

No. 24-297

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

TAMER MAHMOUD, *ET AL.*,  
*Petitioners,*

v.

THOMAS W. TAYLOR, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS  
SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
BOARD OF EDUCATION, *ET AL.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari  
to the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fourth Circuit

---

**Brief *Amici Curiae* of America's Future, U.S.  
Constitutional Rights Legal Def. Fund,  
Fitzgerald Griffin Foundation, and  
Conservative Legal Def. and Education Fund  
in Support of Petitioners**

---

RICK BOYER  
Lynchburg, VA

J. MARK BREWER  
Johnson City, TX

JAMES N. CLYMER  
Lancaster, PA

WILLIAM J. OLSON\*  
JEREMIAH L. MORGAN  
WILLIAM J. OLSON, P.C.  
370 Maple Ave. W., Ste. 4  
Vienna, VA 22180  
(703) 356-5070  
wjo@mindspring.com  
Attorneys for *Amici Curiae*  
*\*Counsel of Record*  
October 16, 2024

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES . . . . .	iii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> . . . . .	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE . . . . .	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT. . . . .	3
ARGUMENT	
I. ELIMINATION OF THE PARENTAL POWER TO OPT-OUT VIOLATES FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION . . . . .	5
A. Forced Participation in Religious Education Violates Free Exercise. . . . .	5
B. A Circuit Split Exists on the Question of Whether Forced Participation in Religious Education Burdens Free Exercise . . . . .	6
II. THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE PROVIDES MUCH BROADER PROTECTIONS THAN THE FOURTH CIRCUIT BELIEVES . . . . .	7
A. The Free Exercise Clause Draws Its Genesis from Madison’s Virginia Declaration of Rights . . . . .	7
B. This Court Has Defined “Religion” by Madison’s Definition . . . . .	9

C. Compulsory Government Education Violates the Free Exercise of Religion . . .	12
III. THE MCPS' COMPULSORY LGBTQ INDOCTRINATION POLICY VIOLATES THIS COURT'S ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE . . . . .	13
A. LGBTQ+ Doctrine Is at Its Core Religious . . . . .	14
B. This Court Has Long Banned Proselytizing in Government Schools . . .	17
C. Public Schools Were Designed for the Propagation of the Religion of Misnamed "Secular" Humanism. . . . .	22
D. MCPS' LGBTQ+ Agenda Is Not Neutral Toward Religion . . . . .	25
CONCLUSION . . . . .	28

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>HOLY BIBLE</u>	
<i>Genesis</i> 2:24 . . . . .	15
<i>Genesis</i> 5:2 . . . . .	16
<i>Leviticus</i> 18:22 . . . . .	14
<i>Leviticus</i> 20:13 . . . . .	14
<i>Jude</i> 1:7 . . . . .	14
<i>Matthew</i> 19:4 . . . . .	16
<i>Mark</i> 10:6-9 . . . . .	15
<i>Romans</i> 1:26-28 . . . . .	14
<i>1 Corinthians</i> 6:9-10. . . . .	15
<i>1 Corinthians</i> 7:2 . . . . .	16
<i>1 Timothy</i> 1:8-11. . . . .	15
 <u>CONSTITUTION</u>	
Amendment I . . . . .	4, 7, 12, 13, 17, 27
 <u>CASES</u>	
<i>Abington School District v. Schempp</i> , 374 U.S. 203 (1963). . . . .	18, 27
<i>Edwards v. Aguillard</i> , 482 U.S. 578 (1987) . . . . .	19
<i>Engel v. Vitale</i> , 370 U.S. 421 (1962) . . . . .	17, 18
<i>Everson v. Bd. of Education</i> , 330 U.S. 1 (1947) . . . . .	20, 21, 25
<i>Florey v. Sioux Falls School District 49-5</i> , 619 F.2d 1311 (8th Cir. 1980) . . . . .	7
<i>Lee v. Weisman</i> , 505 U.S. 577 (1992). . . . .	19
<i>McCullum v. Board of Education</i> , 333 U.S. 203 (1948). . . . .	17
<i>Reynolds v. United States</i> , 98 U.S. 145 (1879) . . . . .	9-12
<i>Santa Fe Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Doe</i> , 530 U.S. 290 (2000). . . . .	19, 27
<i>Stone v. Graham</i> , 449 U.S. 39 (1980) . . . . .	18, 19, 26

<i>Torcaso v. Watkins</i> , 367 U.S. 488 (1961) . . . . .	24, 25
<i>Wallace v. Jaffree</i> , 472 U.S. 38 (1985) . . . . .	19, 26
<i>West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette</i> , 319 U.S. 624 (1943) . . . . .	17
<i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i> , 406 U.S. 205 (1972) . . . . .	2-7

