



MINNESOTA
FOR MARRIAGE

ONE MAN, ONE WOMAN
WWW.MINNESOTAFORMARRIAGE.COM



Why Preserving Marriage Matters

The debate over the definition of marriage has unfolded across America for the past several years, and is the subject of the proposed amendment on the November 2012 ballot to preserve marriage in Minnesota.

But what is the debate really about, how does it affect society and what is at stake in the outcome of the amendment vote?

What is at stake in this debate are two competing definitions of marriage. One definition – advocated by gay “marriage” activists – would define marriage as the union of any two people regardless of gender. The other definition, contained in the proposed constitutional amendment and reflective of the collective understanding of virtually every nation throughout recorded history, is that marriage is the union of one man and one woman.

Only one of these definitions of marriage would exist in the law. It would become the sole definitional basis for the only law-sanctioned marriage that could exist.

Why has virtually every society defined marriage as the union of one man and one woman? The answer can be summarized in one word: children. Marriage is a special relationship reserved exclusively for heterosexual unions because only the intimate relationship between men and women has the ability to produce children. Marriage serves a vital and universal societal purpose – to channel biological drive that might otherwise become socially destructive into enduring family units for the benefit of any

children produced by that sexual union. By encouraging men and women to marry, society helps ensure that children will be known by and cared for by their biological parents. Simply stated, while death and divorce too often prevent it, children need both a mother and a father.

The amendment preserves Minnesota’s historic and traditional definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman – the same definition adopted by voters in every state to consider the question (31 of 31 states have voted to define marriage in this way).

Additionally, passage of the marriage protection amendment ensures that the people of Minnesota themselves, and not activist judges or politicians, decide how our state will define marriage in the future. Without a marriage amendment in our constitution, activist judges or politicians can substitute their values for those of the people of Minnesota. This is exactly what happened elsewhere. The marriage protection amendment ensures that if activists want to redefine marriage in the future, they must receive the approval of voters to do so.

Marriage as the union of one man and one woman is in the public good. It serves the interests of men and women, of children, and of society itself. The marriage protection amendment on the November 2012 ballot gives voters the opportunity to preserve this special institution.

VOLUNTEER TO PRESERVE MARRIAGE!

Enacting the Marriage Protection Amendment requires thousands of supporters to create a grassroots movement.

Please complete and return this card or go to **www.MinnesotaForMarriage.com** to join us today! **You don't have to be a resident of Minnesota to help!**

Name _____

Email _____

Phone _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Church I belong to _____

In City _____

Please count me as a public supporter of the Minnesota Marriage Protection Amendment and keep me updated on the campaign

I can help as follows:

- Making a financial contribution
- Spreading the word
- Contacting voters
- Hosting a house party
- Placing a sign at my home or business
- Being a zip code captain
- Being a church captain

THE THREAT TO MARRIAGE

Right now, attempts are being made in Minnesota's courts and in the Legislature to redefine marriage or eliminate it altogether. If activist judges or politicians were to succeed in redefining marriage in Minnesota in the future, there would be profound consequences for religious organizations, individuals, and small businesses—and for society itself.

Those who do not agree with this new definition of marriage as a genderless institution existing for the benefit of adults – not children — will be treated under the law just like racists and bigots, and will be punished for their beliefs. This is already occurring:

- Religious groups who have refused to make their facilities available for same-sex couples have lost their state tax exemption.
- Religious groups like Catholic Charities in Boston and Washington DC have had to choose between fulfilling their social mission based on their religious beliefs, or acquiescing to this new definition of marriage. They have, for example, been forced to close their charitable adoption agencies.
- Whenever schools educate children about marriage, which happens throughout the curriculum, they will have no choice but to teach this new genderless institution. In Massachusetts, kids as young as second grade were taught about gay marriage in class. The courts ruled that parents had no right to prior notice, or to opt their children out of such instruction.
- Wedding professionals have been fined for refusing to participate in a same-sex ceremony.
- Doctors, lawyers, accountants and other licensed professionals risk their state licensure if they act on their belief that a same-sex couple cannot really be married. A counselor, for example, could not refuse “marriage therapy” to a same-sex couple because she doesn't believe in gay marriage. She'd put her licensure at risk.
- Those people – a strong majority of Minnesotans – who believe marriage is between one man and one woman, would be the legal equivalent of bigots for acting on their heartfelt beliefs. Refusal to accommodate and recognize same-sex “marriages” would be the equivalent of racial discrimination. Not only will the law penalize traditional marriage supporters, but the power of government will work in concert to promote this belief throughout the culture.
- Perhaps most importantly, shifting the focus of our marriage laws away from the interests of children and society as a whole, and onto the desires of the adults involved in a same-sex relationship will result in the most profound long-term consequences. Such a paradigm shift says to children that mothers and fathers don't matter (especially fathers) – any two “parents” will do.

Prepared and paid for by Minnesota for Marriage, 2355 Fairview Ave N, Box 301, Roseville, MN 55113, in support of the Minnesota Marriage Protection Amendment.



2355 Fairview Ave N
Box 301
Roseville, MN 55113

Minnesota for Marriage
2355 Fairview Ave N
Box 301
Roseville, MN 55113