



The Nomination of Judge Amy Coney Barrett: A Critical Threat to True Religious Freedom

The death of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg and the reaction of the president and his allies in the Senate has led us to a perilous point in our nation's history. The hard-fought rights secured in recent decades are under threat. Our thorough review of Judge Amy Coney Barrett's judicial record, scholarship, and public statements reveals an approach to religious freedom that threatens our basic ability to believe as we choose, without fear of discrimination or harm. We therefore take the unprecedented step of opposing her nomination to the Supreme Court.

This is not a decision we reach lightly, but it is one we make with resolve and determination. If there is anything you know about Interfaith Alliance, it is that we take faith seriously. Our nation was founded and is sustained by the uncompromising respect for the diversity of beliefs among its citizens. The gifts we each bring to the public square arrive with equal authority: they are protected and validated by the highest law of the land, the U.S. Constitution.

Essential to our democratic framework is Article VI, making clear that religious affiliation is no barrier to public office.¹ Politicians, appointees, and judges are free to worship as they choose, provided they refrain from using their office to enforce their personal religious beliefs on others.² We do not oppose Judge Barrett because of her faith. Our opposition derives from a record that illustrates a willingness to impose her beliefs on the rest of us. Our grave concern is grounded in the Constitution and our conviction that true religious freedom is under attack by those seeking to redefine it as a protection limited to one sectarian point of view.

People of differing conviction may disagree strongly. Our country has fought legislative fights and, at great cost, military battles over those disagreements in the past. But at no time in more than 150 years has the divide between advocates for religious freedom been more pronounced than at a time such as this. And at no time since the Civil War has one group of

Our thorough review of Judge Coney Barrett's record reveals an interpretation of religious freedom that threatens our basic right to believe as we choose. Interfaith Alliance therefore takes the unprecedented step of opposing her nomination to the Supreme Court.

¹ Stating, unequivocally, "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." U.S. Const., Art. 6, Clause 3.

² The First Amendment states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." U.S. Const., Amend. 1. The Supreme Court outlined a test for determining when a government action supersedes these boundaries, which Judge Coney Barrett has specifically singled out for skepticism. *Lemon v. Kurtzmann*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971).



advocates sought to impose their restrictive view of America on others using the tools of government.

On September 26, 2020, President Trump nominated Judge Amy Coney Barrett to fill Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's seat on the Supreme Court. Following Justice Ginsburg's death the week prior, we urged the president and Senate Leader Mitch McConnell to honor the precedent they set in 2016 and allow the winner of November's election to nominate her successor. We also released five essential questions related to religious freedom that any nominee to the Supreme Court must answer.³

These calls for consistency and cooperation went unheeded. In the days following her nomination, Interfaith Alliance examined Judge Coney Barrett's public statements, scholarship, and record as a federal judge using those five questions as guidelines. What we found raises deep concerns about her commitment to protecting true religious freedom for all Americans.

Interfaith Alliance has never, in our organizational history, opposed a judicial nominee on their merits.⁴ But over the course of her career, Judge Coney Barrett has consistently sided with those seeking to impose their religious beliefs on others and shown a skepticism toward the most fundamental of legal precepts - *stare decisis*, the respect for settled law. Her judicial philosophy, evidenced by her past work, endangers the decades of progress our nation has made toward robust protection of civil rights and the indispensable separation of religion and government.

The respect we have for our supporters and our commitment to challenging extremism requires us to take this action, based on clear standards guided by our values. We urge the Senate to reject this nominee.

The First Amendment Protects Our Freedom of - and Freedom From - Religion

Religious freedom has a specific meaning, rooted in our rich but imperfect history. Over many decades, our first freedom has been understood to protect personal belief and free exercise, ensuring that each person can choose to adhere to a particular religious tradition or to none at all. President Franklin Roosevelt spoke to this issue with great clarity, saying, "The traditional Jeffersonian principle of religious freedom was so broadly democratic that

³ Interfaith Alliance, *5 Questions for the Next SCOTUS Nominee*, Medium (Sep. 23, 2020), <https://medium.com/@intrfthalliance/5-questions-for-the-next-scotus-nominee-c466e49553d5>.