#### MISCELLANEOUS

J. Cahn, <u>The Return of the Gods</u> (Frontline: 2022) . . . . .	16
J. Dunphy, “ <u>A Religion For A New Age</u> ,” <i>The Humanist</i> 43:1 (Jan.-Feb. 1983) . . . . .	24
H. Edmondson, <u>John Dewey and the Decline of American Education</u> (ISI: 2014) . . . . .	23
<u>The Founders’ Constitution</u> (P. Kurland & R. Lerner, eds., U. of Chi.: 1987) . . . . .	10, 11, 13, 26
C. Haynes, Ph.D., “James Madison: Champion of the ‘cause of conscience,’” <i>Washington Times</i> (Dec. 12, 2016) . . . . .	8
H. Mann, II, <u>Life and Works of Horace Mann</u> (Lee and Shepherd Publishers: 1891) . . . . .	22
D. Noebel, J. Baldwin and K. Bywater, <u>Clergy in the Classroom: The Religion of Secular Humanism</u> (Summit Press: 2007) . . . . .	23, 24
R. Perry and J. Cooper, eds., <u>Sources of Our Liberties</u> , Revised ed. (American Bar Foundation: 1978) . . . . .	8, 9
H. Titus, “The Free Exercise Clause: Past, Present and Future,” 6 REGENT U. L. REV. 7 (1995) . . . . .	12

## INTEREST OF THE *AMICI CURIAE*<sup>1</sup>

America’s Future, U.S. Constitutional Rights Legal Defense Fund, Fitzgerald Griffin Foundation, and Conservative Legal Defense and Education Fund are nonprofit organizations, exempt from federal income tax under either section 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code. These entities, *inter alia*, participate in the public policy process, including conducting research, and informing and educating the public on the proper construction of state and federal constitutions, as well as statutes related to the rights of citizens, and questions related to human and civil rights secured by law.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In October 2022, Montgomery County, Maryland public schools (“MCPS”) announced a new line of “over 22 LGBTQ+-inclusive texts.” *Mahmoud v. McKnight*, 688 F. Supp. 3d 265, 272 (D. Md. 2023) (“*Mahmoud I*”). These included books celebrating same-sex marriage and changing “gender identity,” and were for use in classes from pre-K through fifth grade. *Id.* at 273. In March 2023, MCPS announced that it would no longer advise parents when teaching such controversial sexual material and would not allow parents and

---

<sup>1</sup> It is hereby certified that counsel of record for all parties received timely notice of the intention to file this brief; that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part; and that no person other than these *amici curiae*, their members, or their counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission.

students to opt out as had been previously permitted. *Id.* at 271, 273-74.

Three sets of parents challenged the policy: Tamer Mahmoud and Enas Barakat, a Muslim couple; Jeff and Svitlana Roman, members of the Roman Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox faiths, respectively; and Catholic parents Chris and Melissa Persak. *Id.* at 274. The parents argued that under *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), strict scrutiny should apply to the MCPS decision to eliminate the opt-out provision. *Mahmoud I* at 288.

The district court ruled that *Yoder* was “inexorably linked to the Amish community’s unique religious beliefs and practices,” thus has no application to any others. *Id.* at 294. The court believed that the plaintiffs had not demonstrated that their children would be coerced to change their beliefs, so there was no substantial burden on their free exercise of religion. *Id.* at 301.

The district court also believed that *Yoder* does not explicitly declare a parent’s interest in the religious upbringing of their children to constitute a fundamental right, for purposes of substantive due process. *Id.* at 304. The court declared that the elimination of the opt-out provision need pass only rational basis review and that it did so. *Id.* at 306. Accordingly, the court denied the parents’ request for injunctive relief. *Id.* at 307.

The Fourth Circuit affirmed over a strong dissent. The Court of Appeals ruled that “to show a cognizable

burden, the parents must show that the absence of an opt-out opportunity coerces them or their children to *believe* or *act* contrary to their religious views.” *Mahmoud v. McKnight*, 102 F.4th 191, 208 (4th Cir. 2024) (“*Mahmoud II*”). The Fourth Circuit agreed with the district court that there was no coercion (*id.* at 209), and it endorsed the district court’s limiting construction of *Yoder* (*id.* at 211). The court also held that the parents could not show likelihood of success on either their free exercise challenge or substantive due process claim. *Id.* at 216-217.

In dissent, Judge Quattlebaum concluded that the MCPS decision “burdened these parents’ right to exercise their religion and direct the religious upbringing of their children by putting them to the choice of either compromising their religious beliefs or foregoing a public education for their children.” *Id.* at 218.

