oppose same-sex marriage are homophobic and bigots."

It seems when all else fails, gay marriage advocates try to silence the opposition through intimidation. The truth is that homosexuality has been broadly tolerated in our country. Homosexuals are allowed to pursue their lifestyles without reprisal. They can form committed relationships, share home ownership, have sex, raise children, commingle property, receive inheritance and spend the rest of their lives together. Seeking to protect the institution, which forms the basic building block of our society, is not bigoted. It is showing concern for future the future of marriage, families and children in our society.

The Defense of Marriage Pledge

Whereas, the institution of traditional marriage – between one man and one woman – provides a firm foundation for family and community; and

Whereas, traditional marriage deserves an important and hallowed place within our culture; and

Whereas, not all domestic relationships are the equivalent of traditional marriage; and

Whereas, judicial activism threatens the institution of traditional marriage and seeks to redefine it;

Therefore, I pledge to support allowing the people of Minnesota to vote on whether our State Constitution should be amended to provide that marriage or its legal equivalent is limited only to the union of one man and one woman.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Elected Office / Title

*Please fax completed copy to (501) 647-7108 or mail to Minnesota Citizens in Defense of Marriage,
1730 New Brighton Blvd PMB233, Minneapolis, MN 55413.*