⁴ In 2018, Interfaith Alliance called on Justice Brett Kavanaugh to withdraw his nomination to the Supreme Court after facing allegations of past sexual misconduct. That call was not based on his judicial philosophy or opinions, but the nature of the claims made against him and his conduct under scrutiny, concluding that "we cannot support the confirmation of a Supreme Court Justice who has demonstrated a pattern of playing fast and loose with the truth for his own benefit." Interfaith Alliance, *Interfaith Alliance Calls on Judge Brett Kavanaugh to Withdraw as a Nominee to the United States Supreme Court*, <https://interfaithalliance.org/interfaith-alliance-calls-on-judge-brett-kavanaugh-to-withdraw-as-a-nominee-to-the-united-states-supreme-court/> (last accessed Oct. 6, 2020).



it included the right to have no religion at all – it gave the individual the right to worship any God [they] chose or no god.”⁵

The element of choice is critical, placing a natural and necessary limit on the role of personal faith in relationships with others. To believe as we choose, we also must have the secure knowledge that we are free from religious coercion. Or, as Justice Ginsburg put it, “with respect to free exercise claims no less than free speech claims, ‘your right to swing your arms ends just where the other man’s nose begins.’”⁶ Under this principle, no other person or government entity can condition *your* participation in public life on adherence to *their* faith.

Judges, as multi-faceted human beings, bring their own experiences and philosophies to the bench. Just as the Constitution protects the separation of religion and government, judges navigate the challenge of preserving the boundary between their personal beliefs and the unbiased administration of the law. As a federal judge, Judge Coney Barrett is protected from any religious test for public office.⁷ Her faith has no bearing on her suitability for the Supreme Court.⁸ However, sincere questions about the role her beliefs play in fulfilling her judicial duties are appropriate – and necessary.

These inquiries are particularly salient as powerful interest groups, emerging out of the Christian Religious Right, are engaged in a concerted legal and legislative campaign to irrevocably alter the meaning of religious freedom. Through the courts, Congress, and executive agencies, proponents make the case that no boundary should exist for those seeking to impose their beliefs on others. Americans of all faiths and philosophies are counting on the Supreme Court to reject these efforts and ensure that religious freedom remains a shield for personal belief, not a sword to inflict harm.

The Role of *Stare Decisis* - Settled Law - in Pursuit of True Religious Freedom

If confirmed, Judge Coney Barrett would return to the site of her formative years as a member of the legal profession. She often speaks of the central role that her clerkship for Justice Antonin Scalia played in the development of her own judicial philosophy. In remarks

⁵ Rev. Dr. C. Welton Gaddy and Rev. Barry W. Lynn, *First Freedom First: A Citizen’s Guide to Protecting Religious Liberty and the Separation of Church and State* 176 (2008).

⁶ J. Ginsburg, *dissenting*, *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682 (2014).

⁷ Article VI of the Constitution states, unequivocally, “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.” U.S. Const., Art. 6, Clause 3.

⁸ Judge Coney Barrett’s affiliation with the charismatic Christian community People of Praise has garnered significant attention. Membership in a faith-based group alone is not relevant to a nominee’s fitness for office. Questions, however, about Judge Coney Barrett’s duty to uphold the Constitution and federal law – above and separate from her personal religious beliefs or commitments – are salient. See, e.g., Baily Aldridge, *What is People of Praise? Trump SCOTUS Nominee Barrett has Ties to Religious Group*, *Miami Herald* (Oct. 1, 2020, 3:56 PM, updated 4:05 PM), <https://www.miamiherald.com/news/nation-world/national/article246145475.html>.



following her nomination by President Trump, she drew clear comparisons between her approach and that of her mentor, saying "his judicial philosophy is mine too."

Known for his championship of originalist jurisprudence, Justice Scalia displayed a willingness to overturn Supreme Court decisions on issues not contemplated by our founders or that ran counter to contemporary public opinion. This kind of legal flip-flopping by the high court can cause confusion and turmoil, especially for historically marginalized communities that depend on the Supreme Court to protect and advance their rights. But Judge Coney Barrett, in a 2017 law review article, suggested a similar skepticism for settled law.