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

There was a time not so very long ago when the proponents of the homosexual rights movement represented that all that they wanted was to be left alone to do what they wanted to do in the privacy of their own bedrooms. In adopting a curriculum to proselytize young grade school children with the school’s LGBTQ+ views, MCPS has moved well beyond that initial demand. Moreover, by eliminating the ability of parents and students to “opt out” of LGBTQ+ indoctrination, MCPS is acting in a truly coercive and abusive manner to indoctrinate students with its secular humanist, religious agenda.



One would have thought that the 1972 *Wisconsin v. Yoder* decision a half-century ago had established the rule that compulsory education could not be used to override the religious liberties of parents and students — but MCPS and the courts below make the untenable argument that only the Amish may enjoy that decision’s protection. Review should be granted simply to reaffirm that venerable precedent.

However, there is another aspect of Free Exercise that needs protection. The Free Exercise Clause creates a jurisdictional divide between the authority of the state and areas of individual autonomy where no government may intrude — in matters of “conscience.” As Madison put it in his Memorial and Remonstrance: “Religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence.” In areas of religion, we are guaranteed Free Exercise of our own conscience. Applied here, parents’ views of the LGBTQ+ agenda are matters of faith and “conscience,” where our duty is owed only to God, making it an “unalienable right” not within the reach of government.

The MCPS removal of the “opt-out” provision also violates this Court’s Establishment Clause jurisprudence. Under a long and unbroken line of this Court’s decisions, government schools may not teach the Bible, or have organized prayer, or even post the Ten Commandments. If public schools may not teach traditional morality, surely the MCPS cannot teach the opposite — especially when MCPS rules prevent

parents and students from opting out to avoid being subjected to a LGBTQ+ catechism.

## ARGUMENT

### I. ELIMINATION OF THE PARENTAL POWER TO OPT-OUT VIOLATES FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION.

#### A. Forced Participation in Religious Education Violates Free Exercise.

MCPS' elimination of the opt-out policy violates the free exercise rights of both students and parents. As Petitioners assert, MCPS' decision forces observant Muslim and Christian students to submit to lectures from public school teachers — in a compulsory education setting — improperly allowing schools to “direct ‘the religious upbringing’ of their children.” Petition for Certiorari (“Pet.”) at 24 (quoting *Espinoza v. Montana Dep’t of Revenue*, 591 U.S. 464, 486 (2020)).

Petitioners note,<sup>2</sup> the Fourth Circuit reads *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), to forbid only government acts compelling affirmative actions which violate Petitioners' religious practices, based on *Yoder's* assertion that the challenged Wisconsin statute “affirmatively compel[led] [the Amish] ... to *perform* acts undeniably at odds with fundamental tenets of their religious beliefs.” *Mahmoud II* at 211 (quoting *Yoder* at 218). However, *Yoder* was not

---

<sup>2</sup> See Pet. at 24-26.

narrowly focused on practices, but also beliefs. *Yoder* taught that:

**exposing Amish children** to worldly influences ... **contrary to beliefs** ... at the crucial adolescent stage of development, **contravenes the basic religious tenets and practice of the Amish faith**, both as to the parent and the child. [*Yoder* at 218 (emphasis added).]

*Yoder* may have resolved a challenge brought by the Amish, but it was not and cannot be confined only to the Amish. *Yoder's* central teaching for this case is that a government may not use compulsory education to subject children to undermine their fundamental religious beliefs.

**B. A Circuit Split Exists on the Question of Whether Forced Participation in Religious Education Burdens Free Exercise.**

Despite the seemingly clear teaching of *Yoder*, the circuits are split, and as Petitioners point out, a majority of the circuits that have addressed the question have ruled that compelled proselytization of students with secular religious beliefs that counter those of the family does not constitute a Free Exercise violation. According to these circuits, no Free Exercise violation can occur unless the students are forced to take some action in opposition to their religious beliefs. *See* Pet. at 20-22. A conflict was created when the Eighth Circuit ruled that “forcing any person to

participate in an activity that offends his religious ... beliefs will generally contravene the Free Exercise Clause[.]” *Florey v. Sioux Falls School District 49-5*, 619 F.2d 1311, 1318-19 (8th Cir. 1980) (citing *Yoder*). In *Florey*, the Eighth Circuit upheld the school district’s observance of religious holidays only because it provided parents and students the right to opt out.

This Court should grant certiorari to revitalize its decision in *Yoder* and to correct the error of the court below and other circuits that impermissibly narrows the protections of the Free Exercise of Religion to the Amish only. However, there is another aspect of free exercise also at stake here which supports review, discussed next.

