



Selected friend-of-the-court briefs submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court in *Hollingsworth v. Perry*
(Briefs are accessible through the links below.)

Amici	Counsel of Record	Description of Argument
Judge George Ress; Judge Giuseppe Mifsud Bonnici; Judge Antonio Baldassarre; Judge Jan Klucka; Judge Milan Karabin; Judge Alexey Ivanov; Cole Durham; Jeremy Rabkin; Donald Kommers; David Forte; James Mackay, Baron Mackay of Clashfern; Roger Trigg; F.A.M.	Professor Cole Durham	International jurists and international-law scholars explaining that international precedent on marriage and domestic relations does not support redefining marriage
Professor Helen Alvare	Professor Helen Alvare	Government's purpose for marriage
Professor Robert P. George, Sherif Girgis, Ryan T. Anderson	Professor Robert P. George	Harms of redefining marriage
Coalition for the Protection of Marriage	Monte Stewart	Marriage is a foundational social institution; redefining marriage changes and harms the institution
Mark Regnerus, Joe Price, Alan Hawkins, Byron Johnson, Douglas Allen, Catherine Pakaluk, David Eggebeen	Abram Pafford	Parenting and family structure studies do not support redefining marriage
Dr. Paul McHugh	Professor Gerard Bradley	Sexual orientation is not immutable
Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays	Dean Broyles	Widespread recognition of and stories about people formerly identifying as homosexuals demonstrate that sexual orientation is not immutable
Institute for Marriage and Public Policy	Professor Nelson Lund	Limitations and politicization of social science
Becket Fund for Religious Liberty	Eric Rassbach	Negative effects on religious liberty from redefining marriage

Amici	Counsel of Record	Description of Argument
Catholic Answers, Christian Legal Society, Catholic Vote Education Fund	Charles LiMandri; Kim Colby	Negative effects on religious liberty from declaring sexual orientation a suspect or quasi-suspect class
North Carolina Values Coalition; Liberty, Life, and Law Foundation	Deborah J. Dewart	Negative effects on constitutional rights (including religious liberty) from redefining marriage
Matthew B. O'Brien	Kristen K. Waggoner	The principle of moral neutrality does not support redefining marriage
Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin	Solicitor General of Indiana Thomas M. Fisher	States supporting laws protecting marriage as the union of one man and one woman
Scholars Robert Nagel; John Baker; Stephen Presser; Stephen Smith; Robert Cochran; Michael I. Krauss; Lawrence Alexander; Patrick McKinley Brennan; Lloyd Cohen; Charles Rice; Timothy J. Tracey; Ralph A. Rossum; Walter Nicgorski; Matthew J. Franck; Wilfred	Professor Robert Nagel	The Supreme Court's respect for judicial restraint and federalism dictates that the definition of marriage should be left to the political process
Coalition of African American Pastors; Center for Urban Renewal and Education; Frederick Douglass Foundation; and law professors Stephen T. Black, Ligia M. De Jesus, Robert J. Delahunty, Scott FitzGibbon, Lynne Marie Kohm, Raymond B. Marcin, Stephen L. Mikochik, Richard S. Myers, Lynn D. Wardle	Professor Lynn D. Wardle	Laws preserving marriage as the union of one man and one woman are nothing like the laws banning interracial marriage that were struck down in <i>Loving v. Virginia</i>
Douglas Ambrose, Herman Belz, Robert D. Benne, Allan C. Carlson, G.M. Curtis, Michael O. Emerson, Timothy George, Harold James, Steven Justice, Robert C. Koons, Stanley Kurtz, Gerald R. McDermott, Russell Moore, Robert Paquette, Paul A. Rahe, Michael A.	William Duncan	Scholars of history and related disciplines explaining the history of marriage and its universal concern for responsible procreation
Concerned Women for America	Holly Carmichael	Groups seeking to redefine marriage have abundant political power
David Benkof, Robert Oscar Lopez, Doug Mainwaring	Herb Grey	Self-identified LGB authors support preserving marriage as the union of one man and one woman
Ethics and Public Policy Center	M. Edward Whelan III	Lower court mistakes and recusal considerations

Amici	Counsel of Record	Description of Argument
National Association of Evangelicals, The Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, The Romanian-American Evangelical Alliance of North America, Truth in Action Ministries	Von G. Keetch	Faith communities supporting marriage laws
American Civil Rights Union	Peter J. Ferrara	The Supreme Court's decision in <i>Lawrence v. Texas</i> does not invalidate laws preserving marriage as the union of one man and one woman
High Impact Leadership Coalition	Cleta Mitchell	California's domestic-partnership laws are nothing like the segregationist Jim Crow laws struck down in <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>
Marriage Anti-Defamation Alliance	Michael Dean	Harassment, intimidation, and violence against the supporters of Proposition 8
Family Research Council	Paul Benjamin Linton	Proposition 8 does not discriminate on the basis of sex or sexual orientation
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops	Anthony R. Picarello, Jr.	Marriage protection laws are supported by multiple rational bases
Liberty Counsel	Mathew D. Staver	The Supreme Court's decision in <i>Romer v. Evans</i> does not support invalidating Proposition 8
Judicial Watch, Allied Educational Foundation	Paul J. Orfanedes	Proposition 8 satisfies rational-basis review
Dr. Daniel N. Robinson	Kevin T. Snider	Response to the positions of the American Psychological Association and plaintiffs' experts
Minnesota for Marriage	Professor Teresa Stanton Collett	The experience with marriage laws in Minnesota shows the importance of allowing the public debate on marriage to continue
Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence	Professor John Eastman	Proposition 8 proponents have standing to defend Proposition 8
Pacific Legal Foundation	Harold Johnson	Proposition 8 proponents have standing to defend Proposition 8 (filed in support of neither party)

Amici	Counsel of Record	Description of Argument
Thomas More Law Center, Chuck Storey (Imperial County Clerk)	Richard Thompson	Laws affirming marriage between a man and a woman do not derive from animus