Under the fundamental principle of *stare decisis*, Supreme Court jurisprudence largely builds upon itself and members of the legal profession rely heavily on the work of those who came before them. On matters of civil rights and religious freedom - particularly for members of minority faiths and nonreligious people - Supreme Court victories are critical building blocks in the pursuit of equal justice under law.⁹ But Judge Coney Barrett proposed a distinction between "super precedents" - past holdings "so deeply embedded that their overruling is off the table" - and other decisions that are ripe for reversal.

One notable example she gave for a past decision that should be reconsidered was *Lemon v. Kurtzmann*, where the Supreme Court outlined the test for determining whether the government has violated the Establishment Clause. The *Lemon* Test, as it is known, remains an essential guidepost in maintaining the boundary between religion and government. This view seems to demonstrate an openness to reevaluate key legal victories that ensure that people of all faiths and of none are treated equally under law. If Judge Coney Barrett's starting point in this inquiry is the *Lemon* Test, her appointment to the Supreme Court places much of the progress made around the separation of religion and government under threat.

Distinguishing Personal Belief from Judicial Philosophy

Discussions about the role that Judge Coney Barrett's faith plays in her judicial philosophy are well underway, in many circles and along various lines of inquiry. She is not the first nominee to face pointed questions about her ability to impose a firm distinction between her personal religious convictions and her judicial duties - nor is this her first time encountering such scrutiny. Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee raised concerns during her first

⁹ See, e.g., *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962) (prohibiting prayer in public schools led by school staff); *Clay v. United States*, 403 U.S. 698 (1971) (authorizing conscientious objector status for Muhammed Ali, based on the boxing legend's religious beliefs); *Hobbie v. Unemployment Appeals Commission of Florida*, 480 US 136 (1987) (holding that a state cannot deny unemployment benefits to an employee dismissed for a religious conflict with her employer); *Holt v. Hobb*, 574 US 352 (2015) (permitting religious accommodations to prison grooming requirements for incarcerated persons on the basis of religious belief).



confirmation hearing, following her nomination to the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, about how she would execute her duties independently of her religious convictions.

For instance, in an exchange with Senator Dick Durbin, she responded to a question about her religious affiliation saying, "If you're asking whether I take my faith seriously and I'm a faithful Catholic, I am," adding, "I would stress that my personal church affiliation or my religious belief would not bear in the discharge of my duties as a judge."¹⁰ She went on to say that it is "never appropriate for a judge to impose that judge's personal convictions, whether they derive from faith or anywhere else on the law."¹¹

Judge Coney Barrett's record, however, paints a very different picture. Despite this declaration, she has consistently interpreted the law in a manner consistent with her personal religious beliefs. This confluence is especially evident in her past statements and decisions regarding reproductive healthcare. For instance, in 2006, in her personal capacity Judge Coney Barrett joined over one hundred local residents in signing a full-page newspaper advertisement calling for the landmark abortion rights case *Roe v. Wade* to be overturned. The ad characterized the decision as "barbaric" and a "raw exercise of judicial power" and also called for the restoration of "laws that protect the lives of unborn children." The sponsoring organization, St. Joseph County Right to Life, often holds in-person protests at abortion clinics in the South Bend, Indiana.¹²

She echoed these sentiments first in her capacity as a professor at Notre Dame and later, as a member of the federal bench. In 2013, Notre Dame Magazine quoted Judge Coney Barrett, saying *Roe v. Wade*, "creat[ed] through judicial fiat a framework of abortion on demand in a political environment that was already liberalizing abortion regulations."¹³ She elaborated on this view a few years later in a discussion at Jacksonville University, saying that in the event that *Roe* is overturned, "states have imposed regulations on abortion clinics, and I

¹⁰ Richard Wolfe and Maureen Groppe, *Amy Coney Barrett, Front Runner for Supreme Court Nomination to Replace Ginsburg, is a Favorite of Religious Conservatives*, USA Today (Sep. 19, 2020, 4:51 PM; updated Sep. 25, 2020, 5:36 PM), <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2020/09/19/ruth-bader-ginsburg-trumps-short-list-begins-amy-coney-barrett/5838036002/>.