## **II. THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE PROVIDES MUCH BROADER PROTECTIONS THAN THE FOURTH CIRCUIT BELIEVES.**

### **A. The Free Exercise Clause Draws Its Genesis from Madison’s Virginia Declaration of Rights.**

The First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law ... prohibiting the free exercise [of religion].” The Fourth Circuit reads this language to mean that “laws incidentally burdening religion are ordinarily not subject to strict scrutiny under the Free Exercise Clause so long as they are neutral and generally applicable.” *Mahmoud II* at 206 (quoting *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 593 U.S. 522, 533 (2021)). To the Fourth Circuit, the Clause “requires merely that the law at issue be rationally related to a

legitimate governmental interest.” *Id.* at 206. But the historical reality is that the Free Exercise Clause embodies James Madison’s revolutionary ideal that government has **no jurisdiction** or authority whatsoever to indoctrinate Americans with respect to **matters of conscience**, as they are **duties owed only to God**, such as their view of LGBTQ+ issues.

Unlike some early state constitutions which provided only for government “tolerance” of religion,<sup>3</sup> Virginia charted a different path that led directly to the First Amendment. Dr. Charles C. Haynes, founding director of the Religious Freedom Center of the Newseum Institute, describes how Virginia embarked on the “world’s boldest ... experiment in religious freedom,” based on Madison’s and Jefferson’s ideal of “**liberty of conscience**, for all.”<sup>4</sup>

[I]n 1776 ... at the convention called to declare Virginia’s independence ... Madison successfully called for an amendment to the venerable George Mason’s draft of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, **changing “toleration in the exercise of religion” to “free exercise of religion.”**

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Massachusetts Constitution, section XXVIII, R. Perry and J. Cooper, eds., Sources of Our Liberties, Revised ed. (American Bar Foundation: 1978) (hereinafter Sources of Our Liberties).

<sup>4</sup> C. Haynes, Ph.D., “James Madison: Champion of the ‘cause of conscience,” *Washington Times* (Dec. 12, 2016) (emphasis added).

With that small change in language, Virginia moved from toleration to full religious freedom — a precedent that would greatly influence the new nation’s commitment to **free exercise** of religion under the First Amendment. **No longer would government have the power to decide** which groups to “tolerate” and what **conditions to place on the practice of their religion.** [*Id.* (emphasis added).]

**B. This Court Has Defined “Religion” by Madison’s Definition.**

In *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 (1879), this Court also viewed the Virginia Declaration of Rights as the ideological precursor to the Free Exercise Clause. *Id.* at 162-63. Noting that “‘religion’ is not defined in the Constitution,” this Court looked to the definition in the Declaration of Rights. *See id.* at 162-63. Section 16 of the Declaration of Rights declared that **religion** is:

**the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence.** [Constitution of Virginia, Section 16, reprinted in Sources of Our Liberties at 312 (emphasis added).]

The *Reynolds* Court recognized that “religion” was exactly as Madison defined it, a subject area that “was not within the cognizance of civil government.” *Reynolds* at 163. The Court explained that this

**jurisdictional principle** was detailed in James Madison's Memorial and Remonstrance, submitted to the Virginia Assembly in 1785, some nine years after the Declaration of Rights, in support of Thomas Jefferson's Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom. Quoting from the Declaration, Madison wrote these words:

[W]e hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, "that **Religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it**, can be directed only by **reason and conviction**, not by **force or violence**." [citing the Virginia Declaration of Rights]. The Religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and **conscience** of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate.... We maintain therefore that in matters of Religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of **Civil Society** and that **Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance**.<sup>5</sup>

Four months later, the General Assembly passed Jefferson's "Act for Establishing Religious Freedom." In the preamble, as the *Reynolds* Court noted, this same **jurisdictional principle** was reaffirmed. *See Reynolds* at 163. The preamble read:

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Madison, "Memorial and Remonstrance" to the Honorable General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia (June 20, 1785), reprinted in 5 The Founders' Constitution at 82 (item # 43) (P. Kurland & R. Lerner, eds., U. of Chi.: 1987) (emphasis added) (hereinafter The Founders' Constitution).

Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; that **all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens, or by civil incapacitations** ... are a departure from the plan of the Holy author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do....<sup>6</sup>

Accordingly, the *Reynolds* Court incorporated Madison's definition of "religion" as the best expression of the intent of the Framers of the Free Exercise Clause.

The LGBTQ+ Agenda being forced on students is a set of teachings on moral topics falling squarely in the area of conscience. It is being forced not only on parents and children who follow Christianity and Islam, but also on those who follow no organized religion and could be agnostics or atheists. The Free Exercise of Religion **does not protect religious people**; rather it protects a sphere of our lives — termed "**religion**" — from any governmental intrusion. That area of "religion" describes all matters that are matters of conscience — such as our view of moral issues — which are areas where no government may proselytize or coerce.

