Free Exercise

Free exercise: 3 Major Problems

- 1) Legal prohibition of religiously obligatory activities: polygamy, snake-handling, peyote
- 2) Acts required by law, but prohibited by religion: mandatory school attendance, Social Security
- 3) Disadvantage because of regulation Blue Laws, Restrictions on public funds

A Foundational Problem: Defining Religion

Two major contexts:

- 1) Providing benefits use of religion for tax evasion, avoiding regulation
- 2) Recognizing other ethical imperatives as equally deserving of protection nonreligious conscientious objectors

United States v. Ballard (1944)

Trial of "I AM" movement leaders for fraudulently seeking and collecting donations on the basis of religious claims that the defendants themselves did not believe

United States v. Ballard (1944)

Court ruled

- the question of whether the Ballards believed their religious claims with "good faith" was rightly submitted to the jury
- the question of the truth or falsity of the beliefs was rightly withheld from the jury

U.S. v. Seeger (1965) Welch v. U.S. (1970)

- Dispute denial sought conscientious objector status for failure to "belong to an orthodox religious sect."
- Claim pacifism as ethical, not religious, choice
- Seeger uses agnostic language, Welch most likely an atheist

U.S. v. Seeger (1965) Welch v. U.S. (1970)

"the statute does not distinguish between externally and internally derived beliefs. Such a determination would ... prove impossible as a practical matter, and we have found that Congress intended no such distinction." (Seeger)

Is secularism a religion?

Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others

Ftn 11 in Torcaso v. Watkins (1961)

Reynolds v. US (1878)

- U.S. criminalizes polygamy in federal territories, including Utah
- Court decides in favor of U.S.
- Fundamental principle: Free exercise rights protect belief, not action

Reynolds v. US (1878)

Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice.

Chief Justice Waite

Davis v. Beason (1890)

Idaho territory statute required voters to swear that they were not members of any organization that "teaches, advises, counsels or encourages" its members to commit the crime of bigamy.

Question: could Idaho prohibit voting based on religious affiliation and not criminal action?

Davis v. Beason (1890)

... if [bigamy and polygamy] are crimes, then to teach, advise and counsel their practice is to aid in their commission, and such teaching and counseling are themselves criminal and proper subjects of punishment....

Crime is not the less odious because sanctioned by what any particular sect may designate as religion.

Justice Field

Wisconsin v. Yoder

- Old Order Amish believe that high school makes teenagers too much "of the world"
- Believe that an 8th grade education is all that is necessary to succeed as farmer
- Lack of high school reduces career options
- Amish do not become dependent on the state

Employment Division v. Smith (1990)

- Drug counselors apply for unemployment, argue discharge for peyote consumption discriminates against religious obligation
- Court changes standard from strict scrutiny to "generally applicable" laws
- Dissenters note that many states exempt Native American religious use of peyote from drug laws

Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. Hialeah

Santeria – Cuban "voodoo" combining Catholicism w/ West African religion

Animal sacrifices and use of animal parts are elements in cermonies

Hialeah law clearly targets Santeria, exempts kosher/halal slaughter

Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) of 1993

"Government shall not burden a person's exercise of religion even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability [unless] it demonstrates that application of the burden... 1) furthers a compelling governmental interest, and (2) is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest."

City of Boerne v. Flores

Constitutionality of RFRA

Does Congress have proper power under 14th Amendment to interpret 1st Amendment?

Does congressional action threaten separation of powers?

Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000

- No government shall impose or implement a land use regulation in a manner that imposes a substantial burden on the religious exercise of a person ... unless [can demonstrate] law is
- a. is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest; and
- b. is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest.

Locke v. Davey (2004)

Establishment Clause v. Free Exercise Clause

Must a state fund scholarships that go to students attending religious colleges equally with secular higher education?

Court finds denial of funding does not evince bias against religion