¹¹ Associated Press, *Her Words: Amy Coney Barrett on Faith, Precedent, Abortion*, Boston Herald (Sep. 27, 2020, 12:39 AM; updated Sep. 27, 2020, 12:39 AM), <https://www.bostonherald.com/2020/09/27/her-words-amy-coney-barrett-on-faith-precedent-abortion/>.

¹² The organization holds extreme views within the anti-abortion movement, including advocating for the criminalization of discarding unused frozen embryos created in the in vitro fertilization process. Emma Specter, *Does Amy Coney Barrett Believe Life Begins at Fertilization?*, Vogue (Oct. 1, 2020), <https://www.vogue.com/article/amy-coney-barrett-pro-life-group>. It is worth noting that the Whole Woman's Health network appeared before the Supreme Court in 2016, challenging a Texas law singling out abortion clinics for overregulation. *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, 579 U.S. ___ (2016).

¹³ John Gagy, *Students, Faculty Mark 40 Years of Roe*, Notre Dame Magazine (Jan. 25, 2013), <https://magazine.nd.edu/stories/lazy-i-students-faculty-mark-40-years-of-ro/>.



think the question is, 'How much freedom the court is willing to let states have in regulating abortion?'"¹⁴

Once confirmed to the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Coney Barrett twice ruled in favor of state restrictions that severely limited access to abortion. In a third case, she joined an opinion suggesting that Supreme Court precedent limiting protests outside of clinics should be overturned, giving legitimacy to the methods of groups like St. Joseph Right to Life that use intimidation to advance their opposition to abortion.¹⁵

The First Amendment guarantees the freedom to believe as we choose and, for many Americans, their faith informs their views on reproductive healthcare and family formation. But we are limited from imposing those views on others, especially from a position of authority like the federal bench. Regardless of her statements to the contrary, Judge Coney Barrett's record illustrates a notable consistency among her personal beliefs, her professional scholarship and statements, and her rulings after joining the 7th Circuit.

Pointing out her potential reluctance to separate her personal views from her constitutional obligations as a federal judge is not an indication of "anti-Catholic bigotry" as President Trump and others have claimed.¹⁶ Sixty years ago, John F. Kennedy was asked how his Roman Catholicism would affect the presidency he sought. He answered that the issue was not what kind of church he believed in, but what kind of America he believed in, saying, "I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute."¹⁷

Judge Coney Barrett has not shown a similar commitment. Instead, when reviewing cases where her personal beliefs and the law may diverge, she has demonstrated a willingness to apply the opposite approach. Her failure to demonstrate an unambiguous commitment to the fundamental separation of religion and government provokes grave concern - and would undermine her standing as a neutral arbiter if confirmed to the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court Should Protect Freedom of Belief - Not Greenlight Discrimination Under the Guise of Religious Freedom

Following the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, scholars have tracked the consolidation of the Religious Right around a new wedge issue: abortion and *Roe v. Wade*. But as public attitudes around sexual orientation and gender identity began to shift, the movement for

¹⁴ Emily Czachor, *Amy Coney Barrett on Abortion, Roe v. Wade and Judicial Precedent in Her Own Words*, Newsweek (Sep. 23, 2020, 5:00 AM),

<https://www.newsweek.com/amy-coney-barrett-abortion-roe-v-wade-judicial-precedent-her-own-words-1533707>.

¹⁵ *Price v. City of Chicago*, 915 F.3d 1107 (7th Cir. 2019).

¹⁶ Joe Sommerlad and Alex Woodward, *Trump News: President Accuses Democrats of anti-Catholic Bias at Charity Event After Biden Speaks of His Faith*, Independent (Oct. 2, 2020), <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-news-live-us-election-biden-latest-coronavirus-update-cases-twitter-b736236.html>.

¹⁷ John F. Kennedy, *Address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association*, (Sep. 12, 1960), <https://jdstone.org/cr/files/ibelieveinamerica.html>.