---

<sup>6</sup> Act for Establishing Religious Freedom (Oct. 31, 1785), reprinted in 5 The Founders' Constitution at 84 (item #44) (emphasis added).



### **C. Compulsory Government Education Violates the Free Exercise of Religion.**

As Jefferson and Madison saw it, and as the *Reynolds* Court later saw it, the Free Exercise Clause cannot be understood in terms of judicial “levels of scrutiny” that have given judges the power to manipulate the text of the Constitution since they were introduced in the mid-1900s. Under the Free Exercise Clause, government has no jurisdiction whatsoever over the area of “religion.” No jurisdiction means no jurisdiction. Under balancing, government can intrude on the rights of Americans if judges believe it meets the terms of some judge-made, atextual test. A few restrictions on free exercise cannot be glossed over in service to some other interests, such as tolerance, or the recently popular Diversity, Equity or Inclusion. There is “no compelling government interest” which can authorize government to intrude on matters of religion. Where there is no jurisdiction, there is nothing to balance. The domain of religion is “wholly exempt from [the] cognizance” of the civil magistrate.

In truth, compulsory education in government schools by itself offends the Free Exercise Clause, as all education has a spiritual underpinning. This principle once was understood broadly, as “both Jefferson and Madison denied to the state any authority to educate or tax the people to support an educational program.”<sup>7</sup> In his Act for Establishing

---

<sup>7</sup> H. Titus, “The Free Exercise Clause: Past, Present and Future,” 6 REGENT U. L. REV. 7, 60 (1995).

Religious Freedom, Jefferson wrote that “to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion ... is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because he being of course the judge ... will make his opinions the rule of judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with his own.”<sup>8</sup>

The Act asserted that, “to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.”<sup>9</sup> That principle shared by Madison and Jefferson, applied here, has been disrespected in the extreme by MCPS and the courts below — which have no problem with compelling the Petitioner parents not just to pay for government propagation of religious beliefs which are an anathema to them, but to then compound the offense by seeking to co-opt Petitioners’ children and indoctrinate them with those beliefs.

### **III. THE MCPS’ COMPULSORY LGBTQ INDOCTRINATION POLICY VIOLATES THIS COURT’S ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE.**

Although below focus was placed on the Free Exercise Clause, it deserves mention that the MCPS policy also violates 80 years of this Court’s Establishment Clause jurisprudence. LGBTQ+ indoctrination is every bit as much a matter of

---

<sup>8</sup> Act for Establishing Religious Freedom at 85.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 84.

conscience and religion as are the Christian disciplines long banned by this Court. In other words, if this Court's Establishment Clause jurisprudence prevents teaching **against** LGBTQ+ doctrine, then it most certainly also prevents the teaching **in favor of** LGBTQ+ doctrine.

#### **A. LGBTQ+ Doctrine Is at Its Core Religious.**

Holy Writ addresses and condemns lesbian, gay, and bisexual practices in the ancient world numerous times in both Old and New Testaments:

- *Leviticus* 18:22: "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination."
- *Leviticus* 20:13: "If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood is upon them."
- *Jude* 1:7: "Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural desire, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire."
- *Romans* 1:26-28: "For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error. And since they did not

see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a debased mind to do what ought not to be done.”

- *Genesis* 2:24: “Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.”
- *Mark* 10:6-9: “But from the beginning of creation, ‘God made them male and female.’ ‘Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.’ So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man separate.”
- *1 Corinthians* 6:9-10: “Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor men who practice homosexuality, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.”
- *1 Timothy* 1:8-11 ESV: “Now we know that the law is good, if one uses it lawfully, understanding this, that the law is not laid down for the just but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for those who strike their fathers and mothers, for murderers, the sexually immoral, men who practice homosexuality, enslavers, liars, perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound doctrine, in accordance with the gospel of the glory of the blessed God with which I have been entrusted.”

- *1 Corinthians* 7:2: “But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband.”

Transgenderism also has ancient spiritual roots. Without even knowing it, many of its proponents have embraced what was a foundational principle of early pagan religions. One of the “gods” of the pagan world was Ishtar, the “goddess of war and sexual love.” See “Ishtar,” *Britannica*. “An ancient Mesopotamian tablet records ... [Ishtar saying] ‘When I sit in the alehouse, I am a woman, and I am an exuberant young man.’” J. Cahn, *The Return of the Gods* (Frontline: 2022) at 118. The goddess Ishtar had summertime festivals and parades. “The parades of the goddess featured men dressed as women, women dressed as men, each dressed as both, male priests parading as women, and cultic women acting as men. They were public pageants and spectacles of the transgendered, the cross-dressed, the homosexual, the intersexual, the cross-gendered.” *Id.* at 181. Transgenderism likewise is at odds with Scripture:

- *Genesis* 5:2: “Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them Man when they were created.”
- *Matthew* 19:4: “And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female.”

## **B. This Court Has Long Banned Proselytizing in Government Schools.**

Under this Court's jurisprudence, when compulsory public schools affirm some religious beliefs while disparaging others, an Establishment Clause violation occurs. This Court has been clear in its view that coercion to change religious practices is not necessary to trigger an Establishment Clause violation. Merely putting the imprimatur of the state in favor of one religious belief over another, is sufficient. Consider this line of cases:

- In *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943), this Court banned government schools compelling children to salute the flag and pledge allegiance regardless of the particular religious views of the child or the sincerity with which they are held.
- In *McCullum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (1948), the Court stated that compulsory, tax-supported public schools could not enable sectarian groups to give religious instruction to public school students in public school buildings.
- In *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962), the Court ruled that students in government school could not be required to recite an official state prayer, **even if students may**

**remain silent or be excused**, and the prayer was denominationally neutral.<sup>10</sup>

- In *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), the Court ruled that school boards may not require passages from the Bible be read or the Lord's Prayer be recited, **even if students may be excused from attending or participating**.<sup>11</sup>
- In *Stone v. Graham*, 449 U.S. 39 (1980), the Court prohibited posting a copy of the Ten Commandments purchased with private contributions on the wall of school classrooms.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> “Neither the fact that the prayer may be denominationally neutral nor the fact that **its observance on the part of the students is voluntary** can serve to free it from the limitations of the Establishment Clause,” this Court ruled. *Engel* at 430 (emphasis added). “[I]t is no ... business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite.” *Id.* at 425.

<sup>11</sup> “Any child shall be excused from such Bible reading ... upon the written request of his parent or guardian.” *Abington* at 205. “The fact that some pupils ... might be excused ... does not mitigate the obligatory nature of the ceremony for [the state law] unequivocally requires the exercises to be held every school day.” *Id.* at 210-211.

<sup>12</sup> “If the posted copies of the Ten Commandments are to have any effect at all, it will be to induce the schoolchildren to read, meditate upon, perhaps to venerate and obey, the Commandments.... [T]his ... is not a permissible state objective under the Establishment Clause.” *Stone v. Graham* at 42. “It does not matter that ... the Ten Commandments are financed by voluntary private contributions, for the mere posting of the copies ... provides the ‘official support of the State ... Government’ that

- In *Wallace v. Jaffree*, 472 U.S. 38 (1985), the Court struck down a state law authorizing a one-minute period of silence in public schools for meditation and voluntary prayer.
- In *Edwards v. Aguillard*, 482 U.S. 578, 589 (1987), this Court struck down a Louisiana law requiring public schools that taught the theory of evolution to also teach the theory of creation.<sup>13</sup>
- In *Lee v. Weisman*, 505 U.S. 577 (1992), including clergy to offer prayers at a public school graduation ceremony was found to violate the Establishment Clause.
- In *Santa Fe Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Doe*, 530 U.S. 290 (2000), this Court struck down a policy permitting student-initiated, student-led prayer at graduations and football games, although the prayers were required to be “nonsectarian” and “non-proselytizing.”

Both the district court and the Fourth Circuit’s Free Exercise analyses turned on the (claimed) absence of “coercion” in the elimination of the opt-out policy. As the district court put it, “The *sine qua non* of a free exercise claim is coercion, and the plaintiffs have not shown the no-opt-out policy likely will ...

---

the Establishment Clause prohibits...” *Id.* at 42.

<sup>13</sup> The Court ruled that “the Act ... has the ... purpose of discrediting evolution by counterbalancing its teaching ... with the teaching of creationism.” *Id.* at 589. The Court declared that the purpose of the Establishment Clause is to ensure that “Government not intentionally endorse religion or a religious practice.” *Id.* at 587.



otherwise coerce their children to violate or change their religious beliefs....” *Mahmoud I* at 298. But in the Establishment Clause context, this Court has been crystal clear that no coercion need be shown whatsoever. Even when children could be excused, proselytization of all sorts was banned by this line of cases. Students who sought protection from prayer, Bible reading, the Ten Commandments, and even a moment of silence, or even hearing a prayer were protected.

How could the Fourth Circuit remain faithful to this Court’s many rulings on the subject, while allowing MCPS to use its compulsory attendance laws to hold students hostage to be indoctrinated in LGBTQ+ doctrine against their and their parents wishes and beliefs?

Indeed, in *Everson v. Bd. of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), this Court made clear that the First Amendment “**requires the state to be a neutral** in its relations with groups of religious believers and non-believers.” *Id.* at 18 (emphasis added). This Court nonetheless famously declared that:

The “establishment of religion” clause of the First Amendment means at least this.... Government can[not] ... pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or **prefer one religion over another**.... No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities ... whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion.... [*Id.* at 15-16 (emphasis added).]