LGBTQ+ equality emerged as a central target for influential figures like the Rev. Billy Graham and his son, Franklin.¹⁸

Justice Scalia, Judge Coney Barrett’s mentor, proved to be a consistent ally when the Supreme Court weighed in on these issues. Over the course of his tenure, Justice Scalia ruled in favor of state anti-sodomy laws,¹⁹ to uphold the federal Defense of Marriage Act,²⁰ and against the legalization of same-sex marriage.²¹ Judge Coney Barrett appears poised to take up his role as a vigorous opponent of LGBTQ+ equality, despite substantive case law tracing these protections to the 14th Amendment.²² As on the issue of abortion, her stated religious views paralleled her analysis of legal issues related to LGBTQ+ equality in the years immediate prior to joining the federal bench.

In her personal capacity, in 2015, she joined a Letter to Synod Fathers from Catholic Women, affirming “the Church’s teachings...on the meaning of human sexuality, the significance of sexual difference and the complementarity of men and women...and on marriage and family founded on the indissoluble commitment of a man and a woman.”²³

Shortly after the *Obergefell* decision, she praised the dissenters, saying “[Chief Justice John Roberts] said, those who want same-sex marriage, you have every right to lobby in state legislatures to make that happen....So I think *Obergefell*, and what we’re talking about for the future of the court, it’s really a who decides question.” A year later, in a lecture at Jacksonville University, she argued that it was a “strain on the text” to say that Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 protects transgender students from discrimination, illustrating her point through anti-trans claims about bathroom use.²⁴

While Judge Coney Barrett’s views on gender and sexuality are notably conservative, the legal questions regarding LGBTQ+ equality under law have evolved since Justice Scalia’s death in 2016. As advocates win successive legal and legislative victories, opponents have increasingly taken to the courts to expand religious exemptions that permit discrimination under the guise of religious freedom. For instance, in 2018, the Supreme Court heard *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*, in which a bakery owner argued

¹⁸ John Paul Brammer, *Billy Graham Leaves Painful Legacy for LGBTQ People*, NBC News (Feb. 22, 2018, 11:25 AM; updated Feb. 22, 2018, 11:25 AM), <https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/billy-graham-leaves-painful-legacy-lgbtq-people-n850031>.

¹⁹ *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558 (2003).

²⁰ *United States v. Windsor*, 570 U.S. 744 (2013).

²¹ *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644 (2015).

²² The court has cited the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the 14th Amendment in key decisions regarding the rights of LGBTQ+ people. See, e.g., *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620 (1996); *Obergefell v. Hodges*, *supra*; and most recently, *Bostock v. Clayton County*, 590 U.S. ___ (2020). Sharita Gruberg, *Beyond Bostock: The Future of LGBTQ Civil Rights*, Center for American Progress (Aug. 26, 2020, 9:01 AM), <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbtq-rights/reports/2020/08/26/489772/beyond-bostock-future-lgbtq-civil-rights/>.

²³ *Letter to Synod Fathers from Catholic Women*, Ethics and Public Policy Center (Oct. 1, 2015), <https://eppc.org/synodletter/>.

²⁴ Jacksonville University, Hesburgh Lecture 2016: Professor Amy Barrett at the JU Public Policy Institute (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7yjTEdZ81II> (last visited Oct. 5, 2020).



that compliance with the state’s anti-discrimination law violated his First Amendment right to freely exercise his religion.²⁵ The court ultimately sidestepped this question, but the decision was nonetheless hailed as a major victory by the Religious Right.

The bakery owner was represented by the Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF), a Christian legal organization at the forefront of the campaign to distort the meaning of religious freedom beyond recognition. ADF, identified as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center,²⁶ has also advocated for the recriminalization of same-sex sexual activity; defended the forced sterilization of transgender people; and claimed that a “homosexual agenda” will destroy Christianity and society.²⁷ Their Blackstone Legal Fellowship is a legal training and internship program designed to inspire attendees toward a “distinctly Christian worldview in every area of law” and show students “how God can use them as judges, law professors and practicing attorneys to help keep the door open for the spread of the Gospel in America.”