In dissent, Justice Jackson provided important background relevant to MCPS that “[o]ur [modern] **public school** ... is a relatively recent development dating from about 1840. It is **organized on the premise that secular education can be isolated from all religious teaching so that the school can ... maintain a strict and lofty neutrality as to religion.**” *Everson* at 23-24 (Jackson, J., dissenting) (emphasis added). It can be argued that the *Everson* Court and Justice Jackson’s dissent erred in believing that “secular education [could be] isolated from all religious teaching,” or be “neutral.”

Most seem willing to believe that at least some subjects, such as arithmetic, can be taught in a secular manner, and not offend the secular/religious divide. Some may contend that teaching about diversity, equity, and inclusion (“DEI”) is purely secular, but by the Madison/Jefferson definition, it is not. Meanwhile, few would argue that teaching children about sexual practices deemed sinful in several religious traditions is purely secular. Since the teaching of a LGBTQ+ curriculum constitutes religious teaching, it must be barred by this Court’s Establishment Clause Jurisprudence. The matter at issue in this case — the MCPS’ elimination of the opt-out — is just the most egregious aspect of MCPS teaching a LGBTQ+ curriculum.

### C. Public Schools Were Designed for the Propagation of the Religion of Misnamed “Secular” Humanism.

It should come as no surprise that MCPS is pushing on students a distinctively irreligious LGBTQ+ agenda. Indeed, those most prominent in developing the public school model did so to shift the nation away from Christianity, beginning around 1840 with Massachusetts educator Horace Mann, who has been described as “the first great American advocate of public education.” To Mann, the salvation of the human race was achieved not through doctrinal religious means, but academic ones. “Our public schools are the Ark of the American Covenant,” Mann stated. “Education is our only political safety. Outside of this ark, all is deluge.”<sup>14</sup>

In an 1840 lecture, Mann — wittingly or not — explained the inherently societally coercive nature of his compulsory education model. “We, then, who are engaged in the sacred cause of education, are **entitled to look upon all parents as having given hostages to our cause,**” he said (emphasis added).<sup>15</sup> The Fourth Circuit, apparently, shares Mann’s view.

Mann’s still-moralistic secularism was quickly succeeded by the militantly secular humanism of John Dewey, perhaps the seminal figure in American public

---

<sup>14</sup> 59 Ohio Education Monthly 650 (O.T. Corson: 1910).

<sup>15</sup> H. Mann, II, Life and Works of Horace Mann, 210, M. Mann, ed. (Lee and Shepherd Publishers: 1891).

education to this day. According to Dewey biographer Henry Edmondson, “Dewey’s unrelenting attack on religion and traditional education is a conspicuous feature of his educational philosophy.” H. Edmondson, John Dewey and the Decline of American Education at 19 (ISI: 2014).

[W]ith reference to the notorious statement generally attributed to Marx, Dewey asserts that “religion is the opium of the people.” Dewey makes little attempt to veil his **hostility to Christianity** in particular.... [*Id.* at 19 (emphasis added).]

Edmondson notes that “Dewey not only rejects conventional religion, he seeks to create a kind of **alternative faith** ... nothing more than a kind of shared democratic faith guided by science.” *Id.* at 21 (emphasis added). Dewey conceived of the educator in surprisingly religious terms as something of a missionary, using the classroom as a pulpit, to replace the Christian religion with materialistic humanism. As Edmondson writes, “[g]iven these views, it is no surprise that Dewey signed the famous ‘Humanist Manifesto’ in 1933, a secularist call to arms that emphatically rejects religious faith.” *Id.* at 20.

Dewey’s good friend Charles Francis Potter, author of Humanism: A New Religion and co-signer with Dewey of the Humanist Manifesto, was still clearer in stating his intent that the public schools should actively proselytize his “new religion.” Potter wrote, “[e]ducation is thus a most powerful ally of Humanism, and **every American public school is a school of**

**Humanism.** What can the theistic Sunday school, meeting for an hour once a week, and teaching only a fraction of the children, do to stem the tide of a five-day program of humanistic teachings?"<sup>16</sup>

Modern humanists echo this theme. In a 1983 article in *The Humanist* magazine, John J. Dunphy wrote:

[T]he battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the **public school** classroom by **teachers** who correctly perceive their role as the **proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity**.... These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, ... utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanists values in whatever subject they teach.... **The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict** between ... the rotting corpse of Christianity ... and the new faith of humanism....<sup>17</sup>

The development of secular humanism as a distinctly anti-Christian religion has not escaped the attention of this Court, as 63 years ago it recognized: "Among **religions** in this country which do not teach

---

<sup>16</sup> D. Noebel, J. Baldwin, and K. Bywater, Clergy in the Classroom: The Religion of Secular Humanism at 40 (Summit Press: 2007) (emphasis added).

<sup>17</sup> J. Dunphy, "A Religion For A New Age," *The Humanist* 43:1 (Jan.-Feb. 1983) (emphasis added).

what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, **Secular Humanism** and others.” *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488, 495 n.11 (1961) (emphasis added).

This Court’s hope in *Everson* that a comprehensive education could somehow be divorced from religion has never been justified in America’s history. Throughout that history, the only real question has been, which religion will be taught in schools?

#### **D. MCPS’ LGBTQ+ Agenda Is Not Neutral Toward Religion.**

MCPS specifically instructs teachers how to proselytize, to counter the beliefs of students who may have religious objections to the storybooks. They are instructed:

If a student says being “gay, lesbian, queer, etc.” is “wrong and not allowed” by his or her religion, teachers might respond, “I understand that is what you believe, but not everyone believes that. We don’t have to understand or support a person’s identity to treat them with respect and kindness.” [*Mahmoud I* at 279.]

MCPS is telling students that the state disapproves of their religious belief and that their belief lacks “respect and kindness.” And MCPS goes far beyond merely posting privately funded religious material on the wall. It actively uses the storybooks as

part of its pedagogy, actively teaching children to “venerate and obey” the idea “that there is no single way to be a boy, girl, or any other gender” — a purely religious postulate, and one directly at odds with the religions of Petitioners. *Id.* at 278. And unlike the Ten Commandments in *Stone*, the storybooks are funded by tax dollars taken directly from the pockets of Petitioners, “for the propagation of opinions which [they] disbelieve[] and abhor[].”<sup>18</sup>

Contrast MCPS’ approach with this Court’s earlier statement in 1985 when it struck down an Alabama statute authorizing public school teachers to hold a moment of silence for “meditation or voluntary prayer.” This Court ruled that “whenever the State itself speaks on a religious subject, one of the questions that we must ask is **whether the government intends to convey a message of endorsement or disapproval of religion.**” *Wallace* at 60-61 (emphasis added). Here, teachers are affirmatively instructed to “convey a message of disapproval,” that Petitioners’ beliefs lack “respect and kindness.” They are to actively serve as Dunphy’s “ardent fundamentalists,” as MCPS instructs “teachers [to] ... try to ‘disrupt the either/or thinking’ and provide examples like ‘Harry Styles wears dresses’ or ‘my best friend is a woman ... married to another woman.’” *Mahmoud I* at 279. MCPS’ promotion of one religious belief over another is blatant.

---

<sup>18</sup> Act for Establishing Religious Freedom at 85.

Here, not only do Petitioners' religious beliefs not get equal time, but teachers are instructed to actively disparage Petitioners' religious beliefs to their own children — in front of their peers. Moreover, unlike the student-initiated prayers in *Santa Fe*, here we have the teachers, the ultimate expression of government authority and sanction, conveying to young “members of the audience who are nonadherents” that “they are outsiders, not full members of the political community.” *Id.* at 309. MCPS defies *Santa Fe*'s command that the Establishment Clause exists to “remove debate over this kind of issue from governmental supervision or control.” *Id.* at 310. Rather, MCPS teachers' job is to end the debate, in favor of one religious perspective and against another.

In the light of these precedents, the MCPS compulsory reading policy, with no opt-out, is a painfully clear Establishment Clause violation. Although the policies this Court has struck down may have promoted Christian beliefs, the MCPS policy is the reverse, promoting beliefs at sharp odds with Christianity (as well as Islam, in the case of some Petitioners).

*Abington* promised that “[t]he government is neutral, and, while protecting all, it prefers none, and it disparages none.” *Abington* at 215. MCPS's policy utterly destroys *Abington*'s promise and effects an unconstitutional establishment of religion under this Court's Establishment Clause jurisprudence.



**CONCLUSION**

The Petition for Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK BOYER  
INTEGRITY LAW FIRM  
P.O. Box 10953  
Lynchburg, VA 24506

J. MARK BREWER  
209 N. Nugent Ave.  
Johnson City, TX 78636

JAMES N. CLYMER  
CLYMER MUSSER &  
SARNO, P.C.  
408 W. Chestnut St.  
Lancaster, PA 17603

WILLIAM J. OLSON\*  
JEREMIAH L. MORGAN  
WILLIAM J. OLSON, P.C.  
370 Maple Ave. W., Ste. 4  
(703) 356-5070

wjo@mindspring.com  
*\*Counsel of Record*

*Attorneys for Amici Curiae*  
October 16, 2024