Judge Coney Barrett has been a paid speaker for the program five times, starting in 2011.²⁸ When pressed by former Senator Al Franken during her 2017 confirmation hearing, she insisted that she did not know that the Blackstone program was run by the ADF, saying, “I actually wasn’t aware until I received the honorarium and saw the ADF on the check, or maybe when I saw an email and saw the signature line.” This information, however, was not a barrier to her repeated participation. “I don’t feel like affiliation with a group,” she added, “commits me to all of that group’s policy positions.”

If confirmed, Judge Coney Barrett may not wait long to illustrate which of ADF’s positions she is inclined to support. On November 4, 2020, the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments in *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, regarding whether a faith-based foster and adoption agency that contracts with the government must abide by applicable non-discrimination laws in service provision.²⁹ ADF represents Catholic Social Services (CSS), arguing that CSS and other faith-based agencies should receive a religious accommodation that permits them to discriminate against prospective parents and foster children under the guise of religious freedom. These arguments turn the principle of religious freedom on its head, manipulating our first freedom into a sword to cause harm instead of a shield to protect against unequal treatment.

²⁵ 584 U.S. ___ (2018).

²⁶ Southern Poverty Law Center, *Alliance Defending Freedom*, <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/alliance-defending-freedom> (last visited Oct. 5, 2020).

²⁷ Frederick Clarkson, When Exception is the Rule: The Religious Freedom Strategy of the Christian Right, Political Research Associates (Jan. 1, 2016), <https://www.politicalresearch.org/2016/01/12/when-exemption-is-the-rule-the-religious-freedom-strategy-of-the-christian-right>.

²⁸ Emma Brown and John Swain, *Amy Coney Barrett, Supreme Court nominee, spoke at program founded to inspire a ‘distinctly Christian worldview in every area of law’*, Washington Post (Sept. 27, 2020, 9:02 AM), https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/coney-barrett-christian-law-fellowship-blackstone/2020/09/27/7ae41892-fdc5-11ea-b555-4d71a9254f4b_story.html.

²⁹ SCOTUS Blog, *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*, <https://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/fulton-v-city-of-philadelphia-pennsylvania/> (last visited Oct. 5, 2020).



The court will also consider key provisions of the Affordable Care Act this term. The issue of birth control coverage has been hotly contested, including litigation led by ADF on behalf of the craft store Hobby Lobby. Before her confirmation to the 7th Circuit, Judge Coney Barrett signed a letter by the Becket Fund - another conservative legal group working to remake the role of religion in public life - condemning the Obama Administration's simple process for registering religious exemptions as an unlawful burden on religious exercise.³⁰ This issue remains under dispute and earlier this year the Supreme Court sided with the Trump Administration after the Department of Health and Human Services issued sweeping new religious exemptions to the coverage requirement.³¹ Judge Coney Barrett's stated views indicate that she would be partial to expansive carve-outs that condition employees' access to healthcare on their boss's religious beliefs.

If Confirmed, Judge Coney Barrett Could Redefine Religious Freedom as We Know It

The Supreme Court stands as the final bulwark against discrimination in the name of religion and the distortion of our first freedom. In her time on the bench, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was a champion of the separation of church and state and an ardent defender of equality. Her replacement should embody the same commitment to guiding our nation along the path toward justice, one decision at a time.

Interfaith Alliance has never, in our organizational history, opposed a judicial nominee. We do so not to call into question Judge Amy Coney Barrett's personal beliefs or experience, but out of profound concern for positions she holds that will undercut true religious freedom for all Americans. Her judicial philosophy, evidenced by her record, endangers the decades of progress our nation has made toward the abiding promise that every American is equal under the law. It brings us no joy to oppose Judge Coney Barrett's nomination to the Supreme Court, but at a time such as this, we believe it necessary.

³⁰ Letter from Becket Fund for Religious Liberty (Feb. 13, 2012), quoted in full in *Cardinal Dolan Joins Protest Over 'Unacceptable' Attack on Religious Liberty*, National Catholic Register (Feb. 27, 2012), <https://www.ncregister.com/news/cardinal-dolan-joins-protest-over-unacceptable-attack-on-religious-liberty>.

³¹ *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 140 S. Ct. 2367 (2020).